


MS. TRICIA DEBLEECKERE: We're going to get started. It's just a little after 6:00. It's ten after 6:00.

So, good evening, everyone. Thank you for coming out in the snowy weather.

I am Tricia DeBleeckere with the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission. I'm the Commission staff on this project. We're here to talk to you today about the Trimont Repowering Project, which I think most of you are aware of.

So we're going to do a brief presentation on essentially the Commission process, we're going to -- I'll hand it over to Adam, who I believe you all know.

So then this is out of order, so I'll give a brief overview of the process that this project is going to go through. Second, Adam will go over the project, what they're proposing to do with the project. And then third, David Birkholz of the Department of Commerce will give you an overview of essentially the environmental review component that's going to go into the review of the site permit amendment.

When we get to the comment portion, this is Janet Shaddix, she is our court reporter, she's
taking down these notes for us to bring back to the office to remember what you all said. So when you're speaking, speak clearly, speak slowly, and if you can face her, otherwise you will be called out and asked to repeat what you said.

So I'm with the Public Utilities
Commission and with me today is Charley Bruce, our public advisor, he's been on the job for one month, so right now he's just watching and seeing how this process goes.

And then last we're going to take your comments and get questions on the project. So anything we can answer for you or any comments you have on the proposal, the impacts you believe the project will have, if you have any proposed mitigation measures for any of those impacts, that's what we're looking for.

We permit wind projects that are greater than five megawatts at the Commission. Counties can elect to assume authority for projects between five and 25. Jackson County has done so. We can amend any of our existing site permits at any time. Trimont was issued a site permit in 2004 and they've come in for a site permit amendment.

Go ahead to the next one.

And so the proposal before the Commission now is Trimont is looking to retrofit existing turbines, replacing cell equipment, refurbish generators to increase the megawatt capacity, replace the rotor, updating electronic controls and some modified wind access buffer setbacks. So those are really the issues that we're looking for your comment on today, about whether those are reasonable changes, what do you think about them, whether we should allow them, and if there are other considerations or conditions we should put on the site permit to allow for any of these modifications.

So we'll seek your comments today verbally through this meeting. We will accept written comments until, really February 21st is your key deadline, February 28 th will be a response period, but really we want your initial comments and your initial feedback by February 21st.

And the three things I mentioned we're looking at are the requested site permit amendment relating to is the change acceptable, should the Commission approve the modified setbacks, and third, are there any other issues or concerns related to this site permit amendment.

So when we consider permitting projects,
we look at effects on land, water, air, public health and welfare, the whole list of items here. There are four buckets of considerations that we really focus on when reviewing these site permit amendments or changes to projects. And those are new information that would substantially change the findings accompanying the Commission's original permit decision, so what has actually changed from the original permit issuance. So it's not just what's changing in the project, but what findings did the Commission make that are different now with the new proposal.

Second is compliance with existing site permit terms and conditions. So essentially has Trimont Wind followed the permit to date and have they done what they're supposed to be doing. Are their compliance filings in, are they up to date. Third, consistency with Commission standards. And so we update our site permit conditions from time to time on a case-by-case basis as we see the industry developing or changes occurring. And so when we have older projects that were permitted some time ago, sometimes ten years ago, we look to see what conditions the Commission has placed in more recent permits and how they are
applicable to the new project.
Fourth, we look at permit distribution and landowner notification requirements. The more we get familiar with wind, it's been about ten years since we started permitting these projects, we're really looking to make sure that landowners in the area were properly noticed. And if we amend a permit we want to make sure that they get renotification both of the amendment that's come in and any future site permit changes if they're approved.

So right now we've got four ways to submit comments. Verbal comments today at this meeting. You can go online to our Speak Up! system, that's an easier entry form for you to submit comments. We accept U.S. mail. And then there's a more formal approach, which you can file through our Commission's docket record. If you efile, that's the easiest way to file comments with attachments or with a letterhead. And so you have to go through a few steps to get there, but it's a more formal approach to submitting comments. So all four of these options are equally valid and have equal weight. So if you have comments today versus submitting comments later, we receive them all the
same .
All of these options are available in the public meeting notice and you should have received a copy of that notice, $I$ assume that's why you're all here. There are some copies on the back table if you want to take those to figure out where you can submit comments.

So that's all $I$ have right now, so I'll pass it over to Adam Sokolski of Trimont Wind to give an overview of the site permit amendment application.

MR. ADAM SOKOLSKI: Great.
Good evening, everybody. I'm Adam Sokolski, I work with Avangrid Renewables. I live and work out of Minneapolis, but I've been involved with a lot of projects down here over the years and others across the country.

There we go. Go to the next slide.
I wanted to give a couple things prior to getting to the meat and potatoes of our project proposal. Avangrid Renewables might be a newer name to some of you, it used to be called Iberdrola Renewables up until about two years ago. We've had a name change that reflects kind of the way we've structured the company here in the United States.

And a little bit more background about the company. About 6,000 megawatts, a little more than 6,000 megawatts of wind scattered throughout the United States from Oregon to Vermont and New Hampshire down to Texas.

We've got about $\$ 10$ billion of U.S.
assets. I believe about 750 employees. Most of our business is wind, but we also own some solar plants and some biomass assets, as well as a relatively large natural gas-fired power plant kind of on the border of Oregon and California.

You can go to the next slide.
And just to give you a little bit of flavor of where we own a wind farm and solar plant operations across the United States. As you can see here in the Upper Midwest, Minnesota, Dakotas, and Iowa, we've got a large concentration here of about 14, 15 wind farms representing I think around 1,450 megawatts, so quite a distribution here in the Upper Midwest.

Go ahead.
So as Tricia had mentioned, Trimont has been around for awhile. Trimont projects, for those of you who are landowners may remember, the landowners put this project together with a project
development company that now Neal Von Ohlen here in our audience and Corey Ebeling are a couple, Trimont Area Wind Farm, LLC. It was a community partnership between the landowner and company, and Avangrid Renewables are the owner of the wind farm itself. What's unique there is that first wind farm, that was the first one in this region, within 50 or 60 miles. It was initially developed by landowners and now, because of that unique partnership, the landownership company as part of the development model receives a share of the project's gross revenues, in addition to land leases and turbine payments that would normally come with a wind farm development.

The project was built in 2005 by our company and is now owned and operated by us as well. The project capacity, there are 67 turbines, each 1.5 megawatts in electrical capacity, creating 100.5 megawatts of electricity. Right now those turbines have what we call 77 meter rotor diameter, or a diameter of the blades is 77 meters or 252 feet across. And the center of that hub, the center of that rotor is about 262 feet off the ground.

We currently have a power sales agreement, Power Purchase Agreement, with Great

River Energy. They're a wholesale transmission and generation cooperative that serves the local rural energy cooperatives in the area and across the state of Minnesota. That power sales agreement ends in the end of 2020. We're working on a new power sales agreement.

Currently we operate that project, when you think about what we call capacity factor, it's a measurement of our efficiency in creating electricity out of wind, think about on your farms, if you farm, think about it as your yield. We operate that at about 37 and a half capacity factor, it's a decent wind project. And the project that we're proposing will have an effect on that.

We have about eight local jobs at the site. The Trimont and Elm Creek Wind Farm operation center, about half the people there work on the Trimont, or work on all the turbines, but there is probably eight FTEs associated with the Trimont project. And we currently pay a wind production tax that goes to the counties and the townships of about $\$ 400,000$ a year. 80 percent to the county, 20 percent to the township, all based on electrical production on an annual basis.

Next slide, please. Here we go.

So this wind farm is only at this point a little bit more than ten years old and why are we talking about retrofitting? First of all, a retrofit increases the reliability, the efficiency, and prolongs the life, the useful life of the facility. These turbines are about 15 years old, they were well built and well maintained, but we have an opportunity here to make an improvement.

So what we're proposing to do here is use a General Electric certified and manufactured and delivered product that increases the rotor diameter of the turbines. So we'll take down the existing blades and rotor and replace it with a larger rotor set. That new rotor set will be 91 meters across or 298 feet. We'll also replace many of the components within what's called the nacelle, the big square box at the top of the tower. That'll include the gearbox or the transmission. Oil cooler, drive shaft, pitch drive, et cetera. A number of components there get switched out.

We're going to refurbish the electrical generator that sits on top, and that will be taken down, trucked off-site but nearby and rebuilt, refurbished, so it's like brand new and put back into the wind turbine. The sum of those changes
will increase the turbine's potential to generate electricity from 1.5 megawatts to 1.6 megawatts, so a slight increase in electric capacity. Finally, we'll put a new software package into the machines and into the system that'll help enhance the controls and help us increase the yield or the capacity factor of the project.

So we're talking about an overall
increase if this project is installed of about 15 percent more megawatt-hours of production on an annual basis. That means more electricity, think of that as more corn or beans coming off the same field. With that, it means additional taxes we'll pay to the local units of government of about 15 percent more because we're taxed on each megawatt-hour of production.

This retrofit should increase the useful
life of the project to about 2045 , so we have a long life extension with this. There will still be maintenance to be done, no question about it. But when we think of useful life it pushes it out another 25 years. And should we get permission to install we would do it in either 2019 or 2020.

So, again, just thinking about the layout
here. What would change? No turbine sites are
changing. We're reusing -- excuse me. We're reusing the existing foundation, access roads, underground electrical systems. Above ground we're using the wind turbine tower and the shell of the nacelle, or the box at the top. There will be some additional internal components that will be reused, but we're able to essentially put a bigger sail on the sailboat here. By changing from 77 to 91 meters in rotor diameter, we've got a 40 percent larger rotor sweep area which helps increase our production. The hub height where the nacelle sits for the center of that hub, that will not get any taller. We're staying the same. So the turbines don't get any taller, except for the blades get wider. And so that tip height, so if you think of one of the blades at the 12:00 position, the measurement from the top of that tip of the blade will increase to about 412 feet, which is a 23-foot increase from the existing condition.

Next slide, please.
Construction process. As I said, the turbines will not move, they'll remain in the same location. We want to reuse the existing underground infrastructure, reuse the existing roads. However, we will need to improve some of the wind farm roads.

Some of them are getting older, some of them need some gravel put back on them to ensure that we build up the project so we don't do any damage. We'll also need a temporary wide-turning radius at the intersection of the project roads and the public roads that will allow for, when we bring in a turbine blade truck, allow for them to make that wide turn with a long truck.

Finally, we'll need -- additionally,
we'll need a temporary construction and laydown area around each wind turbine. So those of you who are landowners, think about a 400 by 400 foot square somewhere around that wind turbine. We need to park a crane, we need to park some vehicles to rebuild the nacelle, to rebuild the rotor, and that'll take up some temporary ground.

We'll use a large crane to lower the rotor and nacelle to the ground. The components will be removed. Some will be disposed of, such as the blades, which will be cut up on site and trucked off site and ground up and recycled. The generator will be shipped off site to a location nearby to be determined, where GE will have contractors and employees working to refurbish that electrical generator.

We'll truck in the new blades, the hub, the nacelle-based equipment and the refurbished generator, which will all be assembled on site and lifted back up on top of the tower.

Finally, we'll test out each turbine individually and go through a condition process. We'll start pulling out the turning radius at the public road entrances because they are temporary, and clean up and restore the site.

Overall, we anticipate it taking, you know, the better part of the season to do that, so similar to a new build. We'll start in the spring, end in the fall. We haven't determined exactly what kind of construction schedule will be used at this point.

I think I've said it before, but turbine locations won't change. We know that's going to be a common question people have. We have had outside engineers look at our underground electric collection system and they find that that underground electric collection system is sufficient to accommodate the new turbines -- not new turbines, the retrofitted turbines, and so we don't anticipate any new underground trenching.

We have a wind farm here, we could always
have a problem with the electrical conductor and it would need to be removed and replaced, that's always a risk with a wind farm, but we don't anticipate trenching any new electrical for the project.

The existing wind turbine towers, the nacelles and the foundations will be reused. We've had outside engineers already in to take a look at the design and the construction of those existing wind turbine foundations. The engineers have found that those are sufficient to support the new equipment.

We'll have some additional testing and inspection prior to construction to make sure there has been no deterioration or degradation that has been unexpected, to ensure that the foundations remain safe and secure for the new product.

Finally, if we do find problems with the foundation, and that's true if we retrofit or not, of course we're going to go in and make the modifications necessary to make sure that the foundations and towers are safe and reliable for not only our workers, for ensuring the plant continues to operate safely, and also for the safety of the general public and landowners.

Next slide.

Crop damage. We'll have some crop damage. There's no question about it. That happens with any wind farm construction project. However, as we always do, we'll work to avoid having any crop damage by working in advance with landowners to try to either not plant in an area or early harvest in an area as an alternative to damaging crops. Of course, we're always going to compensate landowners for damage to crops. We break it, we pay for it. That's just been a long-term promise we have with the landowners to ensure that we're not infringing on someone else's income.

Drain tile damage. We've had drain tile damage on these sites. There's no question about it. There is a lot of drain tile here in the local area. And we're committed, if we have a drain tile problem, we're committed to having it repaired and fixed properly. So just as we've always had, if you have a drain tile problem, let us know, and we're going to make sure that it gets fixed if it's been associated with the project. I know Bill Swan from this project site here and his team have been really great about that over the years.

I think that's it. Here's my contact information. I've got business cards. I'm going to
stick around after as well to talk to folks and answer any questions.

I'll turn it back over to David.
MR. DAVID BIRKHOLZ: Good evening. My name is David Birkholz, I'm with the Minnesota Department of Commerce. I'm the old-timer in the group here because I was out here talking with several of you in 2004. I'm still around. But we work with the Department of Commerce, then we were in the Environmental Quality Board.

And in the initial project we did two things. There was a certificate of need, if you'll recall, and we did an environmental review in my office on the certificate of need, which the PUC made the decision on. And then the other environmental review that takes place on a wind farm is actually the research and the surveys and the application. And that permit went through the Environmental Quality Board and we were out here for meetings on that as well. So that's 14 years ago.

So we're talking about changing the project, but it's also important to understand what's changed out here as well so we're not just assuming that everything is the same.

So there's a lot of interest -- well, in
the first place, now all the decisions, as Tricia has pointed out, have been transferred by the legislature over to the Public Utilities Commission. And then my group from the Environmental Quality Board was transferred over to Commerce, but we're still working together on the same project and we're still doing the same things.

At this stage, we don't have to do another certificate of need. But we do have to look at what is going to be the environmental impact of making a change of this magnitude.

We've been looking, over the past couple years between the Commission and the Department and several developers, including Avangrid, and talking about exactly this idea. Minnesota has been permitting wind turbines for 20 years now, which is really an amazing thing to think about back then because it was all so bright and shiny and new at the time. But there are a couple from that period on Buffalo Ridge that are looking to do fairly similar projects of doing this. And it's all new, to decide what needs to be done, what needs to be looked at.

So for this project we all sat down and went through, as noted in the old permit that they
have, and you may want to go online and see that, and the new permits that Tricia talked about that have changed over the last 20 years. And there are a lot of different things that the state of Minnesota and the industry have learned about the environmental impact of wind energy and wind farming and a lot of information about the things that need to be looked at.

The important thing here is that we sat down together and we've gone back and we've gone over a lot of the same things that went into the application the first time we looked at it. Are there changes in the area? Are there changes in the environment locally? What kind of changes will take place based on these changes? What are the advantages of doing retrofitting over new projects? And what kind of review needs to take place? So those are a lot of questions that are being asked and a lot of new things that don't have answers yet because this is number one. This is the first retrofit project that we're looking at. So we're learning and doing it at the same time and that's why it's especially important to solicit a lot of information from landowners because that's, again, the final layer of impact, that's where it hits the
ground.
Some of you are participants, I'm sure, and other people in the area aren't, and there's a slightly -- there's a bit of difference in the impact view based on your perspective, I'm sure. But the things that we've asked the company to do and the company has offered to do, they've gone through and done many of the same surveys and modeling of the turbines and the noise, the noise modeling, the shadow flicker modeling, the types of things that are going to be impacts that will be a part of any wind farm. We've gone through and see if there's any environmental changes, has the land use changed, are there different -- are there different wetland implications? What's stayed the same? What's changed?

Anyway, the important thing at this point in time is that along with what we're doing, we're learning. The basic thing that I'm trying to say rather poorly is that we're trying to learn the right questions we're asking as we're asking the questions. We're trying to ask the questions and we're trying to learn what the right questions are to ask. And that will take -- and that's why we're out asking for a local opinion.

So one of the things that $I$ would suggest is that we do have online the old permits that were in place from the beginning of the project. We have online on our site at the Department of Commerce, as well as at the PUC, the types of permits that are being issued now. And there are quite a few variations. And as Tricia said, we update. Every time projects have made amendments, we've updated them so that it's consistent across-the-board. So all projects are responsible to fulfill the same environmental responsibilities across-the-board.

Avangrid has a series of projects that are newer and newer and newer, as we go, as you all know because they're down here, so they've followed that path as well as they've gone along the way.

The reason we're out here today is, again, before we would actually give -- before we, and it's not we, it's the Public Utilities Commission itself that makes the decision, but it's my office that does most of the environmental review and the checking to see that the surveys are done and that the impacts are done and that people have had the chance to have input on the project.

So the thing that we're out here for today is to collect, I want to encourage you to go
online and look at the differences and to see what might be missing. To go in and look at the application -- you probably have received a copy of the application. Have people received a copy at this point in time?

MR. ADAM SOKOLSKI: No.
MS. TRICIA DEBLEECKERE: They've received notice and a link where they can get the application.

MR. DAVID BIRKHOLZ: Right. So you have a chance to go over and look at that. So the point is, you're going to have input from your perspective, from, again, on the ground of what we're missing.

The application looks at everything we've asked them to look at. We've talked it back and forth and we've come back. And the step of the project now, before it goes before the Commission, is for you and your neighbors to step up and say what needs to be reviewed to be able to do this. And so what needs to be reviewed, what's already been taken care of, what is positive, what is negative. What is positive, even. This is not just a look to see what's wrong, this is a look to see let's do this the right way and retrofitting and
making the best use of the resource, again, as possible.

So before I stand up here and just start redundantly working myself back out of a corner that I've talked myself into, I'll sit down and just say that we really sincerely are looking for the input of all of you who are out here. And helping us to learn as we go into this new process of retrofitting and relooking at another new way to look at wind energy in Minnesota and the way to do it best and the way to do it most efficiently and we appreciate your help.

So tonight we're going to go ahead and have you come up here and speak. And Tricia can explain that. But you're also going to be able to, as I said, look at all the materials that you have and look at all the materials that you want to, and there will be a time period so that you can put in written comments as well, and so you're not just based off the top of your head, you can be able to review what's on the table.

So thank you for coming out to do this and we look forward to your comments and I'll let Tricia continue.

MS. TRICIA DEBLEECKERE: Thanks, David.

So right now we're at the public comment portion where we're here to answer any questions you might have or whatever input you have.

So would anybody like to start?
All right. And you could -- actually, could you come up to the front so Janet can hear both your first and last name?

MR. TIM STAHL: My name is Tim Stahl, I'm the Jackson County engineer.

COURT REPORTER: And the spelling, please.

MR. TIM STAHL: S-T-A-H-L. I don't need to spell Jackson, do I?

COURT REPORTER: No, I think I have that one. Thank you.

MR. TIM STAHL: All right. As I'm perusing the document here, with all the wind production or wind farms in Jackson County, we've had a development agreement. From the highway engineer's perspective we are watching out for the condition of the roads. That the roads' condition prior to construction is similar to the post construction activities.

At this time in this document and in previous documents that was addressed, that
necessary permits will have to be acquired through the road authorities. So I would like to make sure that that goes on record, that that is something $I$ need to see. The reason being is that there will still be traffic. I found out today that the nacelle comes off and goes to another location, that is a very heavy load, which may exceed the capacity of an existing road, be it a township or a county road.

So I just want to make sure that that development agreement, which includes a road use agreement and a public drainage agreement is adhered to in a retro project.

Thank you.
MS. TRICIA DEBLEECKERE: Thank you for your comments.

Who else? Anybody else? This will be a short meeting. There you go.

MR. NEAL VON OHLEN: DO I have to stand up there?

MS. TRICIA DEBLEECKERE: If you can say your name.

MR. NEAL VON OHLEN: Neal Von Ohlen.
COURT REPORTER: Spell it, please.
MR. NEAL VON OHLEN: N-E-A-L, V-O-N
$\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{L}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{N}$.
I'd just like to make a comment. So Corey and I helped the Trimont Wind Farm, LLC. So for Avangrid to justify this input they're putting into this project, this cash they're going to have to put into this project, when we originally signed back in 2005 we signed a 30-year lease. And to justify it, they wanted to add another ten years on to that lease to make it a 40-year lease.

And right now at this meeting there is -I'm one, and there's five other landowners behind me, and they don't -- they all live within the project, they're all -- they live, farm, work in the area. And so to add those extra ten years, I just wanted to stress that those were absentee landowners. But to justify to add those ten years, you basically had to go to 67 landowners and have them sign the necessary paperwork to add the ten years. And out of the 67 landowners, every single person signed that lease. So, I mean, if there was one person that was upset with noise, birds, visual, anything, why would they sign that lease? And there wasn't a single person that did not sign that lease.

So I think that right there tells you that the people that are in this project are very
happy. They do a great job with tile repair, they help out anyway they can with the landowners, and it's been a great cooperation between the landowners and the company and everyone is very happy.

MS. TRICIA DEBLEECKERE: Great. Thank you.

I'll stand up here for a little longer. All right. Going once, going twice.

All right.
MR. STEVE FLOHRS: All right. I'm Steve Flohrs, Martin County Commissioner. F-L-O-H-R-S. The only -- Adam and I talked about it a little bit earlier, I'm only worried about the setbacks, with the change in the rotor size and the setbacks. We were talking about it. Could you explain it all to me, how we get generally around that? Or how many sites are there that I actually have to worry about with the setbacks? None?

MR. ADAM SOKOLSKI: Commissioner Flohrs, I don't recall the number off the top of my head. I know Sarah and I worked on the analysis of that.

MR. DAVID BIRKHOLZ: I think it's on the order of 21.

MR. STEVE FLOHRS: 21 will be impacted?
MR. ADAM SOKOLSKI: That's my
recollection as well as at least the right ballpark. And the issue here is the question of what's called the wind access buffer setback that the state Utilities Commission imposes upon a large wind system like this. That setback is measured by multiplying the rotor diameter of the wind turbines times three, or times five, depending on the direction. The idea is the setback from the boundary of your leased land, either three rotor diameters on the east-west, or five rotor diameters on the north-south access, to make sure that there is a significant buffer between two different wind farms and two different wind rights holders. That's the largest setback in the country for a wind setback.

There are some noise setbacks in other states that rival that, but we're really looking at the largest setback that we have to deal with here in Minnesota and the largest setback that we have in the Upper Midwest region.

Commissioner Flohrs, you're correct, we're not going to move the turbines. Economically that doesn't work. So we've asked the Commission in our application for relief from the wind access buffer setback in the specific locations where --
because we're not moving the turbines, we need some relief to allow those turbine locations to have a larger rotor diameter placed upon them. And so we've asked that of the Commission.

Back in 2004, when we initially permitted the project, we asked for similar relief in cases where complying with the wind access buffer setback would have placed turbines in an undesirable location. I can't remember all the circumstances, but I think one had to do with that that placement would put it into a native prairie and the restored or original native parcel and we didn't want to do that. Another case was I believe it was going to get close to or into a wetland area that we didn't want to get into.

So we've asked for relief and the
Commission has granted relief in some cases throughout the years to accommodate what's called efficient development of the wind resource. So that's what we're asking for here, in that case. We are not asking for any relief on any of the other setbacks or standards. The noise setback, the road setbacks, et cetera. We continue to comply with those fully. But in this case, the wind access buffer setback, it kind of boxes us in and so we've
chosen to ask for relief there.
MS. TRICIA DEBLEECKERE: That's a good point. Because this is our first repowering project, that's a question that really hasn't been before the Commission before. And so when we look at variances from kind of our existing standards, we look on a case-by-case basis. However, I know that this specific instance and any future similar requests from the Commission like this will be a very difficult one for the Commission to answer.

When you are looking at easements that overlap either internally with the Trimont project, when you go externally and you start impacting the wind of neighbors without easement agreements, that's going to be a really hard decision for the commissioners to make and nobody has made that decision yet so that's forthcoming with this application. That's what we're really looking for for input from everybody on this project and the pros, the cons, and what we should do about it.

MR. DAVID BIRKHOLZ: I might just say, as Adam says, it's not just about the noise setbacks because that's a different setback, but it's a development setback. It's a best use of the resource setback. So internally for the company's
benefit and for the development of people who own land rights that aren't in the project, it's -- but what I think, the way I look at it, is the decision that the Commission is making is the same as it's always making, is what's the best use of the resource. And over the years that three by five setback, based on the prevailing wind, has been a very workable number. But it's not a number set in statute, or it's not a number set in rule, it's a number set in precedent and the fact that it's worked for basic projects.

So the real question the Commission will have to make, they have to establish if the other environmental conditions are met, and if this is a project that is really advancing the wind projects in Minnesota and the wind goals in Minnesota, is balancing that question. Is can we -- can they adjust that setback in consideration of making the best use of the wind resource and making the best and least impact on the environment while doing so.

MR. STEVE FLOHRS: Thank you.
MS. TRICIA DEBLEECKERE: Anybody else?
MR. DAVID BIRKHOLZ: It's an interesting question.

MR. NEAL VON OHLEN: I have a question.

When Trimont was built, didn't we use a five by five setback? Which has since been lessened to a three by five?

MR. ADAM SOKOLSKI: Right.
MR. NEAL VON OHLEN: All right.
MR. DAVID BIRKHOLZ: And of course the difference in these are going to vary a bit depending on where it is because, of course, this project is not moving turbine bases, locations, or towers. So if you're going to increase the wind capacity, you're going to increase the rotor diameter 77 to 91 meters, so it's a matter of how much of that space, you know. 'Cause when you do that, the rotor diameter expands, as Adam said earlier, that three by 91 is going to be obviously larger than three by 77. But, also, how far does that go towards impacting another person's land rights. Or not land rights, but wind rights.

MS. TRICIA DEBLEECKERE: Any other
comments? Going once, going twice?
We're going to be done before 7:00.
MR. ADAM SOKOLSKI: May I fill in one piece to help close the information with the question that Commissioner Flohrs asked?

Just looking at Table 7 of our
application, page 13, this table describes those cases where we're asking for relief of the wind access buffer for specific cases. It also describes the distances that we're asking for relief. And the greatest distance $I$ can see here is about 225 feet. And that doesn't include the road right-of-way distances either. So that's 225 feet, the road right-of-ways within that 225. So you have a very small area in any of these parcels that's being affected or impacted. It's not like we're slopping over three rotor diameters onto an adjacent parcel, it's relatively small distances.

MS. TRICIA DEBLEECKERE: That's a really good table to look at if you want a better perspective of it.

Thank you. Thank you, everybody, for coming. Please submit written comments if you have anything else to add. Feel free to call myself or Charley or David if you have any questions.

Thanks for coming out.
(Meeting concluded at 6:55 p.m.)
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| 12:25;21:13,13,14,15; | comply (1) | corn (1) | 32:15,17;33:3 | $20: 22 ; 22: 8 ; 23: 21,22$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22:13 | 31:23 | 13:12 | decisions (1) | 34:21 |
| changing (4) | complying (1) | corner (1) | 20:1 | down (9) |
| 6:10;14:1,8;19:21 | 31:7 | 25:4 | degradation (1) | 4:1;8:16;9:4;12:12, |
| Charley (2) | component (1) | Counties (2) | 17:14 | 23;20:24;21:10; |
| 4:7;35:19 | 3:21 | 4:19;11:21 | delivered (1) | 23:14;25:5 |
| checking (1) | components (4) | country (2) | 12:11 | Drain (5) |
| 23:21 | 12:15,20;14:6; | 8:17;30:14 | Department (5) | 18:13,13,15,16,19 |
| chosen (1) | 15:18 | County (6) | 3:20;19:6,9;20:13; | drainage (1) |
| 32:1 | concentration (1) | 4:21;11:22;26:9,18; | 23:4 | 27:12 |
| circumstances (1) | 9:17 | 27:8;29:11 | depending (2) | drive (2) |
| 31:9 | concerns (1) | couple (4) | 30:7;34:8 | $12: 18,19$ |
| clean (1) | 5:23 | 8:19;10:2;20:12,19 | describes (2) |  |
| 16:9 | concluded (1) | course (4) | 35:1,3 | E |
| clearly (1) | 35:21 | 17:19;18:8;34:6,8 | design (1) |  |
| 4:3 | condition (4) | court (4) | 17:8 deterioration (1) | earlier (2) |
| close (2) | 14:19;16:6;26:21, | 3:25;26:10,14; | deterioration (1) | 29:13;34:15 |
| 31:14;34:23 | 21 | 27:24 | 17:14 | early (1) |
| collect (1) | conditions (5) | crane (2) | determined (2) | 18:6 |
| 23:25 | 5:11;6:14,20,24; | 15:14,17 | 15:23;16:13 | easement (1) |
| collection (2) | 33:14 | creating (2) | developed (1) | 32:14 |
| 16:20,21 | conductor (1) | 10:18;11:9 | 10:8 | easements (1) |
| coming (5) | 17:1 | Creek (1) | developers (1) | 32:11 |
| 3:5;13:12;25:22; | cons (1) | 11:16 | 20:14 | easier (1) |
| 35:17,20 | 32:20 | Crop (3) | developing (1) | 7:15 |
| comment (4) | consider (1) | 18:1,1,4 | 6:21 | easiest (1) |
| 3:24;5:8;26:1;28:2 | 5:25 | crops (2) | development (8) | 7:19 |
| comments (18) | consideration (1) | 18:7,9 | 10:1,11,14;26:19; | east-west (1) |
| 4:12,13;5:13,15,17; | 33:18 | currently (3) | 27:11;31:19;32:24; | 30:10 |
| 7:13,13,16,19,22,24, | considerations (2) | 10:24;11:7,20 | 33:1 | Ebeling (1) |
| 25;8:7;25:19,23; | 5:11;6:3 | cut (1) | diameter (8) | 10:2 |
| 27:16;34:20;35:17 | consistency (1) | 15:20 | 10:20,21;12:11; | Economically (1) |
| Commerce (5) | 6:18 | D | 14:9;30:6;31:3;34:12, | 30:22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 3: 20 ; 19: 6,9 ; 20: 5 ; \\ & 23: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { consistent (1) } \\ 23: 9 \end{array}$ | D | 14 diameters (3) | effect (1) <br> 11:14 |
| Commission (23) | Construction (8) | Dakotas (1) | 30:10,10;35:11 | effects (1) |
| 3:7,8,12;4:7,19;5:1, | 14:21;15:10;16:14; | 9:16 | difference (2) | 6:1 |
| 22;6:11,18,24;20:3, | 17:8,13;18:3;26:22, | damage (7) | 22:4;34:7 | efficiency (2) |
| 13;23:19;24:18;30:4, | 23 | 15:3;18:1,2,5,9,13, | differences (1) | 11:9;12:4 |
| 23;31:4,17;32:5,9,10; | contact (1) | 14 | 24:1 | efficient (1) |
| 33:4,12 | 18:24 | damaging (1) | different (7) | 31:19 |
| Commissioner (4) | continue (2) | 18:7 | 6:11;21:4;22:14,15; | efficiently (1) |
| 29:11,19;30:21; | 25:24;31:23 | date (2) | 30:12,13;32:23 | 25:11 |
| 34:24 | continues (1) | 6:15,17 | difficult (1) | efile (1) |
| commissioners (1) | 17:22 | David (11) | 32:10 | 7:18 |
| 32:16 | contractors (1) | 3:19;19:3,4,5; | direction (1) | eight (2) |
| Commission's (2) | 15:23 | 24:10;25:25;29:22; | 30:8 | 11:15,19 |
| 6:7;7:18 | controls (2) | 32:21;33:23;34:6; | disposed (1) | either (5) |
| committed (2) | 5:5;13:6 | 35:19 | 15:19 | 13:23;18:6;30:9; |
| 18:16,17 | cooler (1) | deadline (1) | distance (1) | 32:12;35:7 |
| common (1) | 12:18 | 5:16 | 35:5 | elect (1) |
| 16:18 | cooperation (1) | deal (1) | distances (3) | 4:20 |
| community (1) | 29:3 | 30:18 | 35:4,7,12 | Electric (4) |
| 10:3 | cooperative (1) | DEBLEECKERE (11) | distribution (2) | 12:10;13:3;16:19, |
| company (9) | 11:2 | 3:1,6;24:7;25:25; | 7:2;9:19 | 21 |
| 8:25;9:1;10:1,4,10, | cooperatives (1) | 27:15,21;29:5;32:2; | docket (1) | electrical (7) |
| 16;22:6,7;29:4 | 11:3 | 33:22;34:19;35:13 | 7:18 | 10:18;11:23;12:21; |
| company's (1) | copies (1) | decent (1) | document (2) | 14:3;15:24;17:1,4 |
| 32:25 | 8:5 | 11:13 | 26:17,24 | electricity (4) |
| compensate (1) | copy (3) | decide (1) | documents (1) | 10:19;11:10;13:2, |
| 18:8 | 8:4;24:3,4 | 20:22 | 26:25 | 11 |
| compliance (2) | Corey (2) | decision (6) | done (8) | electronic (1) |
| 6:13,17 | 10:2;28:3 | 6:8;19:15;23:19; | 4:21;6:16;13:20; | 5:5 |


| Elm (1) <br> 11:16 <br> else (4) | exceed (1) | 8:6 | front (1) | H |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | file (2) | $26: 6$ |  |
|  | except (1) | 7:17,19 | FTEs (1) |  |
| 27:17,17;33:22; | 14:14 | filings (1) | 11:19 | half (2) |
| 35:18 | excuse (1) | 6:17 | fulfill (1) | 11:12,17 |
| else's (1) | 14:1 | fill (1) | 23:10 | Hampshire (1) |
| 18:12 | existing (12) | 34:22 | fully (1) | 9:4 |
| employees (2) | 4:22;5:2;6:13; | final (1) | 31:24 | hand (1) |
| 9:7;15:24 | 12:12;14:2,19,23,24; | 21:25 | future (2) | 3:13 |
| encourage (1) | 17:5,8;27:8;32:6 | Finally (4) | 7:10;32:8 | happens (1) |
| 23:25 end (2) | expands (1) $34: 14$ | 13:3;15:9;16:5; $17: 17$ | G | $18: 2$ happy (2) |
| 11:5;16:13 | explain (2) | find (2) |  | happy (2) |
| ends (1) | 25:15;29:16 | 16:20;17:17 | gas-fired (1) | hard (1) |
| 11:4 | extension (1) | findings (2) | 9:10 | 32:15 |
| Energy (4) | 13:19 | 6:7,10 | GE (1) | harvest (1) |
| 11:1,3;21:6;25:10 | externally (1) | first (8) | 15:23 | 18:6 |
| engineer (1) | 32:13 | 10:6,7;12:3;20:1; | gearbox (1) | head (2) |
| 26:9 | extra (1) | 21:12,20;26:7;32:3 | 12:18 | 25:20;29:20 |
| engineers (3) | 28:14 | five (9) | General (2) | health (1) |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 16:19;17:7,9 } \\ \text { engineer's (1) } \end{gathered}$ | F | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 19,20 ; 28: 11 ; 30: 7 \\ & 10 ; 33: 6 ; 34: 2,2,3 \end{aligned}$ | 12:10;17:24 generally (1) | 6:2 |
| 26:20 |  | fixed (2) | 29:16 | 26:6 |
| enhance (1) | face (1) | 18:18,20 | generate (1) | heavy (1) |
| 13:5 | 4:4 | flavor (1) | 13:1 | 27:7 |
| ensure (3) | facility (1) | 9:14 | generation (1) | height (2) |
| 15:2;17:15;18:11 | 12:6 | flicker (1) | 11:2 | $14: 11,15$ |
| ensuring (1) | fact (1) | 22:10 | generator (4) | help (5) |
| 17:22 | $33: 10$ factor (3) | FLOHRS (7) | 12:22;15:21,25; | $13: 5,6 ; 25: 12 ; 29: 2$ |
| entrances (1) | factor (3) | 29:10,11,19,24; | 16:3 | $34: 23$ |
| $16: 8$ entry (1) | 11:8,12;13:7 | 30:21;33:21;34:24 | generators (1) | helped (1) |
| entry (1) | fairly (1) 20:20 | F-L-O-H-R-S (1) 29:11 | 5:4 gets (1) | 28:3 |
| environment (2) | fall (1) | focus (1) | - 18:20 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { helping (1) } \\ 25: 7 \end{array}$ |
| 21:14;33:20 | 16:13 | 6:4 | goals (1) | helps (1) |
| environmental (12) | familiar (1) | folks (1) | 33:16 | 14:10 |
| 3:21;19:10,13,16, | 7:4 | 19:1 | goes (5) | Here's (1) |
| 19;20:4,10;21:6; | far (1) | followed (2) | 4:10;11:21;24:18; | 18:24 |
| 22:13;23:11,20;33:14 | $34: 16$ farm (16) | 6:15;23:14 | 27:3,6 | highway (1) |
| equal (1) | farm (16) | foot (1) | good (5) | $26: 19$ |
| 7:23 | 9:14;10:3,5,7,14; | 15:12 | 3:4;8:13;19:4;32:2; | hits (1) |
| equally (1) | $11: 11,16 ; 12: 1 ; 14: 25 ;$ $16: 25 \cdot 17 \cdot 3 \cdot 18 \cdot 3$ | form (1) | 35:14 | $21: 25$ |
| $7: 23$ equipment (3) | 16:25;17:3;18:3; 19:16;22:12;28:3,13 | $7: 15$ formal (2) | government (1) $13: 14$ | holders (1) 30:13 |
| $5: 3 ; 16: 2 ; 17: 11$ | farming (1) | 7:17,21 | granted (1) | $\begin{array}{r} 30: 13 \\ \text { hub (4) } \end{array}$ |
| especially (1) | 21:6 | forth (1) | 31:17 | 10:22;14:11,12; |
| 21:23 | farms (4) | 24:17 | gravel (1) | 16:1 |
| essentially (4) | 9:18;11:10;26:18; | forthcoming (1) | 15:2 |  |
| 3:12,21;6:14;14:7 | 30:13 | $32: 17$ forward (1) | Great (6) | I |
| establish (1) | February (3) | forward (1) | 8:12;10:25;18:23; |  |
| 33:13 | 5:15,16,18 | 25:23 | 29:1,3,5 |  |
| et (2) | feedback (1) | found (2) | greater (1) | $8: 22$ |
| 12:19;31:23 | 5:18 | 17:9;27:5 | 4:18 | idea (2) |
| even (1) | Feel (1) | foundation (2) | greatest (1) | 20:15;30:8 |
| 24:23 | 35:18 | 14:2;17:18 | 35:5 | impact (5) |
| evening (3) | feet (6) | foundations (4) | gross (1) | 20:10;21:6,25;22:5; |
| $3: 4 ; 8: 13 ; 19: 4$ everybody (3) | 10:21,23;12:15; $14 \cdot 18 \cdot 35 \cdot 5,7$ | $17: 6,9,15,21$ four (3) | 10:12 | 33:20 |
| everybody (3) 8:13;32:19;35:16 | $14: 18 ; 35: 5,7$ few (2) | four (3) $6: 3 ; 7: 12,22$ | ground (7) 10:23;14:3;15:16, | impacted (2) |
| everyone (2) | few $7: 21 ; 23: 6$ | Fourth (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 23 ; 14: 3 ; 15: 16, \\ & 18,21 ; 22: 1 ; 24: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 29:24;35:10 <br> impacting (2) |
| 3:4;29:4 | field (1) | 7:2 | group (2) | $32: 13 ; 34: 17$ |
| exactly (2) | 13:13 | free (1) | 19:7;20:4 | impacts (4) |
| 16:13;20:15 | figure (1) | 35:18 |  | 4:14,16;22:11; |


| 23:22 | 21:11;25:5,8;28:5,6; | laydown (1) | 16,24,24;25:9,16,17, | megawatt (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| implications (1) | 31:11,14,15 | 15:10 | 23;32:5,7;33:3;35:14 | 5:4 |
| 22:15 | involved (1) | layer (1) | looked (3) | megawatt-hour (1) |
| important (4) | 8:15 | 21:25 | 20:23;21:8,12 | 13:16 |
| 19:22;21:9,23; | Iowa (1) | layout (1) | looking (13) | megawatt-hours (1) |
| 22:17 | 9:17 | 13:24 | 4:17;5:2,7,20;7:6; | 13:10 |
| imposes (1) | issuance (1) | learn (3) | 20:12,20;21:21;25:6; | megawatts (8) |
| 30:4 | 6:9 | 22:20,23;25:8 | 30:17;32:11,18;34:25 | 4:19;9:2,3,19; |
| improve (1) | issue (1) | learned (1) | looks (1) | $10: 18,19 ; 13: 2,2$ |
| 14:25 | 30:2 | 21:5 | 24:15 | mentioned (2) |
| improvement (1) | issued (2) | learning (2) | $\operatorname{lot}(9)$ | 5:19;9:22 |
| 12:8 | 4:23;23:6 | 21:22;22:19 | 8:16;18:15;19:25; | met (1) |
| include (2) | issues (2) | lease (6) | 21:4,7,11,18,19,23 | 33:14 |
| 12:17;35:6 | 5:7,23 | 28:7,9,9,20,22,23 | lower (1) | meter (1) |
| includes (1) | items (1) | leased (1) | 15:17 | 10:20 |
| $27: 11$ <br> includin | 6:2 | $30: 9$ leases (1) | M | $\begin{aligned} & \text { meters (4) } \\ & 10: 21 ; 12: 14 ; \end{aligned}$ |
| 20:14 | J | 10:12 |  | 34:12 |
| income (1) |  | least (2) | machines (1) | Midwest (3) |
| 18:12 | Jackson (4) | 30:1;33:20 | 13:4 | 9:16,20;30:20 |
| increase (11) | $4: 21 ; 26: 9,13,18$ | legislature (1) | magnitude (1) | might (4) |
| 5:4;13:1,3,6,9,17; | Janet (2) | 20:3 | 20:11 | 8:21;24:2;26:3; |
| 14:10,18,19;34:10,11 | 3:25;26:6 | lessened (1) | mail (1) | 32:21 |
| increases (2) | job (2) | 34:2 | 7:16 | miles (1) |
| $12: 4,11$ | 4:8;29:1 | letterhead (1) | maintained (1) | $10: 8$ |
| individually (1) | jobs (1) | 7:20 | $12: 7$ | Minneapolis (1) |
| 16:6 | 11:15 | life (5) | maintenance (1) | 8:15 |
| industry (2) | justify (3) | 12:5,5;13:18,19,21 | 13:20 | Minnesota (10) |
| $6: 21 ; 21: 5$ | 28:4,8,16 | lifted (1) | makes (1) | 3:7;9:16;11:4;19:5; |
| 6:6;18:25;21:7,24; | K | link (1) | $23: 19$ making (6) | $30: 19 ; 33: 16,16$ |
| 34:23 |  | 24:8 | 20:11;25:1;33:4,5, | missing (2) |
| infrastructure (1) | key (1) | list (1) | 18,19 | $24: 2,14$ |
| 14:24 | $5: 16$ | 6:2 | manufactured (1) | mitigation (1) |
| infringing (1) | kind (7) | little (7) | 12:10 | 4:16 |
| 18:11 | 8:24;9:10;16:14; | 3:2;9:1,2,13;12:2; | many (3) | model (1) |
| initial (3) | $21: 14,17 ; 31: 25 ; 32: 6$ | $29: 7,13$ | 12:15;22:8;29:17 | 10:11 |
| 5:17,18;19:11 |  | live (3) | Martin (1) | modeling (3) |
| initially (2) | L | 8:14;28:12,13 | 29:11 | 22:9,10,10 |
| 10:8;31:5 input (6) |  | LLC (2) | materials (2) | modifications (2) $5 \cdot 12 \cdot 17 \cdot 20$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { input (6) } \\ & 23: 23 ; 24: 12 ; 25: 6 ; \end{aligned}$ | ```land (7) 6:1;10:12;22:13;``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:3;28: } \\ & \text { load (1) } \end{aligned}$ | $25: 16,17$ matter (1) | 5:12;17:20 modified (2) |
| 26:3;28:4;32:19 | 30:9;33:2;34:17,18 | 27:7 | 34:12 | 5:6,22 |
| inspection (1) | landowner (2) | local (5) | may (4) | month (1) |
| 17:13 | 7:3;10:4 | 11:2,15;13:14; | 9:24;21:1;27:7; | 4:8 |
| install (1) | landowners (16) | 18:15;22:25 | 34:22 | more (11) |
| 13:23 | 7:6;9:24,25;10:9; | locally (1) | mean (1) | 6:25;7:3,17,21;9:1, |
| installed (1) | 15:12;17:24;18:5,8, | 21:14 | 28:20 | 2;12:2;13:10,11,12,15 |
| 13:9 | 11;21:24;28:11,16,17, | location (4) | means (2) | most (4) |
| instance (1) | 19;29:2,3 | 14:23;15:22;27:6; | 13:11,13 | 3:10;9:7;23:20; |
| 32:8 | landownership (1) | 31:9 | measured (1) | 25:11 |
| interest (1) | $10: 10$ | locations (4) | 30:5 | move (2) |
| 19:25 | large (4) | 16:17;30:25;31:2; | measurement (2) | $14: 22 ; 30: 22$ |
| interesting (1) | 9:10,17;15:17;30:4 | $34: 9$ | 11:9;14:17 | moving (2) |
| 33:23 | larger (4) | long (2) | measures (1) | 31:1;34:9 |
| internal (1) | 12:13;14:9;31:3; | 13:18;15:8 | 4:16 | much (1) |
| 14:6 | 34:16 | longer (1) | meat (1) | 34:13 |
| internally (2) | largest (3) | 29:7 | 8:20 | multiplying (1) |
| 32:12,25 | 30:14,18,19 | long-term (1) | meeting (6) | 30:6 |
| intersection (1) | last (3) | $18: 10$ | $5: 14 ; 7: 14 ; 8: 3$ | myself (3) |
| 15:5 | 4:11;21:3;26:7 | look (20) | $27: 18 ; 28: 10 ; 35: 21$ | 25:4,5;35:18 |
| into (12) | later (1) | $6: 1,24 ; 7: 2 ; 16: 19$ | meetings (1) |  |
| 3:22;12:25;13:4,5; | 7:25 | 17:7;20:9;24:1,2,11, | $19: 20$ |  |


|  | 4:1 | 22 | 10:3,10 | (6) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | notice (3) | opportunity (1) | pass (1) | 16:15;22:17; |
|  | 8:3,4;24:8 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 8:9 } \\ \text { past (1) } \end{gathered}$ | 24:5,11;32:3 |
| nacelle (6) | noticed (1) | options (2) |  | pointed (1) |
| 12:16;14:5,11; |  | 7:23;8:2 | 20:12 | 20:2 |
| 15:15,18;27:6 | notification (1) | order (2) | path (1) | poorly (1) |
| nacelle-based (1) | number (7) | Oregon (2) | pay (3) | $22: 20$ portion (2) |
| nacelles (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 19 ; 21: 20 ; 29: 20 ; \\ & 33: 8,8,9,10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9: 4,11 \\ \text { original (3) } \end{gathered}$ | $11: 20 ; 13: 14 ; 18: 9$ | $3: 24 ; 26: 2$ |
| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 17: 6 \\ \text { name (6) } \end{array}$ |  |  | payments (1) | position (1) |
|  | 0 | originally (1) |  | 14:16 |
| $8 ; 27: 22$ | obviously (1) | 28:6 | 11:17;16:18;22:3; | 24:22,23 |
| native (2) |  |  | 23:22;24:4;28:25; | possible (1) |
| $\begin{array}{r} 31: 11,12 \\ \text { natural (1) } \end{array}$ | $34: 15$ | $8: 17$ | $33: 1$ | 25:2 |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { occurring (1) } \\ 6: 22 \end{array}$ | $4: 4$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { percent (5) } \\ 11: 22,23 ; 13: 10,15 ; \end{array}$ | $26: 22$ |
| Neal (7) |  |  |  |  |
|  | off (7) | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { out }(\mathbf{2 5 )} \\ 3: 5,15 ; 4: 4 ; 8: 6,15 ; \\ 11: 10 ; 12: 20 ; 13: 21 \end{array}$ | period (3) | $\begin{gathered} \text { potatoes (1) } \\ 8: 20 \end{gathered}$ |
| 25;33:25;34:5 | 22;25:20;27:6;29:20 |  | 5:17;20:19;25:18 | potential (1) |
| N-E-A-L (1) | offered (1) | 16:5,7;19:7,19,23; | permission (1) | 13:1 |
| 27:25 | 22:7 | 20:2;22:25;23:16,24; | 13:22 | power (5) |
| nearby (2) | office (3) | $25: 4,7,22 ; 26: 20 ; 27: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { permit (19) } \\ & 3: 23 ; 4: 18,23,24 ; \\ & 5: 12,20,24 ; 6: 4,8,9,14, \end{aligned}$ | 9:10;10:24,25;11:4, |
| 12:23;15:22 | 4:2;19:14;23:20 off-site (1) | $28: 19 ; 29: 2 ; 35: 20$ |  | 5 |
| necessary (3) $17: 20 ; 27: 1 ; 28$ | off-site $12: 23$ | outside (2) 16:18;17:7 | 5:12,20,24;6:4,8,9,14, 15,$19 ; 7: 2,8,10 ; 8: 10$ | prairie |
| need (15) | Ohlen (7) | over (15) | 19:18;20:25 | precedent (1) |
| $\begin{aligned} & 14: 25 ; 15: 1,4,9,10 \\ & 13,14 ; 17: 2 ; 19: 12,14 \\ & 20: 9 ; 21: 7 ; 26: 12 ; 27: 4 \\ & 31: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 1 ; 27: 19,23,23, \\ & 25 ; 33: 25 ; 34: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 13,18 ; 8: 9,16 ; \\ & 18: 23: 19: 3: 20: 3.5 .12 \end{aligned}$ | permits (6) | 33:10 |
|  |  |  | 4:22;6:25;21:2 | presentation (1) |
|  | O-H-L-E-N (1) 28:1 | 21:3,11,16;24:11 33:6;35:11 | 23:2,5;27:1 | 3:11 prevailing (1) |
|  | Oil (1) | 33:6;35:11 overall (2) | permitted (2) | prevailing (1) 33:7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20: 22,22 ; 21: 17 ; \\ & 24: 20,21 \end{aligned}$ | ```12:18 old (4) 12:2,6;20:25;23:2``` | 13:8;16:1 | permitting (3) | previous (1) |
|  |  | overlap (1) | 5:25;7:5;20:16 | 26:25 |
| negative (1) |  | 32:12 | person (3) | prior (3) |
| 24:23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:2,6;20:25;23:2 } \\ & \text { older (2) } \end{aligned}$ | overview (3) | 28:20,21,2 | 8:19;17:13;26:22 |
| neighbors (2) | 6:22;15:1 old-timer (1) | 3:16,20;8:10 own (3) | person's | probably (2) 11:19;24:3 |
| 24:19;32:14 new (23) | old-timer (1) 19:6 | own (3) 9:8,14;33: | $34: 17$ perspective (4) | (11:19;24:3 |
| new (23) ${ }^{\text {6:6,12;7:1;9:4 }}$ | once (2)29:8;34:20 | owned (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 5 ; 24: 13 ; 26: 20 ; \\ & 35: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 17:1;18:17,1 |
| 11:5;12:14,24;13:4; |  | $\begin{gathered} 10: 16 \\ \text { owner (1) } \\ 10: 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | problems (1) |
| 16:1,12,22,22,24; | $\begin{aligned} & 29: 8 ; 34: 20 \\ & \text { one (12) } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 35: 15 \\ \text { perusing (1) } \end{gathered}$ | $17: 17$ |
| 17:4,10,16;20:18,21; | 4:8,25;10:7;14:16; |  | 26:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { process }(6) \\ & 3: 12,16 ; 4: 10 ; 14: 21 ; \end{aligned}$ |
| 21:2,16,19;25:8,9 newer (4) | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 20 ; 23: 1 ; 26: 15 \\ & 28: 11,21 ; 31: 10 \end{aligned}$ | P | piece (1) $34: 23$ |  |
| newer (4) $8 \cdot 21 \cdot 23 \cdot 13,13,13$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 32:10;34:22 } \\ & \text { online (5) } \end{aligned}$ |  | pitch (1) | product (2) |
| next (6) |  | package (1) | 12:19 | 12:11;17:1 |
| 4:25;8: | 7:14;21:1;23:2,4; | 13:4 | place (5) | production (6) |
| 11:25;14:20;17:25 | 24:1 | page (1) | 19:16;20:1;21:15, | 11:20,24;13:10,16 |
| nobody (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 1 ; 17: 22 ; 29: 12, \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ | paperwork (1) | 17;23: | 14:11;26:18 |
| 32:16 |  |  | placed (3) | project (47) |
| noise (6) |  | parcel (2) | 6:25;31:3,8 <br> placement (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 8,10,17,18,19 ; \\ & 4: 12,15 ; 6: 10 ; 7: 1 \\ & \text { 8:20;9:25,25;10:15, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 22:9,9;28:21;30: | onto (1) |  |  |  |
| 31:22;32:22 | 35:11 | 31:12;35:11 | 31:10 |  |
| None (1) | operate (3) | parcels (1) | plant (4) | $17 ; 11: 7,13,13,20$ |
| 29:18 | 11:7,12;17:23 | 35:9park (2) | 9:10,14;17:22;18:6 plants (1) | 13:7,9,18;15:3,5; 17:4;18:3,21,22; |
| normally | 10:16 |  | 9:8 | $19: 11,22 ; 20: 6,24$ |
| $10: 13$ <br> north-south |  | 15:13,14 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:11,22;20:6,24; } \\ & 21: 21 ; 23: 3,23 ; 24: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| north-south 30:11 | operation (1) | part (3) <br> 10:10;16:11;22:12 | please (5) 11:25;14:20;26:11; | 27:13;28:5,6,13,25; |
| noted (1) | 11:16 operations (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 2 \\ & \text { partnership (2) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{p m}(\mathbf{1}) \\ 35: 21 \end{gathered}$ | 31:6;32:4,12,19;33:2, |
| 20:25 | $\begin{gathered} 9: 15 \\ \text { opinion (1) } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 15 ; 34: 9 \\ \text { projects (15) } \end{gathered}$ |
| notes (1) |  |  |  |  |


| 4:18,20;5:25;6:5, | rebuild (2) | replaced (1) | 29:8,9,10;30:1;34:4,5 | 3:17;6:13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22;7:5;8:16;9:23; | 15:14,15 | 17:2 | right-of-way (1) | secure (1) |
| 20:21;21:16;23:8,10, | rebuilt (1) | replacing (1) | 35:6 | 17:16 |
| 12;33:11,15 | 12:23 | 5:3 | right-of-ways (1) | seeing (1) |
| project's (1) | recall (2) | reporter (4) | 35:8 | 4:9 |
| 10:12 | 19:13;29:20 | 3:25;26:10,14; | rights (5) | seek (1) |
| prolongs (1) | receive (1) | 27:24 | 30:13;33:2;34:18, | 5:13 |
| 12:5 | 7:25 | Repowering (2) | 18,18 | series (1) |
| promise (1) | received (4) | 3:9;32:3 | risk (1) | 23:12 |
| 18:10 | 8:3;24:3,4,7 | representing (1) | 17:3 | serves (1) |
| properly (2) | receives (1) | 9:18 | rival (1) | 11:2 |
| 7:7;18:18 | 10:11 | requested (1) | 30:17 | set (5) |
| proposal (4) | recent (1) | 5:20 | River (1) | 12:14,14;33:8,9,10 |
| 4:14;5:1;6:12;8:21 | 6:25 | requests (1) | 11:1 | setback (17) |
| proposed (1) | recollection (1) | 32:9 | road (8) | 30:3,5,8,14,15,18, |
| 4:15 | 30:1 | requirements (1) | 16:8;27:2,8,9,11; | 19,25;31:7,22,25; |
| proposing (3) | record (2) | 7:3 | 31:22;35:6,7 | 32:23,24,25;33:7,18; |
| 3:18;11:14;12:9 | 7:18;27:3 | research (1) | roads (6) | 34:2 |
| pros (1) | recycled (1) | 19:17 | 14:2,24,25;15:5,6; | setbacks (9) |
| 32:20 | 15:21 | resource (5) | 26:21 | 5:6,22;29:14,15,18; |
| Public (12) | redundantly (1) | 25:1;31:19;32:25; | roads' (1) | 30:16;31:22,23;32:22 |
| 3:7;4:6,8;6:1;8:3; | 25:4 | 33:6,19 | 26:21 | several (2) |
| 15:5;16:8;17:24;20:3; | reflects (1) | response (1) | rotor (19) | 19:8;20:14 |
| 23:18;26:1;27:12 | 8:24 | 5:16 | 5:5;10:20,23;12:11, | Shaddix (1) |
| PUC (2) | refurbish (3) | responsibilities (1) | 13,13,14;14:9,10; | 3:25 |
| 19:14;23:5 | 5:3;12:21;15:24 | 23:11 | 15:15,18;29:14;30:6, | shadow (1) |
| pulling (1) | refurbished (2) | responsible (1) | 9,10;31:3;34:11,14; | 22:10 |
| 16:7 | 12:24;16:2 | 23:10 | 35:11 | shaft (1) |
| Purchase (1) | region (2) | restore (1) | rule (1) | 12:19 |
| 10:25 | 10:7;30:20 | 16:9 | 33:9 | share (1) |
| pushes (1) | related (1) | restored (1) | rural (1) | 10:11 |
| 13:21 | 5:23 | 31:11 | 11:2 | shell (1) |
| put (9) ${ }_{5}$ | $\underset{5.21}{\text { relating (1) }}$ | retro (1) | S | 14:4 |
|  |  |  | S | Shiny (1) |
| $28: 6 ; 31: 11$ | $9: 9 ; 35: 12$ | 5:2;12:4;13:17; |  | shipped (1) |
| putting (1) | reliability (1) | 17:18;21:21 | $17: 16,21$ | 15:22 |
| 28:4 | 12:4 | retrofitted (1) | safely (1) | short (1) |
| Q | reliable (1) | 16:23 | 17:23 | 27:18 |
| Q |  | retrofitting (4) | safety (1) | Sign (3) |
|  | relief (9) | 12:3;21:16;24:25; | 17:23 | 28:18,22,23 |
| Quality (3) <br> 19:10,19•20: | 30:24;31:2,6,16,17, | 25:8 | sail (1) | signed (3) |
| quite (2) | relooking (1) | 14:23,24 | sailboat (1) | significant (1) |
| 9:19;23:6 | 25:9 | reused (2) | 14:8 | 30:12 |
|  | remain (2) | 14:6;17:6 | sales (3) | similar (5) |
| $\mathbf{R}$ | 14:22;17:16 | reusing (2) | 10:24;11:4,5 | 16:12;20:21;26:22; |
|  | remember (3) | 14:1,2 | same (13) | 31:6;32:8 |
| radius (2) | 4:2;9:24;31:9 | revenues (1) | 8:1;13:12;14:13,22; | sincerely (1) |
| 15:4;16:7 | removed (2) | 10:12 | 19:24;20:6,7;21:11, | 25:6 |
| rather (1) | 15:19;17:2 | review (7) | 22;22:8,16;23:10; | single (2) |
| 22:20 | Renewables (4) | 3:21,22;19:13,16; | 33:4 | 28:19,23 |
| real (1) | 8:14,21,23;10:5 | 21:17;23:20;25:21 | Sarah (1) | sit (1) |
| 33:12 | renotification (1) | reviewed (2) | 29:21 | 25:5 |
| really (14) | 7:9 | 24:20,21 | sat (2) | site (20) |
| 5:7,15,17;6:4;7:6; | repair (1) | reviewing (1) | 20:24;21:9 | 3:22;4:22,23,24; |
| $18: 22 ; 20: 17 ; 25: 6$ | 29:1 | 6:4 | scattered (1) | 5:12,20,24;6:4,13,19; |
| 30:17;32:4,15,18; | repaired (1) | Ridge (1) | 9:3 | 7:10;8:10;11:16; |
| 33:15;35:13 | 18:17 | 20:20 | schedule (1) | 15:20,21,22;16:3,9; |
| reason (2) | repeat (1) | right (19) | 16:14 | 18:22;23:4 |
| 23:16;27:4 | 4:5 | 4:9;7:12;8:8;10:19; | season (1) | sites (3) |
| reasonable (1) | replace (3) | $22: 21,23 ; 24: 10,25$ | $16: 11$ | $13: 25 ; 18: 14 ; 29: 17$ |
| 5:8 | 5:5;12:13,15 | 26:1,5,16;28:10,24; | Second (2) | sits (2) |




