

Hearing - Day 3

Council Review of Boardman to Hemingway Transmission Line

August 31, 2022



206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989

1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101

www.buellrealtime.com

email: info@buellrealtime.com



Page 540

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
ENERGY FACILITY SITE COUNCIL MEETING

Council Review of the Proposed Order/Proposed Contested
Case Order for the
Boardman to Hemingway Transmission Line

August 31, 2022
Day 3 of 3
8:00 a.m.

REPORTED BY: CRYSTAL R. McAULIFFE, RPR, CCR 2121,
Oregon CCR 22-0002

Page 541

1 APPEARANCES

2

3 OREGON DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY COUNCILMEMBERS:

4 KENT HOWE, Vice Chair

5 HANLEY JENKINS II

6 PERRY CHOCKTOOT

7 JORDAN TRUITT

8 CINDY CONDON

9 ANN BEIER

10 TODD CORNETT, Secretary

11 OREGON DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY STAFF:

12 KELLEN TARDAEWETHER

13 Senior Energy Facility Siting Analyst

14 SARAH ESTERSON

15 Siting Analyst

16 CHRISTOPHER CLARK

17 Siting Policy Analyst and EFSC Rules Coordinator

18 550 Capitol Street Northeast

19 1st Floor

20 Salem, Oregon 97301

21 FOR EFSC COUNCIL:

22 JESSE RATCLIFFE

23 OREGON DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

24 1162 Court Street Northeast

25 Salem, Oregon 97301

503.947.4549

jesse.d.ratcliffe@doj.state.or.us

FOR DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY:

PATRICK ROWE

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

1162 Court Street Northeast

Salem, Oregon 97301

503.947.4520

patrick.g.rowe@doj.state.or.us

Page 542

1 APPEARANCES

2 (Continued)

3 FOR IDAHO POWER:

4 LISA RACKNER

5 JOCELYN PEASE

6 McDOWELL RACKNER & GIBSON

7 419 Southwest Eleventh Avenue

8 Suite 400

9 Portland, Oregon 97205

10 503.595.3925

11 lisa@mrg-law.com

12 jocelyn@mrg-law.com

13

14 FOR STOP B2H and DR. SUZANNE FOUTY:

15 KARL ANUTA

16 LAW OFFICE OF KARL G. ANUTA

17 735 SW 1st Avenue

18 Portland, Oregon 97204

19 503.827.0320

20 kga@integra.net

21

22 Also Present:

23 Irene Gilbert

24 Joe Horst

25 Sam Myers

Page 543

1 LA GRANDE, OREGON; AUGUST 31, 2022

2 8:00 a.m.

3 -o0o-

4

5 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Good morning, everyone.

6 Welcome back. The time is now eight o'clock in the

7 morning. And I would like to call the August 29th,

8 30th, and 31th, 2022 meeting of the Energy Facility

9 Siting Council to order.

10 Mr. Secretary, please call the roll.

11 SECRETARY CORNETT: Kent Howe.

12 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Here.

13 SECRETARY CORNETT: Hanley Jenkins.

14 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: Here.

15 SECRETARY CORNETT: Jordan Truitt.

16 COUNCILMEMBER TRUITT: Here.

17 SECRETARY CORNETT: Cindy Condon.

18 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Here.

19 SECRETARY CORNETT: Perry Chocktoot.

20 COUNCILMEMBER CHOCKTOOT: Here.

21 SECRETARY CORNETT: Ann Beier.

22 COUNCILMEMBER BEIER: Here.

23 SECRETARY CORNETT: You have a quorum,

24 Mr. Vice Chair.

25 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. Are there any

1 agenda modifications?
 2 SECRETARY CORNETT: Mr. Vice Chair, just as
 3 a reminder, at the end of the meeting today, we will go
 4 back to the meeting minutes from June and July. And
 5 then there was, at least thus far, one item that was
 6 pushed to the end of the meeting today, which was the
 7 notification related to the blasting plan. So that's
 8 the one remaining issue from all of the standards and
 9 issues that the Council has heard thus far. So that's
 10 the one that we will return to.
 11 And we do have a proposal for Council, so
 12 thank you to Christopher Clark. He did some research on
 13 that and has provided that. And Sarah is working up a
 14 proposal that we will have for Council on that one.
 15 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. Thank you.
 16 So I have the following announcements.
 17 Please silence your cell phones. Those participating
 18 via phone or webinar, please mute your phone. And if
 19 you receive a phone call, please hang up from this call
 20 and dial back in after finishing your other call.
 21 For those signed on to the webinar, please
 22 do not broadcast your webcam. Reminder to Council and
 23 anyone addressing the Council to please remember to
 24 state your full name clearly and do not use the speaker
 25 phone feature as it will create feedback.

1 Jesse Ratcliffe, Department of Justice Senior Assistant
 2 Attorney General of the Natural Resources section.
 3 So we are ready to move to the Noise Control
 4 Regulation Standard. And we have issues NC11, -2, -3,
 5 and -4. And so I'll turn it over to Ms. Tardaewether.
 6 MS. TARDAEWETHER: Good morning. Thank you,
 7 Vice Chair. Good morning, members of the Council.
 8 For the record, my name is Kellen
 9 Tardaewether, Senior Siting Analyst, Oregon Department
 10 of Energy.
 11 I'm going to do an introduction for Council
 12 for noise. I'm going to deviate a little bit from what
 13 my PowerPoint presentation had and we are all boarding
 14 the train and we're leaving Council's standards and
 15 we're headed to the realm of the other applicable
 16 standards and rules.
 17 So this is going to be exciting and we're
 18 going to look at some rules. And I don't want
 19 anybody -- there will be a lot, but I'm going to talk
 20 you through what they are. And I think that's the best
 21 way to set you up for the background for some of the --
 22 the pretty technical information that you're going to be
 23 hearing today regarding noise for the facility.
 24 So we are in the realm of the noise control
 25 regulations that are under the Department of

1 For those testifying on B2H agenda item,
 2 please use the "raise your hand" feature in Webex to
 3 speak during the public comment period, or press star 3
 4 to raise your hand if you are participating by
 5 telephone.
 6 You may sign up for email notices by
 7 clicking the link on the agenda or on the Council web
 8 page. You are also welcome to access the online mapping
 9 tool and any documents by visiting our website.
 10 Energy Facility Council meetings shall be
 11 conducted in a respectful and courteous manner where
 12 everyone is allowed to state their positions at the
 13 appropriate times, consistent with Council rules and
 14 procedures. Willful, accusatory, offensive, insulting,
 15 threatening, insolent, or slanderous comments which
 16 disrupt the Council meetings are not acceptable.
 17 Pursuant to Oregon Administrative Rule
 18 345.011.0080, any person who engages in unacceptable
 19 conduct which disrupts the meeting may be expelled.
 20 So today, we're continuing our review of the
 21 proposed order and proposed contested case order and
 22 exception hearing on the Boardman to Hemingway
 23 Transmission Line.
 24 We have Kellen Tardaewether, the Senior
 25 Siting Analyst for the Oregon Department of Energy, and

1 environmental qualities noise rules. And Council has
 2 seen the noise rules before and we've talked about them.
 3 But if the Council has wondered what are we
 4 doing making decisions about DEQ's noise rules, I'm
 5 going to show you why.
 6 And while we're getting there, I'm going to
 7 remind the Council that under the Council's general
 8 standard of review, the question is whether or not the
 9 preponderance of evidence supports the conclusion that
 10 the application for site certificate or the proposed
 11 facility meets Council's standards, Council's statutes,
 12 and then other applicable laws and statutes as
 13 identify -- you know, in Oregon as identified in the
 14 Second Amended Project Order. So that is where we're
 15 going.
 16 And so up here on my screen -- and there is
 17 a little bit of delay. So this is in the proposed
 18 order.
 19 So this is -- this is why Council is making
 20 decisions on the -- the DEQ noise rules, which is just
 21 what I'm going to call them. They are noise
 22 regulations. So the legislative assembly actually
 23 withdrew funding.
 24 So DEQ doesn't actually fund, administer, or
 25 generally mediate or provide input or interpretation for

1 their rules or implementation of their rules.
2 However, the DEQ noise rules are still rules
3 that are -- apply in Oregon. Therefore, they fall into
4 that bucket underneath the general standard of review
5 that the Council must find -- must evaluate and find
6 compliance with.

7 Oh, my sharing bar. Bear with me here.

8 Okay. So this is the rule-set. Let me see
9 if I can make it bigger here for folks.

10 Okay. Noise control regulations for
11 industry and commerce, so I'm going to kind of walk
12 through here. These are standards and regulations.
13 We're going to skip over one. Those are existing noise
14 sources.

15 What are we talking about?

16 We're talking about new noise sources. So
17 there's new noise sources and we're on previously
18 unused -- previously used sites and new sources located
19 on previously unused sites.

20 And in the proposed order, the applicant
21 provides information and representations that the site
22 for the proposed transmission line is an unused site,
23 predominantly using information from Exhibit K, which is
24 information about land use.

25 The facility crosses mostly EFU lands and

1 that have, like, weather conditions that have light
2 moisture so, like, a light rain that is light enough
3 that where the moisture would amplify the corona noise,
4 but not heavy enough rain to where the sound of the rain
5 would actually drowned out the corona noise.

6 So those are kind of the conditions in which
7 corona -- the corona effect would be the most amplified.

8 So underneath here the "no person owning or
9 controlling," this is where we have your -- the two
10 noise standards. And we have this -- I'm going to stop
11 or start with -- okay.

12 So we have this -- so the noise source here,
13 transmission lines are not allowed to increase the
14 ambient statistical noise levels by more than 10
15 decibels, "dBA," in any one hour. Okay. So that is
16 one. This is one of the noise standards.

17 We call that the "ambient degradation
18 standard" or the "anti-ambient degradation standard."

19 So this is where in any one hour the noise
20 from the facility cannot exceed 10 dBA.

21 The other, the other noise standard is the
22 maximum noise standard and there's this table eight.

23 And I have it later in the presentation,
24 which I'll go over. So this is the maximum noise levels
25 that are represented in this table. So those are the

1 some forested lands. But, in general, one of the ways I
2 think about it is like a used site would be a brown
3 field or already developed or an industrial site and an
4 unused site would be, generally, an undeveloped site.

5 The rules that fall under an unused site are
6 more stringent than a used site. So it is a more
7 conservative set of rules that would apply to the
8 facility.

9 So we're looking at this big "B," little
10 "i," and then, you know, "ii," so we're just going to
11 kind of walk through this.

12 Now, also what are we talking about with
13 noise?

14 We know we have a transmission line. We're
15 going to be constructing and operating a transmission
16 line. So there's noise associated with construction,
17 which I'll talk about that. And then there's noise
18 associated with the operation of the proposed facility.
19 The vast majority of that noise is the corona noise
20 associated with operating a high voltage transmission
21 line.

22 Generally speaking, the higher the voltage,
23 the more corona noise you may have under certain
24 circumstances.

25 Corona noise is most apparent in conditions

1 two that we look at.

2 Okay. I'm going to scroll down. There
3 are -- so Council will just see here. This doesn't
4 apply. But there are separate rules that would apply to
5 a wind energy facility. This is not a wind energy
6 facility, so we are applying the non-wind rules.

7 Okay. Okay.

8 This is an applicable portion of the rules.
9 This is some direction about measurement and where
10 measurement of a noise source or measurement points
11 for -- on gaining data to establish what the existing
12 ambient or baseline noise is. So these are rules
13 that -- that provide direction about the location and --
14 and how to go about measurement.

15 Okay. The sub (5) are exceptions. So there
16 are explicit exemptions for noise under the DEQ noise
17 rules. One of them that we -- and the proposed order
18 does talk about several exemptions.

19 The one that really -- that kind of Council
20 is the most familiar with and that we talk about in the
21 proposed order is the exemption for sounds that
22 originate from a construction site.

23 So noise associated with constructing a
24 facility is exempt from these noise rules. They
25 contemplate that construction may be noisy. However,

1 there is a lengthy explanation of noise associated with
2 construction in the proposed order because that's also
3 where we talk and we pull in the assessment under
4 recreation, protected areas, and scenic resources, we
5 point to that evaluation to give an idea of what the
6 noise associated with construction may be.

7 Okay. And then we have, under this sub (35)
8 of the noise control regulations, there are exceptions.

9 Just give me a moment. I'm going to check
10 with my notes to see if I need to go back to my
11 PowerPoint and see if I'm on target here with what I
12 want to say.

13 Okay. Very good.

14 Before I go into exceptions -- and I'll just
15 leave these here. But I wanted to talk about and to
16 give some background about ambient or baseline noise
17 levels.

18 So here, really, what we're doing -- and
19 these are for all of Council's facilities, what is
20 modeled is the worst-case noise that could potentially
21 come out of a proposed facility.

22 So with other types of facilities, we
23 generally talk about -- for example, with, like, a solar
24 facility, what is the noise-generating equipment?
25

And it is usually associated with the

1 scenarios when it's the loudest, likely would not even
2 be heard because the ambient noise is so loud.

3 However, out at Hanley's house, it's rural
4 and it's quiet. Your ambient noise are the sounds of
5 maybe dogs barking in the distance and birds chirping
6 and maybe some back-traffic, far-away airplanes. These
7 are the ambient noise levels.

8 So this is what the applicants -- all
9 applicants have to establish. And so that there is
10 ambient noise monitoring, where the applicant goes out
11 into the field, positions monitoring devices and
12 measures during the day and during the night in time
13 spans and then -- and then takes the most -- again,
14 we're applying the most conservative assumptions.

15 So usually what's used is the ambient noise
16 level in, like, late, late night/early morning when it's
17 just the quietest and that is the ambient assumed for
18 that site all the time. So it's the most conservative.

19 And then we add that -- we take that ambient
20 and add on the projected maximum corona noise, and that
21 is what is applied to that ambient degradation standard
22 of the "no more than 10 dBA per hour" and the maximum
23 noise. So those are kind of a very high level summary
24 of those two.

25 So -- and we will get to this. And the

1 transformers and any equipment associated with the
2 battery storage. And the applicant has to model the
3 most possible equipment that they are proposing and put
4 that into their noise assessment.

5 Here, part of the noise -- the noise -- the
6 maximum or worst-case noise that we're talking about is
7 the corona noise. So what the applicant has provided in
8 Exhibit X, which has information about the noise, is the
9 worst-case noise -- or a situation where corona would be
10 the worst. So that is kind of one bundle of assessment
11 that goes over here.

12 But then, because these are not existing
13 facilities, these are proposed facilities. So we're
14 projecting ahead and we're modeling. And part of that
15 modeling has to take into consideration the existing
16 noise levels at a site.

17 And that is the baseline or an ambient noise
18 level. Because -- and we can just run a scenario of --
19 say that we had a facility or this facility was
20 criss-crossing or right adjacent to I-84 as opposed to
21 maybe Hanley's house, which is rural and, you know,
22 nestled and it's very quiet and peaceful out there.

23 The ambient noise next to I-84 is going to
24 be louder. And so, therefore, any noise from the corona
25 noise from a transmission line, even in the worst-case

1 applicant has conducted that modeling. And there are
2 several areas where the applicant does not meet or
3 exceeds the anti-ambient degradation standard. So the
4 noise level in any hour would be more than 10.

5 So there are several instances in this. So
6 then the applicant in its application has requested
7 Council apply -- consider and apply an exception to the
8 noise rules. They also are requesting a variance to the
9 noise rules in these situations.

10 So I'm just going to -- that's what we're
11 going to look at these rules here, and these are -- this
12 is the findings that are provided in their proposed
13 order.

14 So for an exemption upon written request for
15 an owner, this would be the applicant. The Department
16 may authorize an exception to these noise rules, what
17 I've talked about, and then these are the
18 circumstances -- this A through E, the circumstances
19 under which an exemption may be granted.

20 The applicant is representing that the
21 corona noise would be an unusual and/or an infrequent
22 event and provides to support that representation.

23 So that's the exception. So -- and here it
24 tells -- tells us to point here. So go here. So we're
25 going to go there now. This is exciting.

1 Okay. So here we are. And so this is
 2 what -- this is what the Department does.
 3 We read rules and we see what an applicant
 4 gets us and we draft findings.
 5 So in establishing an exception, Department
 6 shall consider protection of health and safety and
 7 welfare of Oregon citizens.
 8 And then we also consider feasibility and
 9 cost of noise abatement; the past, present, and future
 10 patterns of land use; relative timing of land use
 11 changes, and other legal constraints.
 12 For exceptions, the Department shall specify
 13 times. So all of these items in here the Department has
 14 evaluated in the proposed order and made -- made
 15 recommendations. So each of these aspects is -- is
 16 represented in the proposed order.
 17 And then -- and -- and so the Council, as
 18 the decision-maker for these rules, is -- has the
 19 authority to do this evaluation and grant or deny these
 20 exceptions and apply the noise rules.
 21 The applicant is also requesting that
 22 Council consider a variance to the noise rules. So the
 23 Commission may grant -- may grant specific variances
 24 from the particular requirements of any rule,
 25 regulation, or order to -- for such specific noise

1 also -- and so it includes the baseline or ambient and
 2 then their maximum modeled. And in that table, it does
 3 include the result of the anti-ambient degradation
 4 standard, so the increase of 10 dBA per hour, but it
 5 also has the results of the maximum allowable.
 6 And in that table, the maximum noise at
 7 any -- and I forgot to give Council the background.
 8 Council has heard it before.
 9 In the DEQ noise rules, they call them
 10 "noise sensitive properties."
 11 In general, those -- Council can think of
 12 those as -- they're properties normally used for
 13 sleeping. That's part of the definition. But it's a
 14 residence. That's what we're looking at.
 15 They are called "noise sensitive
 16 properties."
 17 In the application and just in the
 18 Department's vernacular, we commonly call it an "NSR" or
 19 a "noise sensitive receptor."
 20 So the NSR, or noise sensitive property,
 21 that has the -- which would experience the loudest
 22 noise, it would be at 47 dBA which is underneath the 50
 23 dBA. Which this is that Table 8 that those noise rules
 24 pointed to. This is just taken out of DEQ's noise
 25 rules.

1 sources upon conditions as it may deem necessary to
 2 protect the public health and welfare if it finds that
 3 strict compliance with rule, regulation, or order is
 4 inappropriate because of conditions beyond the control
 5 of persons granted such variance. So we're going
 6 to procedures for requesting.
 7 So this is the second part in the proposed
 8 order where there is an evaluation and recommendation
 9 for Council's consideration.
 10 Okay. Let me go back here. That was kind
 11 of a lot of rules. And we can go back to that. And
 12 maybe I'll just proceed.
 13 But if Council has any questions about
 14 those, we can do that now or at the end.
 15 So just give me one minute. I'm almost
 16 through here. Maybe.
 17 Okay. I had these snippets of rules in my
 18 PowerPoint and I thought it was better to actually just
 19 look at them.
 20 So under -- there is a table NC-4, which is
 21 the summary of acoustic modeling results, comparison of
 22 predicted facility sound levels to late night baseline.
 23 It provides the results of the applicant's
 24 noise modeling. So this is their establishment of the
 25 baseline at representative locations. And then it

1 And again, we're kind of looking -- we're
 2 going the most conservative, which is the I-50. When
 3 the Council sees the "I-50" is generally the statistical
 4 noise level that is the quietest.
 5 So everything is kind of the most
 6 conservative application within these rules. So the --
 7 and so when we talk about "maximum allowable," 50 dBA is
 8 that threshold. Because in here it's the most
 9 conservative. It is the lowest noise.
 10 And -- in that table, NSR it would be 47.
 11 So we're recommending the maximum allowable noise
 12 standard is met.
 13 And that concludes my portion.
 14 MR. RATCLIFFE: Thanks, Kellen.
 15 So we have four issues that are part of the
 16 contested case that exceptions were filed on related to
 17 the noise standard.
 18 We're gonna take those issues one by one.
 19 So our first issue is NC-1. The limited party here is
 20 Stop B2H.
 21 The issue is whether the Department
 22 improperly modified, slash, reduced the noise analysis
 23 area in Exhibit X from one mile of the proposed site
 24 boundary to one-half mile of the proposed site boundary,
 25 and whether one of the Department's application rules.

1 So one of the application materials rules in Division 21
2 requires notification to all owners of noise-sensitive
3 property within one mile.

4 So the proposed contested case order
5 opinion, the hearing officer found that the Department's
6 application rule does require that an applicant identify
7 and address -- and include addresses for noise sensitive
8 receptors within a mile of the site boundary.

9 A separate Council rule allows for the
10 Department to modify the information to be required in
11 an application for site certificate if that modification
12 is reflected in the Department's project order.

13 We've heard about the project order a few
14 times. And, again, that is the document that is
15 intended to provide the roadmap to the applicant for the
16 standards that are going to be required to be met in the
17 application process.

18 The -- in this case, the project order was
19 amended a couple of times. So in the Second Amended
20 Project Order the Department modified the requirements
21 of the application -- the application requirements to
22 accommodate the linear nature of the proposed facility
23 and established that the extent of the names and
24 addresses that must be identified for noise-sensitive
25 properties extend to a half-mile from the site boundary

1 within its authority and established the noise analysis
2 area in the Second Amended Project Order as the area
3 within and extending one-half mile from the site
4 boundary.

5 So, again, that's the summary of the hearing
6 officer's proposed contested case order opinion. And
7 we'll now here oral argument from Stop B2H on this
8 issue.

9 MR. ANUTA: Good morning, members of the
10 Commission. My name is Karl Anuta. I'm representing
11 Stop B2H.

12 First, let me point something out to make
13 sure that we're all clear. Stop did not accept on the
14 issue of notice. Stop only accepted on the issue of the
15 modification in the project order of the pre-existing
16 rule.

17 And this is an interesting legal issue.
18 Hopefully, the Council has thought through this. The
19 basic problem here is that you have an existing rule
20 that says one mile is what is required for the list.

21 The Department's position is that you have
22 another rule that allows you to modify that rule in a
23 project order. And the problem for you is the Oregon
24 Administrative Procedures Act or "APA," is what governs
25 rule-making and it does not provide for having a rule

1 rather than a mile.

2 So one of the issues raised by Stop B2H was
3 whether or not the Department's authority to modify
4 these application requirements are limited to a
5 situation where the applicant has made a written request
6 to waive requirements.

7 The hearing officer found that while that
8 provision does authorize the Department to modify
9 requirements upon the applicant's written request, it
10 does not preclude the Department from otherwise
11 establishing on its own the applicable application
12 requirements in the project order.

13 Separately -- and we're, you know, getting a
14 little technical here, but the -- the rule that refers
15 to the -- the mile boundary, the hearing officer found
16 that that's not a requirement for issuing public notice.

17 Public notice and entities that must receive
18 notice are addressed in a separate Department -- or
19 Council rules.

20 And that, further, the -- the rule at issue
21 here does not establish or define the noise analysis
22 area.

23 So the Hearing Officer's ultimate conclusion
24 here was that separately from modifying the information
25 requirements in the application, the Department acted

1 that lets you modify a rule in an order. It has very
2 strict prescriptions. You have to go through a
3 rule-making process that publishes notice and does all
4 the things that the APA requires. There's no dispute
5 that didn't happen here.

6 So the really simple direct issue is can
7 ODOE pass a rule giving itself an exemption from the
8 Administrative Procedures Act rulemaking or rule
9 modification requirements.

10 Stop's position is straightforward. No.
11 Every agency is bound by the APA. If you want to change
12 a rule, you have to go through rulemaking. You can do
13 that on a temporary or emergency basis, if you find that
14 there's an emergency. Not sure how you could find there
15 would be an emergency because a power company wants to
16 make a lot of money building a line, but -- maybe that
17 would -- they could try to argue that. But here there
18 was no effort to get an emergency rule passed. There
19 was no amended rule that you could apply in a project
20 order. You had the existing rules. And instead, the
21 Department modified the rule to say something that it
22 didn't say.

23 So our position is very straightforward.
24 You don't have the authority to do that.

25 You, the Council, should tell the

1 Department -- make them go back and do it correctly.
 2 And why does that matter?
 3 Because that list that they create is the
 4 noise -- is -- provides the public, or you, the ability
 5 to look at what noise-sensitive receptors are out there
 6 and what might be covered by the project boundary or the
 7 project one-mile radius.
 8 And that's something that the public should
 9 know. That's why your rules require that notice within
 10 a half mile.
 11 You now have a whole group of people that
 12 were between a half mile and a mile that could never
 13 figure out because the list wasn't accurately done.
 14 Whether they were on the list or off the list.
 15 And that's what happens if you change rules
 16 in the middle of a proceeding without going through the
 17 APA.
 18 I'd be happy to answer questions, if you
 19 have any.
 20 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Thank you, Mr. Anuta.
 21 Any questions from Council?
 22 Thank you.
 23 MS. RACKNER: Mr. Anuta is asking you to
 24 look at one portion of your rules. And to -- and to --
 25 excuse me. I seem to have some sound going on here.

1 project order identifies the provisions of this rule
 2 applicable to the application for the proposed facility,
 3 including any appropriate modifications to application
 4 of the rule.
 5 So, clearly, within your rules itself, ODOE
 6 had the authority to make a revision to the analysis
 7 area in the project order and that is exactly what they
 8 did.
 9 There is no reason for rulemaking. There is
 10 no error that was committed on a procedural basis here.
 11 I also want to point out that while ODOE --
 12 excuse me, while Stop B2H is stating that they are
 13 concerned that people on that list going out to a mile
 14 may not have had proper notice.
 15 At the same time they've said -- and this is
 16 true in their exceptions -- they didn't raise a notice
 17 argument. So I think that's a red herring.
 18 And the final thing I just want to emphasize
 19 is while ODOE did reduce the analysis area at the
 20 outset, Idaho Power did analyze for noise effects only
 21 out to a half a mile.
 22 Ultimately, in response to concerns -- and
 23 this is a familiar refrain you'll hear -- Idaho Power
 24 heard concerns. Idaho Power ultimately expanded its
 25 analysis area out to one mile.

1 Could I pause my time?
 2 Thank you. I seem to have made all kinds of
 3 mistakes.
 4 Okay. I think that's better. All right.
 5 And again, for the record, I'm Lisa Rackner.
 6 So Mr. Anuta wants you to look at one
 7 portion of your rules which are the requirement lists
 8 for Exhibit X, to read that all by itself and say you
 9 can't change that rule except to do so under the APA.
 10 But that's not the way you look at a set of
 11 rules. Basic principles of statutory construction
 12 require you to look at all of the rules and construe
 13 them together.
 14 And if you do that, you will see that ODOE
 15 definitely had the authority to make changes in the
 16 project order to the analysis area for noise.
 17 And I hate quoting noise -- excuse me,
 18 quoting rules by number, but I think it's helpful to do
 19 so.
 20 OAR Chapter 345-21-0004, that section
 21 provides that ODOE may waive or modify any of the
 22 application content requirements listed in Chapter 21
 23 that ODOE determines are not applicable to the proposed
 24 facility.
 25 Similarly, 345-21-0010(1) states that the

1 And as a result, found one additional
 2 exceedance going out to one mile. So in the end, the
 3 analysis area was out to one mile.
 4 And finally, in the site conditions that
 5 were adopted by the hearing officer, ultimately, Idaho
 6 Power is going to have to update the list of landowners
 7 going out to a mile, provide them all with notice of the
 8 conditions that are adopted in the site certificate so
 9 that everybody going out to one mile was going to
 10 understand what the rules are around noise, what
 11 mitigation they might be entitled to, and what the
 12 process is for compliance.
 13 And I see I've gone over. I apologize.
 14 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Thank you, Ms. Rackner.
 15 Are there any questions from Council?
 16 Guess not.
 17 Counsel Rowe.
 18 MR. ROWE: Patrick Rowe, Department of
 19 Justice for the Oregon Department of Energy.
 20 I've said this before, I think at least
 21 internally, this is an issue that only an administrative
 22 law professor could love.
 23 I don't have much to add to what Mr. Rackner
 24 said, but I will -- always good to hear things a couple
 25 times to make sure you're following.

1 The rule at issue seeks only a list of names
2 and addresses of noise-sensitive receptors within one
3 mile of the proposed facility.

4 It doesn't establish a public notice hearing
5 requirement and it doesn't establish an analysis area.

6 That rule doesn't say you have to analyze
7 noise within one mile. It says give us a list of the
8 NSR properties within one mile.

9 Council rules don't specify an analysis area
10 to determining compliance with the noise control
11 regulations. There are statute, as well as rules, that
12 provide authority for the Department to establish
13 application requirements in the project order.

14 Okay. So this -- what was done here isn't
15 being done just pursuant to a rule. It is also being
16 done pursuant to a statute, which says in the project
17 order, the Department shall establish what statutes,
18 rules, Council standards apply to the application.

19 Consistent with that authority in the
20 project order, the Department set the noise analysis
21 area at a half mile of the site boundary.

22 Even if the Division 21 rule at issue
23 required analysis within one mile, which it does not,
24 the Department would have authority to modify that
25 provision consistent with the statute as well as the

1 there is a comment period. And we ask reviewing
2 agencies to comment on if they have any feedback about
3 analysis areas. You know, agencies generally don't
4 comment on noise. But just for Council to take into
5 consideration that we take that information and then
6 that's the basis that we modify analysis areas and then
7 your rules tell us to establish that in the project
8 order, which happens after the notice of intent phase.

9 The intent is just that it is a longer
10 linear facility and to have kind of -- it's kind of like
11 a reasonable factor. And this is just in conversations
12 in our understanding with the people that did establish
13 that, because it happened prior to Sarah and I being
14 here.

15 But that -- that because it is this long,
16 you know, 274 mile linear facility, that a reasonable
17 analysis area that basically going out a mile would just
18 be a really big and maybe unnecessary analysis.

19 This is -- and this is just from my
20 understanding. We don't actually have anything in the
21 record that has a basis or a reason for it.

22 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. Secretary Cornett,
23 I believe we're ready for the straw poll.

24 SECRETARY CORNETT: Okay. This would be to
25 agree with the finding of -- for the record, Todd

1 rules that Ms. Rackner just mentioned.

2 Also as Ms. Rackner mentioned, all of this
3 is essentially moot. Because even though in the project
4 order the Department said analyze within half a mile,
5 Idaho Power ended up evaluating noise-sensitive
6 receptors and potential noise impacts extending out to
7 one mile in response to public comment and concern about
8 this issue.

9 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Thank you, Counsel Rowe.
10 Any questions from the Council?

11 Okay. Do we want to continue our practice
12 of taking on each issue and resolving with the straw
13 poll for the proposed contested case order one at a
14 time?

15 Yeah, Council Condon.

16 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Cindy Condon.
17 Just a question for the Department.

18 What was the reason for the half mile? Just
19 general reasoning for half mile.

20 MS. TARDAEWETHER: For the record, Kellen
21 Tardaewether.

22 That was established prior -- prior to Sarah
23 and I being here.

24 After the establishment of the analysis
25 areas, happens after the "notice of intent" phase where

1 Cornett.

2 "Agree with the findings of fact,
3 conclusions of law, and conditions of approval in the
4 proposed contested case order pertaining to issue NC-1."

5 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Sounds right.

6 SECRETARY CORNETT: Kent Howe.

7 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Yes.

8 SECRETARY CORNETT: Ann Beier.

9 COUNCILMEMBER BEIER: Yes.

10 SECRETARY CORNETT: Hanley Jenkins.

11 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: Yes.

12 SECRETARY CORNETT: Jordan Truitt.

13 COUNCILMEMBER TRUITT: Yes.

14 SECRETARY CORNETT: Perry Chocktoot.

15 COUNCILMEMBER CHOCKTOOT: Yes.

16 SECRETARY CORNETT: Cindy Condon.

17 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Yes.

18 SECRETARY CORNETT: Thank you,

19 Councilmembers.

20 MR. RATCLIFFE: The next issue is NC-2. We
21 have several limited parties associated with this issue,
22 Stop B2H, Gilbert, and Horst, all three of these limited
23 parties filed exceptions.

24 The issue is whether the Department erred in
25 recommending that the Council grant a variance/exception

Page 572

1 from the Oregon DEQ's noise rules, OAR 340-035-0035, and
 2 whether the variance/exception is inconsistent with
 3 ORS 467.010.
 4 So the Hearing Officer's opinion on this
 5 issue first notes one of the Council's statutes
 6 ORS 469.370 sub (7), which establishes that the Council
 7 must determine whether the proposed facility complies
 8 with any additional statutes, rules, or ordinances
 9 determined to be applicable to the facility by the
 10 project order as amended.
 11 So again, this is setting the stage that
 12 these noise rules come from another source of law and
 13 not the Council's own rules in the first instance, but
 14 the DEQ noise rules.
 15 ORS 469.401 establishes the Council's
 16 authority in consolidating other permits or permit
 17 requirements into the site certificate.
 18 Based on these statutes taken together, the
 19 Council has the jurisdiction and authority to determine
 20 whether the proposed facility meets DEQ's noise control
 21 regulation requirements for an exception and/or a
 22 variance from the ambient anti-degradation standard.
 23 And that standard is a limit not to exceed
 24 more than 10 dBA above the baseline ambient noise levels
 25 in any one hour.

Page 573

1 And further, that the Council is not
 2 required to consult with the Environmental Quality
 3 Commission or DEQ in making its determination.
 4 The hearing officer found that 30 years ago
 5 the Environment Quality Commission and DEQ suspended
 6 their responsibility for administrating the noise
 7 program.
 8 And, essentially, this places the Council as
 9 the sole authority to make findings and rules on an
 10 applicant's request for variance and exception, just as
 11 it does to the Council's authority to make decisions
 12 with respect to any aspect of the noise rules that may
 13 apply here.
 14 The hearing officer found that limited
 15 parties presented no persuasive evidence that the
 16 Department's recommendation that the Council grant a
 17 variance or exception was an error.
 18 The hearing officer found that exceedances
 19 of the ambient degradation standard met the criteria for
 20 being unusual or infrequent, because it would occur less
 21 than 2 percent of the time. Only during foul weather,
 22 where foul weather is infrequent in the project area and
 23 at times of low ambient noise levels and when the
 24 transmission line is operating at full capacity.
 25 ORS 467.010, which is the legislative policy

Page 574

1 behind the noise control rules states that it's to
 2 provide protection of the health, safety, and welfare of
 3 Oregon citizens from the hazards and deterioration of
 4 the quality of life imposed by excessive noise
 5 emissions.
 6 The hearing officer found that the proposed
 7 facility will not present a threat to the environmental
 8 quality of life in this State. The Department --
 9 further that the Department appropriately considered the
 10 factors under OAR 340-35-0010(2).
 11 The hearing officer also noted the noise
 12 conditions that have been imposed here.
 13 Noise condition one, which is a pre --
 14 preconstruction requirement to work with known NSRs
 15 where exceedances would occur and agree and implement
 16 noise impact-related mitigation.
 17 And second, a post-construction requirement
 18 to evaluate any noise complaints and implement noise
 19 impact-related mitigation if the complaint is deemed
 20 valid.
 21 This includes a Council review component if
 22 any disputes on the level of mitigation end up being
 23 unresolved.
 24 That with these conditions that are included
 25 in the proposed contested case order that this would

Page 575

1 result in the protection of health, safety, and welfare
 2 of Oregon citizens.
 3 So that is the summary.
 4 So again, we have three parties who filed
 5 exceptions on this issue and they can present oral
 6 argument in the order that they choose.
 7 MS. GILBERT: Good morning. Irene Gilbert
 8 here.
 9 Knowing you are going to deny my request for
 10 exception on this, based on -- and you've also denied
 11 all procedural arguments, I'm going to kind of focus
 12 some on the procedural issues that relate to this
 13 particular case.
 14 This is one of many issues when the
 15 Administrative Law Judge used procedures to hamstring
 16 the public participation in contested cases.
 17 My contested case in regard -- is in regard
 18 to whether it's appropriate for Council to authorize an
 19 exception in variance to the DEQ's rules. And this is
 20 one example because, obviously, in order to decide if
 21 you are going to be able to issue an exception, you have
 22 to know what the noise effects are.
 23 And I was denied any arguments regarding the
 24 methodology or the establishment of what the actual
 25 noise impacts are going to be, which makes it very

1 difficult to justify an exception. And they -- if you
 2 look at the noise issue, it is -- it's one issue and yet
 3 you see four -- actually, there were a couple other
 4 noise issues, if you will, which were really just pieces
 5 of the noise problem.
 6 So anyway, when you -- there are a couple of
 7 court decisions. One is DLCD v. Tillamook County which
 8 says divisions -- decisions stating -- stating
 9 petitioners need not have raised individual arguments
 10 regarding my issue.
 11 So what -- what that court decision said was
 12 you don't have to give all the details. All you have to
 13 do is raise the broad issue.
 14 And another one here says that -- this is
 15 with League of Women Voters, says that individual
 16 arguments regarding issue on appeal cannot be limited.
 17 So the fact that they have thrown out
 18 everything in my contested case on the exception or
 19 variance that had to do with what the actual noise
 20 levels are and whether or not that was correctly
 21 identified is not going to hold water in appeal.
 22 The -- let's see. I wanted to also state
 23 that I might insert, anyway, the fact that there's no
 24 deference to an agency when it comes to interpreting
 25 another agency's rules or statutes.

1 time. So if we were to have this -- this weather
 2 pattern for four days in a row, then it would be just a
 3 minor event in a 365-day year.
 4 That's not what the rules say. The rules
 5 say one hour within any 24-hour period if there's an
 6 exceedance, there's an exceedance. That is not
 7 infrequent. Thank you.
 8 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Any questions from
 9 Council?
 10 Ready for the next.
 11 MR. ANUTA: Karl Anuta on behalf of Stop.
 12 You have several issues embedded in this
 13 particular one. One of them is the legal question of
 14 can the Department -- or the Council take over the
 15 authority of DEQ and EQC to grant a variance.
 16 Our position is very simple.
 17 You could go to them, or the applicant could
 18 go to them and say "Will you let us do this because
 19 you're no longer administering the program?"
 20 And if they say, heck, yeah. We're no
 21 longer doing anything, then you have authority.
 22 If you don't do that, you can't just usurp
 23 the authority of another agency and say, hey, we're
 24 going to do that stuff because we don't think they will.
 25 So that's pretty much a straightforward

1 And actually, the statute specifically says
 2 that the rules -- how the rules are supposed to be
 3 established by DEQ and the DEQ rules have to cover
 4 specific items and that they are, in effect, the
 5 statute.
 6 Because the statute is so clear that it says
 7 you will determine how you're going -- how you're going
 8 to measure it. How you're going to interpret it. It's
 9 that specific.
 10 The -- the other thing -- so I was going to
 11 talk about unusual and infrequent.
 12 ODOE re-interpreted the idea about what --
 13 how much noise level the exceedance there is.
 14 In the rules it clearly says that when the
 15 corona noise is exceeding the ambient degradation
 16 standard, they are talking about how many days. And it
 17 specifically says any -- within a 24-hour period if
 18 there's an exceedance, there's an exceedance of this
 19 standard.
 20 So in Union County, that means that 365 days
 21 out of every year, we could expect the weather to
 22 be such that -- (audio disruption) -- instead of looking
 23 at it that way. What the developer did is they said,
 24 well, if we look at the amount of days -- or not the
 25 amount of days, but the -- look at it as a block of

1 legal question. We don't think you have that authority.
 2 ODOE argues that you do.
 3 I think we'll ultimately end up having to
 4 see how an appellate court views that. We don't think
 5 the grant of authority is that broad.
 6 The secondary issues you have here is does
 7 the applicant's materials and the Department's analysis
 8 actually meet the requirements for a variance? And --
 9 or an exception. And if there is one, should it be for
 10 the entire line or should it be based on individual NSRs
 11 where the actual high levels of noise will occur?
 12 Our position on the latter is very
 13 straightforward. You shouldn't be granting anybody an
 14 exception for an entire facility that goes for almost
 15 300 miles. It should be focused on the NSRs where there
 16 are actually exceedances.
 17 As to whether they meet the standard, they
 18 don't. As Ms. Gilbert just noted that there isn't an
 19 infrequent issue here because it's 48 days if you're in
 20 Union County. That's not infrequent. There's also no
 21 special circumstances here that render compliance
 22 impractical. There are other routes where there
 23 wouldn't be this problem. One of them would be the NEPA
 24 route. But the other routes would make this perfectly
 25 feasible.

1 There's also an exception allowed if
 2 substantial compliance would result in substantial
 3 curtailment or closing down of the business.
 4 Well, the business doesn't exist right now.
 5 It wouldn't be closing anything down. And if the
 6 applicant can't comply with the noise standards, then
 7 they shouldn't be building the line. You shouldn't be
 8 approving things because -- simply because the applicant
 9 can't meet your standard. You should be saying meet the
 10 standards or your certificate is denied. That's how
 11 that it is supposed to work.
 12 And then one of the other points to think
 13 about is, you are obligated, if you are actually
 14 applying the DEQ noise rules to balance the equities
 15 here, and that wasn't done.
 16 If you look at the order, the public health,
 17 welfare, and safety on noise issues were not balanced
 18 against IPCs. The only thing that was balanced was the
 19 cost and the difficulty for IPC of building a line that
 20 actually complied with the standards.
 21 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Thank you, Mr. Anuta.
 22 Are there any questions from Council?
 23 Okay. Thank you.
 24 The next is Mr. Horst.
 25 MR. HORST: Excuse me. My name is Joe

1 state and the health of safety and welfare of the people
 2 of the state as is pollution of the air and waters of
 3 this state.
 4 The Oregon legislature takes noise pollution
 5 very seriously. While the Oregon Department of
 6 Quality (sic) no longer does the variances or exception,
 7 they did set the standards to what maximum noise levels
 8 should be.
 9 If a company wanted to pollute a river and
 10 their guess is going to be 10 to 20 percent over what
 11 the maximum allowed is, or if a company wanted to put
 12 smoke in the air, you know, just saying -- it might be
 13 10, might be 20. We really don't know that for sure.
 14 Over the maximum allowed, I'm sure they would be
 15 rejected.
 16 There -- there -- there -- the Department
 17 is and Idaho Power is asking for exceptions that would
 18 be determined over the maximum level that the ODEQ has
 19 already made maximum level should be.
 20 So I'm asking that the -- the -- that you
 21 guys reject the -- their exceptions or variances at all.
 22 I'm just going to make a quick comment.
 23 From what I've seen of this process so far, yesterday I
 24 made a comment that on this -- that the La Grande City
 25 Council does not want this route to be used. There's

1 Horst. Just regards to contested case NC-2. OAR
 2 340-035-0010 regarding exceptions reads specifically, in
 3 establishing exceptions, the Department shall consider
 4 the protection of health, safety, and welfare of Oregon
 5 citizens.
 6 This does not do that. You know, there
 7 might be an argument made that this might be for the
 8 greater good of the northwest, but the OAR specifically
 9 says health, safety, and welfare of Oregon citizens, not
 10 Idaho citizens.
 11 OAR 340-035-0100 regarding variances reads,
 12 specifically, conditions for granting. The Commission
 13 may grant specific variances from the particular
 14 requirements of any title, regulation, or order to a
 15 specific person or class of persons shall specific noise
 16 upon such conditions as it may deem necessary to protect
 17 the public health and welfare.
 18 This actually does the opposite of that. It
 19 does not protect the public health and welfare. So
 20 that -- therefore, that does not apply.
 21 The Oregon legislature has made it very
 22 clear, ORS 467.010 reads: The legislative assembly
 23 finds that the increasing incidents of noise emissions
 24 in this State at unreasonable levels is as much of a
 25 threat to the environmental quality of life in this

1 many citizens who don't want it to be used. You guys
 2 aren't listening to us. You're not listening to us at
 3 all.
 4 Mr. White came in and he was concerned about
 5 the -- the blasting -- you know, he lives on the bottom
 6 of a huge, steep hillside, and he's concerned about his
 7 house.
 8 And you guys say, well, we're going to give
 9 you a week's notice, you know, so you can get out of
 10 your house so if the rocks come down, you're not in it.
 11 It's just wrong. You're not listening to what we're
 12 trying to say. He didn't care about the notice. He
 13 doesn't want his house flattened.
 14 You know, while that road -- my road might
 15 be 15 to 20 percent, it goes at an angle, that -- if you
 16 ever look at that hillside right at the bottom of those
 17 houses, it's big and it's steep. If a car -- if a
 18 cement truck is coming down that road and there is
 19 another car coming the other way, just a blind corner,
 20 either the two are going to hit or one -- that cement
 21 truck is going to go off the road. If it does, it is
 22 going to land right on a couple of houses. There's no
 23 way it can't.
 24 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Thank you, Mr. Horst.
 25 MR. HORST: Yeah. Okay. I apologize.

1 Thank you.
 2 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Any questions of
 3 Mr. Horst?
 4 Okay.
 5 MS. RACKNER: Good morning. Lisa Rackner,
 6 again, for the record.
 7 The argument that the parties have made on
 8 this issue are far-ranging, and I will try to just
 9 briefly touch on as many as I can in the time that I
 10 have.
 11 First, as Mr. Ratcliffe explained, EFSC does
 12 have expressed jurisdiction to assess an application for
 13 a site certificate to make sure that it complies with
 14 state statutes and rules that are normally administered
 15 by and enforced by others, including ODEQ's noise rules.
 16 In EFSC's findings regarding compliance with
 17 such statutes and rules, it is binding on those
 18 agencies.
 19 Accordingly, the Council does have
 20 jurisdiction to issue a variance or exception in this
 21 case. And as we explained in our briefing, the
 22 legislature, when it adopted the noise statute, it
 23 clearly didn't intend that it would be inflexibly
 24 applied in each case because it allowed for variances
 25 and exceptions.

1 in compliance with the noise rules approximately 98.7
 2 percent of the time. And when you specifically look at
 3 the La Grande area, which was the subject of some
 4 controversy here, B2H will be in compliance
 5 approximately 97.3 percent of the time.
 6 Now, both Stop B2H and Ms. Gilbert have
 7 focused on the fact that Idaho Power's analysis does
 8 show that if you look at that data on a daily basis,
 9 there will be 48 days in a year or 13 percent of the
 10 days where there will be an exceedance.
 11 But we think the sole focus on that data
 12 point is -- it's misleading, because it treats a day in
 13 which there is a -- an exceedance in one hour the same
 14 as a day where there was an exceedance in every hour.
 15 And so while that is an interesting data
 16 point, we're not ignoring it. We think much more
 17 salient is to think about how many total hours of the
 18 day is there going to be an exceedance, and it's a tiny
 19 little fraction.
 20 Finally, a variance is appropriate because
 21 strict application of the noise rules, given the
 22 numerous other constraints the company needs to avoid
 23 would -- could render B2H unpermissible, which
 24 would deprive the region of critical infrastructure
 25 that's necessary to achieve a clean energy grid. And

1 Now, neither EQC or DEQ are currently
 2 enforcing their noise statutes and rules. So in order
 3 to give effect to the legislature's intent, EFSC is the
 4 only agency that can consider a variance or an exception
 5 in this case.
 6 So you have the ability to do so. And as a
 7 matter of policy, you should do so.
 8 And with respect to Mr. Anuta's suggestion
 9 that the applicant or ODOE should have consulted with
 10 DEQ or ODOE, I can tell you there's an affidavit in the
 11 record here that on another issue related to noise, the
 12 applicant did contact DEQ to try to get some advice and
 13 were told very clearly, we don't have staff to even talk
 14 to you about this issue. That was on a different issue,
 15 not the variance or exception issue.
 16 But to give you a sense, there is evidence
 17 in the record that there is no one to talk to there
 18 about noise.
 19 So second, based upon Idaho Power's noise
 20 modeling analysis, the corona noise exceedances caused
 21 by foul weather events are, in fact, infrequent and
 22 unusual, therefore, warranting an exception to DEQ's
 23 anti-degradation standard.
 24 Idaho Power has demonstrated that on average
 25 in applying conservative assumptions the project will be

1 it's been supported and prioritized by the state and the
 2 nation.
 3 And with respect to Mr. Anuta's claim that
 4 if we -- that the NEPA route wouldn't have had any of
 5 the same issues, there's absolutely no evidence in the
 6 record to suggest that there would have been no
 7 exceedances along the NEPA route.
 8 And finally -- and thank you, the other
 9 parties went a little long, so I will, if you'll indulge
 10 me, just 30 more seconds.
 11 Keep in mind, also, that health and welfare
 12 is one of the bases, one of the things you have to
 13 consider when you would grant an exception or a
 14 variance.
 15 Keep in mind that corona noise that is
 16 predicted to occur will only be during foul weather and
 17 it's most likely to cause an exceedance in nighttime
 18 hours when it is particularly quiet. Under these
 19 conditions, most residence will be in doors where sound
 20 levels will be significantly attenuated. And under foul
 21 weather conditions, where the rain is heavy, then corona
 22 is frequently masked by the sound of the rain hitting
 23 the foliage. So our prediction of exceedances is really
 24 quite conservative.
 25 As Idaho Power's acoustical expert, Mr. Mark

1 Bastasch, explained, the evidence confirms that B2H
2 won't cause exceedances of DEQ's maximum allowable sound
3 standards for industry sources the maximum amount. And
4 Oregonians can reasonably be expected to hear, sleep,
5 and go about their daily activities without
6 interruption. Therefore, the granting of a variance and
7 exception, together with the site conditions that we'll
8 talk about a little bit more in a few minutes, are fully
9 protective of Oregonians.

10 Thank you.

11 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Thank you, Ms. Rackner.
12 Are there any questions from Council?
13 Councillor Condon.

14 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: So I can face you
15 without turning. Thank you. Cindy Condon.

16 One of the things that is concerning to me
17 is -- there's certainly reliance on modeling. I
18 certainly get that. And there are -- are certainly
19 comments made that people can reasonably expect this or
20 that.

21 So when the project is finished, if there
22 are exceedances, what's -- what's the consequence of
23 that?

24 Does the public just live -- in your mind,
25 does the public just live with that? You know, yep.

1 into homes.

2 If people are more concerned about the
3 impact of noise, maybe they wouldn't be able to hear the
4 noise because they already have, like, a really strong
5 and tight house but they are more concerned about noise
6 in their front yard, there is -- we can plant trees. We
7 can put in foliage. So there is -- I use the term a lot
8 of tools in the tool kit. So there are a lot of tools
9 in the tool kit for addressing concerns.

10 So for those people for whom an exceedance
11 is expected or -- or under our analysis before
12 construction even occurs, we're going to go through that
13 whole process. And as -- I think Jesse explained that
14 if there's any disagreement about whether the mitigation
15 that we're proposing is adequate, then we come to the
16 Council and the Council can decide. This was good
17 enough or this wasn't good enough. Try something
18 different.

19 So there's a whole process and set of rights
20 that land owners will have under that condition.

21 Now, what about those people that we
22 don't -- we haven't predicted are going to have an
23 exceedance, but once the line is energized they think it
24 is noisy and they are concerned about it. Then there is
25 a complaint process.

1 We've tried to protect health and welfare. Or is there
2 mitigation that can be done for that?

3 MS. RACKNER: Let me talk a little bit about
4 the mitigation and the complaint process.

5 And these are required in the proposed
6 conditions. And forgive me if I don't know which
7 condition number is which without checking my notes.

8 But first of all, prior to construction,
9 Idaho Power is going to meet with each and every
10 landowner where there is an exceedance that is predicted
11 and work with them to come up with a mitigation plan.

12 And Idaho Power proposed -- and the hearing
13 officer adopted some very specific kind of minimal
14 requirements that the company will -- will offer, for
15 instance, noise attenuating windows. They make really
16 good strong windows that are specifically made to
17 attenuate noise.

18 And what the company has committed to do and
19 what the hearing officer has requiring us to do is look
20 at what's the amount of the exceedance. And the higher
21 the exceedance, the stronger level of window that we
22 would propose to install.

23 For landowners who don't want -- maybe they
24 already have fantastic windows and they want something
25 else. There's things you can do by blowing insulation

1 And again, prior to construction -- there is
2 a lot of detail in the conditions, but prior to
3 construction the company has to provide ODOE with a
4 detailed complaint process that -- that will kind of lay
5 out what -- what the rules are. So people can come to
6 us. They can rely -- if they want to do their own
7 measurement they can do their own measurement;
8 otherwise, we can bring in -- we can bring in our own
9 measurement.

10 If there's a disagreement. Again, that type
11 of thing can be resolved by the Council.

12 But then we go -- but if we find that there
13 is actually an exceedance, that they are correct, this
14 is loud, and it's an exceedance then we go through the
15 whole mitigation process with -- with those folks, as
16 well.

17 So whether they are on our list where
18 there's an expected exceedance or whether an unexpected
19 exceedance is identified, there's a full suite of
20 mitigation that we can provide.

21 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Thank you.

22 And just to follow up. So the number of
23 people on your list are within the one mile -- I think
24 you said there was just one more exceedance from the
25 half mile to one mile.

1 MS. RACKNER: Yeah.
 2 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: But would it be the
 3 NSRs within the mile that you're --
 4 MS. RACKNER: Yes.
 5 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: -- assessing?
 6 MS. RACKNER: And to go back to something I
 7 said earlier. And again, there's a lot of detail and so
 8 I hope that, Kellen, you'll correct me if I get any of
 9 this detail wrong. I'm not looking at the site
 10 condition itself.
 11 But this was something that the company
 12 agreed to do. It was really in response to some
 13 concerns that Stop B2H was raising about notice that
 14 what we agreed to do was that prior to the line being
 15 energized we will provide notice.
 16 We're going to update X-7, which was our
 17 list of all landowners within a mile -- so we're going
 18 to update that list because there could have been
 19 changes. Then we're going to send out notice to all
 20 those folks within the mile and tell them what their
 21 rights are.
 22 So not -- so we will have already mitigated
 23 for the people we know about. But then before the line
 24 is energized, we'll make sure that all landowners
 25 understand that if they are hearing corona noise and

1 MS. RACKNER: So we -- under our modeling,
 2 we predict that there are 41 residences. And I believe
 3 they are all residences. We looked at schools and
 4 hospitals as well. But I believe they are all
 5 residences. And there's 41 of them where there's a
 6 prediction of an exceedance.
 7 Now, a number of these exceedances are 1 dBA
 8 over the threshold, but there are exceedances -- you
 9 know, I'm not going to say exactly what it is, because I
 10 don't want to get it wrong. But they are more
 11 significantly -- you know, more significant of
 12 exceedances. They are kind of all over the map.
 13 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: This is Hanley.
 14 I would like to go back to the issue of
 15 whether or not EFSC has the authority to grant the
 16 variance. And we have in the record evidence that DEQ
 17 responded -- they had an internal management directive,
 18 and they responded to Stop's discovery request, that --
 19 that the DEQ and EQC no longer administered the noise
 20 control program and will not process requests for
 21 exceptions and variances, and local governments and EFSC
 22 may enforce the noise rules. So that's directly from
 23 DEQ.
 24 So I think it is important to recognize that
 25 they recognize that we have the authority to process the

1 they are bothered by it, that they have rights under a
 2 complaint process.
 3 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Thank you.
 4 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Yes, Councillor Beier.
 5 COUNCILMEMBER BEIER: This is Councillor
 6 Beier, for the record.
 7 Variances and exceptions make me a little
 8 queasy. And I want to make sure that the Department and
 9 the Council are on great grounds in setting forth the
 10 parameters for issuing this exception.
 11 So that's for the Department.
 12 Just to make sure we feel really
 13 comfortable. Because any time you grant a variance or
 14 an exception, you're kind of setting a precedent and it
 15 just -- it just makes me queasy.
 16 But also, Kellen, if we can, before we get
 17 done with the noise discussion, dig in a bit to the
 18 conditions because I think that would help us all be
 19 more comfortable.
 20 And thank you for going through that detail
 21 of what kind of mitigation. That makes me a lot more
 22 comfortable in terms of the overall process.
 23 Also, if you could remind me how many of
 24 these noise-sensitive residences or occurrences there
 25 are currently. I can't remember.

1 exceptions, backslash, variance requests.
 2 And then, also, I believe it's under a DEQ
 3 administrative rule, 340-035-0110, states that DEQ is
 4 going to suspend their administration of the noise
 5 program and includes, but not limited to, processing
 6 requests for exceptions and variances.
 7 So not only do they recognize that we have
 8 the authority, they recognize they no longer had the
 9 authority.
 10 So I think that's important for us to
 11 recognize as well.
 12 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Any other questions from
 13 Council of Ms. Rackner?
 14 Okay. Counsel Rowe.
 15 MR. ROWE: Hanley just did my job for me.
 16 That is one of the main points I was going
 17 to make is that there is that DEQ internal management
 18 directive that explicitly says that EFSC staff review
 19 applications to ensure that the proposed facilities
 20 meet the state noise regulations.
 21 So contrary to Mr. Anuta's assertion, this
 22 Council and the Department don't need to go to DEQ and
 23 EQC to request that authorization because they have
 24 already made it explicit.
 25 Beyond that, I don't know that there's much

Page 596

1 I can add.
 2 I will point out, I do appreciate the
 3 question about the conditions that have been imposed.
 4 And we do intend to go into those in some detail under
 5 issue NC-4 and those are in the proposed contested case
 6 order as well.
 7 So when we have that discussion, we should
 8 all have those conditions in front of us so that you're
 9 comfortable that you're really understanding them.
 10 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Thank you, Counsel Rowe.
 11 And on my job here, keeping people to three
 12 minutes, I let both parties exceed that. And so I
 13 consider it even right now.
 14 But from here on, I'll be interrupting you
 15 at the 3-minute limit.
 16 So on the -- I guess we're ready for the
 17 straw poll.
 18 SECRETARY CORNETT: Mr. Vice Chair -- for
 19 the record, Todd Cornett -- so there's a lot of overlap
 20 between issues N-2, N-3, and N-4. And so you can
 21 absolutely take a straw poll solely on this issue right
 22 now.
 23 Our recommendation is because there is so
 24 much overlap to wait and do a consolidated straw poll on
 25 issues NC-2, NC-3, NC-4, as well as the standard.

Page 597

1 As Patrick kind of pointed, under issue
 2 NC-4, you're going to get into the conditions more. So,
 3 again, your choice. But it's our recommendation, and
 4 the way we've set this up is to hold until the
 5 conclusion of all of the remaining noise control issues.
 6 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. What's the pleasure
 7 of the Council?
 8 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: This is Hanley. We
 9 have polled on one, NC-1. I would like to go ahead and
 10 poll on NC-2 and then consolidate 3 and 4, if we can.
 11 SECRETARY CORNETT: That's fine.
 12 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Council good with that?
 13 Okay.
 14 SECRETARY CORNETT: Okay. "Agree with the
 15 findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of
 16 approval in the proposed contested case order pertaining
 17 to issue NC-2."
 18 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Sounds good.
 19 SECRETARY CORNETT: Ann Beier.
 20 COUNCILMEMBER BEIER: Yes.
 21 SECRETARY CORNETT: Perry Chocktoot.
 22 COUNCILMEMBER CHOCKTOOT: Yes.
 23 SECRETARY CORNETT: Cindy Condon.
 24 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Yes.
 25 SECRETARY CORNETT: Hanley Jenkins.

Page 598

1 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: Yes.
 2 SECRETARY CORNETT: Kent Howe.
 3 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Yes.
 4 SECRETARY CORNETT: Jordan Truitt.
 5 COUNCILMEMBER TRUITT: Yes.
 6 SECRETARY CORNETT: Thank you,
 7 Councilmembers.
 8 MR. RATCLIFFE: Issue NC-3 has one limited
 9 party filed exception, Stop B2H.
 10 The issue is whether the methodologies used
 11 for the noise analysis to evaluate compliance with
 12 OAR 340-35-0035 were appropriate and whether the Oregon
 13 Department of Energy erred in approving the methodology
 14 used to evaluate compliance with that rule.
 15 The Hearing Officer's opinion, she first
 16 noted that the applicant identified specific locations
 17 within the 300-mile transmission line to set noise
 18 monitors and collect ambient noise monitoring data to
 19 then be used for the evaluation of predicted worst-case
 20 operational noise to evaluate whether the proposed
 21 facility would result in an increase of 10 dBA or above
 22 the ambient anti-degradation standard.
 23 In Union County, the location selected and
 24 evaluated in the application for site certificate and
 25 proposed order for baseline noise monitoring is referred

Page 599

1 to as MP-11. MP-11 is in proximity to I-84, Highway 30,
 2 and a Union Pacific Railroad. Noise measurements
 3 identified ambient noise levels at this location of
 4 32 dBA.
 5 The applicant's expert witness, Mark
 6 Bastasch, confirmed that the noise level used to
 7 evaluate compliance with the anti-ambient noise
 8 degradation standard is based on L-50, which is an
 9 averaging of all total hours, train noise, given its
 10 limited duration, would be filtered out over the
 11 sampling period.
 12 In response to issues raised by the limited
 13 parties through the contested case proceeding, the
 14 applicant introduced new noise monitoring data for four
 15 new monitoring position locations within Union County.
 16 These are referred to as MP-100, -101, -102, and -103.
 17 Data was collected for three weeks in
 18 October 2021. The applicant selected the monitoring
 19 positions to represent NSRs located closer to Morgan
 20 Lake and the La Grande Valley.
 21 Baseline data relies on the quietest times
 22 of day, midnight to 5 a.m., where wind data was recorded
 23 as calm. At these four new monitoring position
 24 locations, the mean L-50 was 31 dBA, 36 dBA, 32 dBA, and
 25 43 dBA, respectively.

Page 600

1 Stop -- the hearing officer also found Stop
 2 B2H's introduction of monitoring data from Mr. Carey
 3 Stanley should not be used to determine representative
 4 ambient noise levels. She concluded that the data set
 5 is too small to allow that conclusion.
 6 She also found that OAR 340-35-0035(3)(a)
 7 expressly authorizes the reviewing agency to approve
 8 sound measurement procedures and the Department and its
 9 noise consultant, Golder Associates, appropriately
 10 vetted and concurred with the applicant's methodology.
 11 The hearing officer also considered whether
 12 the variance/exception should only apply to the NSRs
 13 where exceedances are predicted to occur today.
 14 The noise control regulations do not address
 15 the difference between a linear and nonlinear facility,
 16 that Council should acknowledge the difference. Either
 17 it could be a situation where there are new NSRs or NSRs
 18 that were inadvertently missed in the evaluation,
 19 granting an exception or variance for the whole line
 20 creates some flexibility for IPC to avoid an automatic
 21 violation of the standard. The conditions assure that
 22 if this were to occur, a full formal evaluation would be
 23 required.
 24 And upon a complaint filed, the same level
 25 of mitigation for known NSRs is required, which includes

Page 601

1 the opportunity for Council review.
 2 So that is the summary of the hearing
 3 officer's opinion on that issue.
 4 And Stop B2H can present oral argument.
 5 MR. ANUTA: Karl Anuta presenting for
 6 Stop B2H.
 7 The -- hopefully you've had a chance to read
 8 the exceptions and materials on this.
 9 The crux of the dispute was over monitoring
 10 point 11 and whether it is or is not representative.
 11 Stop provided a spot-check with data from
 12 Mr. Stanley that showed it was not representative.
 13 The Idaho Power did a spot-check for a
 14 little bit longer, but it was still nothing but a spot
 15 check that suggested it might be representative but it
 16 maybe not. Maybe it was not representative in the other
 17 way.
 18 Ultimately, the problem here is that you're
 19 trying to set -- they are using monitoring point 11 to
 20 set a baseline level. And the baseline level that was
 21 chosen, which was started out at 32 and went to 31 dBA,
 22 is way higher for a rural area than any other of the
 23 rural counties.
 24 And there's a chart in the record. We cited
 25 it repeatedly in our testimony and our exceptions that

Page 602

1 shows all the other counties have baseline dBAs between
 2 24 and 25. That's where the dBA for Morgan Lake and
 3 Mill Creek routes should be. And we presented evidence
 4 that showed that the fundamental problem with monitoring
 5 point 11 is it's too close to the Union Pacific train
 6 line where there are 25 to 35 trains per day that
 7 increase the ambient noise level.
 8 So that's the fundamental problem.
 9 Here we urge you to remand for further
 10 analysis or to conclude that what's really needed here
 11 is to set a baseline for Union County that's same as the
 12 baselines for the other rural counties, which is the 24
 13 to 25 levels.
 14 If you do that, it's going to increase the
 15 number of NSR exceedances. But as has been pointed out,
 16 there is a process in the conditions for complaints in
 17 addressing those exceedances. And we think that process
 18 should be available to all those people that are at 25
 19 and go up from there, rather than just all those people
 20 that are at 31 and go up from there.
 21 And I'll talk more about the conditions when
 22 we get to NC-4. We made a bunch of recommendations to
 23 tighten up that language so that it really does what
 24 Idaho Power says they want to do.
 25 For now, I think what you really need to

Page 603

1 wrestle with is do you want to have ambient noise levels
 2 set at a level way higher for Union County than all the
 3 other rural counties and what's the safe thing to do
 4 here.
 5 We've outlined in our testimony and our
 6 exceptions why the safe thing to do is to lower the dBA
 7 for the baseline for Union County. I urge you to do so.
 8 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Thank you, Mr. Anuta.
 9 Are there any questions from Council?
 10 Okay. Thank you.
 11 MS. RACKNER: Again, Stop B2H's argument
 12 about Idaho Power's noise monitoring methodology is
 13 focused on the company's use of MP-11 to set the average
 14 ambient sound level for NSRs in the Morgan Lake area.
 15 However, all of these arguments were
 16 completely invalidated by the Company's supplemental
 17 noise monitoring in Morgan Lake area which yielded
 18 ambient sound levels which are virtually identical to
 19 the ones that we received at MP-11. So all this focus
 20 on what's wrong with MP-11 is simple misdirection.
 21 Mr. Anuta also referred to our monitoring as
 22 spot monitoring. Well, Mr. Stanley performed spot
 23 monitoring for three years.
 24 Idaho Power performed monitoring round the
 25 clock for three weeks, which was the same monitoring

1 protocol that was approved by ODOE for all the initial
 2 monitoring. So our supplemental monitoring was robust
 3 and lengthy and can't fairly be called spot monitoring.
 4 Now, in response to Stop's concern.
 5 So we did do this supplemental monitoring.
 6 The monitoring point that we selected for the Morgan
 7 Lake area, which was the area of most concern was right
 8 adjacent to the park. We chose the quietest place in
 9 the area that we could to provide the most conservative
 10 results.
 11 For MP-11, Idaho Power measured an ambient
 12 sound level of 31 dBA, which is 1 dBA less than what we
 13 had found at MP-11. One dBA, as our expert explained,
 14 it is not perceptible to the ear. But it did create, if
 15 we adopt that approach, which we agreed to do, two more
 16 NSRs that will be mitigated under our plan.
 17 Now, Stop B2H has taken exception to the
 18 fact that the hearing officer didn't accept the
 19 monitoring results of its own expert, Mr. Stanley, which
 20 was indeed significantly lower than what we received
 21 from MP-11 or 100.
 22 But as I said, that took place at just three
 23 and a half hours. And as pointed out by both ODOE's
 24 expert and our expert, Mr. Stanley failed to follow the
 25 most basic procedures for ensuring a verifiable and

1 but didn't calibrate his equipment.
 2 His equipment also hadn't been calibrated as
 3 required under DEQ rules. You have to have it
 4 calibrated a year before you do your monitoring. That
 5 didn't happen. He didn't do a calibration in the field.
 6 I don't believe he ever admitted that that
 7 was the problem with his monitoring, but you'd have to
 8 read his testimony. He seemed more to be focused on the
 9 fact that he had to agree that since he only monitored
 10 for three hours, he can't possibly have claimed to have
 11 captured any representative example.
 12 And he did in his -- he did in his
 13 monitoring results note that it was a quiet night with
 14 no wind. Well, many nights are quite windy. There's a
 15 lot of trees out in that area, which means that it's
 16 loud when it's windy.
 17 So -- so on that, I think Mr. Stanley did
 18 acknowledge that his -- that it was just the brevity of
 19 his monitoring meant that it really couldn't be used to
 20 set any kind of a responsible level.
 21 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: Thank you.
 22 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Any other questions from
 23 Council?
 24 Okay. Thank you.
 25 MS. RACKNER: Thank you.

1 reliable data.
 2 And in the end, while Mr. Stanley initially
 3 said that he produced an ambient level for the area --
 4 he had to agree that he never really intended -- that
 5 that's not really what his monitoring was intended to
 6 do.
 7 So Stop B2H also argued a list of criticisms
 8 of Idaho Power's selection of MP-11 as the proxy. And I
 9 see I'm out of time and I'm going to be respectful.
 10 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Thank you, Ms. Rackner.
 11 Are there any questions of Ms. Rackner?
 12 Councillor Jenkins.
 13 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: Sorry. This is
 14 Hanley.
 15 Lisa, I'm having trouble finding it, but I
 16 was pretty sure that I had read in the exceptions that
 17 Mr. Stanley admitted that his measurements -- and you
 18 just alluded to that -- had problems because, one, he
 19 didn't calibrate his equipment and, two, it was only for
 20 the four hours; is that correct?
 21 MS. RACKNER: So I think Mr. Stanley did
 22 acknowledge through his attorney -- there was some email
 23 back and forth -- that he had not calibrated his
 24 equipment. He did something -- I can't remember --
 25 something called like a "spot-check" of his equipment,

1 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Counsel Rowe.
 2 MR. ROWE: Patrick Rowe, Department of
 3 Justice on behalf of Department of Energy.
 4 And couple comments just for context. I
 5 know that we've already discussed the noise rules, but I
 6 want it to make sure that council is understanding that
 7 is, really essentially, two types of noise rules that
 8 DEQ has. Kellen discussed these. There's a maximum
 9 allowable noise and there's the anti-ambient degradation
 10 standard. No one is arguing that the proposed facility
 11 will exceed the maximum allowable noise. All we're
 12 talking about is whether it will exceed the anti-ambient
 13 degradation standard, meaning 10 dBA above background
 14 levels. I just want to make sure that we're all
 15 understanding that.
 16 Second, with regard to the additional
 17 supplemental monitoring that was done, I also want to
 18 make sure that Council is appreciating that this was
 19 done during the course of the contested case.
 20 So Idaho Power was being responsive to
 21 concerns that were raised. They weren't turning a deaf
 22 ear. They are acknowledging that legitimate concerns
 23 had been raised about the monitoring that was done at
 24 MP-11 and whether or not it was representative.
 25 In response to that, during the course of

1 the contested case, they retained their noise expert to
 2 go out and do, as Ms. Rackner just described, an
 3 additional three weeks of supplemental monitoring.
 4 The hearing officer held that methodologies
 5 that Idaho Power used for the noise analysis were
 6 appropriate. The Department agrees.
 7 CHAIR HOWE: Thank you, Mr. Rowe.
 8 Any questions from Council?
 9 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: This is Hanley. My
 10 question is for Patrick. The hearings officer
 11 recommended revisions to noise condition number one to
 12 add the additional two exceedance locations.
 13 Does the Department support that?
 14 MR. ROWE: I think there was actually a
 15 correction. There were two locations that Idaho Power
 16 had initially estimated exceedances at and then
 17 determined that there would not be exceedances -- but
 18 then identified two other locations where their analysis
 19 had now projected that there would be exceedances.
 20 So the Department does support the
 21 correction to the NS -- the NSR numbers that are
 22 identified in the condition.
 23 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Any other questions from
 24 Council?
 25 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: No. My comment

1 case order?
 2 MR. ROWE: Correct. But not currently --
 3 not in the Department's order.
 4 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: Right.
 5 MR. ROWE: So that would be a change.
 6 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: Yes. Okay. Thank
 7 you.
 8 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. I believe we're
 9 continuing on now to NC-4. And it's yours, Counsel
 10 Ratcliffe.
 11 MR. RATCLIFFE: Issue NC-4, the limited
 12 party is Stop B2H.
 13 The issue is whether the mitigation/proposed
 14 site conditions adequately protect the public health,
 15 safety, and welfare.
 16 The proposed contested case order, the
 17 hearing officer's opinion, the hearing officer noted
 18 that there were -- that the proposed order -- the
 19 Department's proposed order included five recommended
 20 conditions to minimize and mitigate potential impacts
 21 from operational corona noise at noise-sensitive
 22 receptors. Through the contested case proceeding, Stop
 23 B2H, the Department and the applicant proposed revisions
 24 to noise control conditions 1, 2, 4 and 5.
 25 The hearing officer rejected review of

1 would be that we make those amendments.
 2 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Yes.
 3 MR. ROWE: Hanley, you had noted that the
 4 hearing officer has included those in the proposed
 5 contested case order; correct?
 6 Okay. So we'll need to -- I want to make
 7 sure I'm on the same page as what you're discussing. So
 8 let me quick look at me my -- let me take a look and
 9 make sure that you and I are talking about the same
 10 thing.
 11 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: Okay. What you're
 12 suggesting is that they are in the contested case order
 13 but they're not in the proposed order?
 14 MR. ROWE: I'm referencing, yes, correct.
 15 There's a proposed amendment in the -- to the condition
 16 in the proposed contested case order that revises the
 17 list of NSRs at which there are projected exceedances.
 18 In other words, those folks that Ms. Rackner
 19 was describing earlier that have already been identified
 20 as possibly having exceedances and who will
 21 automatically be part of the mitigation process that
 22 Ms. Rackner described. So there is a proposed amendment
 23 to those identified NSRs. That's what I'm referring to
 24 and that is in one of the noise control conditions.
 25 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: In the contested

1 additional revisions to noise control conditions
 2 proposed by Stop B2H in their closing argument, but
 3 accepted revisions proposed by the Department and the
 4 applicant. The reasoning was based on the fact that the
 5 Department and the applicant would not have had an
 6 opportunity to review and respond.
 7 The hearing officer concluded that the
 8 amended recommended conditions posed by the Department
 9 and applicant are adequate to protect public health,
 10 safety, and welfare.
 11 And so this is where -- as part of the
 12 discussion we're going to go into a bit more detail in
 13 terms of the amended recommended noise control
 14 conditions. And -- and I -- you know, we -- we can see
 15 what the Council wants to do with this.
 16 We can either pull those amended conditions
 17 up on the screen now before the oral argument takes
 18 place and, you know, try to work through some of that or
 19 we can go ahead and have the oral argument first and
 20 then have discussion on the amended conditions.
 21 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Council prefer details now
 22 or after oral testimony?
 23 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: Yeah, I'm with Ann.
 24 I'd do the -- this is Hanley. I'd do the testimony.
 25 And we've got the full package.

Page 612

1 MR. RATCLIFFE: Okay. So we can go ahead
 2 and have Stop B2H come on up for oral argument, then.
 3 MR. ANUTA: Karl Anuta appearing for Stop
 4 B2H.
 5 First, let me start off by pointing out from
 6 a background perspective. Stop submitted a series of
 7 proposed amendments to the noise control conditions to
 8 1, 2, 3, and 4. Those are on PDF pages 38 through 48 of
 9 our exceptions. They are outlined with the proposed
 10 changes in red and I urge you, when you get to the point
 11 of discussing conditions, pull those up and look at them
 12 or have the Department pull them up so you can see how
 13 our language actually tracks what Idaho Power claims
 14 that it is willing to do and tries to lock down the
 15 protections for the citizens of these counties that will
 16 be crossed by this massive project in a way that is
 17 functional.
 18 Basically, the initial dispute here was that
 19 the hearings officer rejected our conditions claiming
 20 they were untimely. That is not correct in our opinion.
 21 We outlined why that was. It's my understanding from
 22 reading the responses that the Department and possibly
 23 even Idaho Power -- although I'm not clear on that --
 24 agree that that rejection is untimely, was
 25 inappropriate, and that those conditions should be

Page 613

1 considered by this Council.
 2 The conditions that we proposed create a
 3 complaint process that extends out to the entire one
 4 mile. It -- they create a notification requirement in
 5 advance of construction, not an advance of energizing
 6 the line after it is already built. But in advance of
 7 construction so that everybody during the whole process
 8 knows what their rights are.
 9 We've also proposed that -- to some
 10 additional monitoring to verify whether the baseline
 11 levels really are accurate.
 12 In addition, we've proposed that the --
 13 again, that the -- the baseline, that levels being
 14 modified back down to the level they should be.
 15 Ultimately, I would urge you to look
 16 carefully at those conditions that we've proposed,
 17 because we tried hard to create a balanced functional
 18 set of conditions. And we are convinced that the set
 19 that was proposed by the hearings officer does not go
 20 far enough in some areas.
 21 In the responses, the Department and Idaho
 22 Power contended that some of our condition language was
 23 redundant of other places. It's not -- we were very
 24 careful to try to cover, for example, ongoing
 25 maintenance in the noise area and technology

Page 614

1 developments in the noise control area out through the
 2 operation of the line, not just up-front. Because as
 3 you all know, technology changes. This line is going to
 4 be here for a minimum of a hundred years and likely
 5 forever. So there should be a condition that requires
 6 ongoing monitoring and ongoing maintenance and ongoing
 7 updated technology.
 8 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Thank you, Mr. Anuta.
 9 Any questions from Council?
 10 Okay.
 11 (Audio disruption.)
 12 MS. RACKNER: -- to hear that you will be
 13 going through the proposed conditions in detail, because
 14 they are long and voluminous and there's lots of little
 15 twists and turns in them. And I think I certainly cover
 16 them all in three minutes.
 17 And I think it's really important to
 18 understand just how robust those conditions are.
 19 And as Mr. Anuta acknowledged and
 20 Mr. Ratcliffe referred to, many of the changes to the
 21 conditions were either proposed by ODOE or Idaho Power,
 22 specifically, to respond to Stop B2H's proposals.
 23 We agreed when we heard their concerns.
 24 There were many of those concerns that rang true for us
 25 and we thought these are issues that we can cover.

Page 615

1 So I'm happy to hear that you will be
 2 hearing more about that. And I think it's hard to talk
 3 about Stop B2H's conditions in the abstract. And,
 4 again, I don't have time to refer to each of them.
 5 I will say that I think that if you -- that,
 6 number one, they are unnecessary to meet the standard.
 7 We disagree. We think that they are -- that they are
 8 duplicative of -- of condition requirements that the
 9 hearing officer already adopted in response to both ODOE
 10 and Idaho Power's proposed changes.
 11 And we also believe that any number of them
 12 are just impractical.
 13 So, for instance, I'm just going to give you
 14 an example. And if I've got this wrong, I'll -- and
 15 Mr. Anuta can correct me, but I believe one of the
 16 proposals is to do ongoing monitoring during -- you
 17 know, once the line has been energized. It is a
 18 300-mile line.
 19 Any kind of -- there just isn't a sensible
 20 monitoring approach that Idaho Power could undertake.
 21 We absolutely believe that the best way to make sure
 22 that the line is operating as it should and not
 23 impacting citizens is the complaint process.
 24 So we think the most important thing that we
 25 can do is make sure that everybody within a mile of that

1 line gets notice that -- gets notice that they have
 2 rights under the complaint process, clearly understand
 3 what the complaint process is, and then it will be up to
 4 ODOE, the applicant, the complainant, and ultimately
 5 this Council to decide what is correct and fair for each
 6 complaint.
 7 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Thank you, Ms. Rackner.
 8 Any questions from Council at this time?
 9 Okay. Counsel Rowe.
 10 MR. ROWE: I don't have any comments, but I
 11 just have a suggestion for how we might go about doing
 12 this.
 13 And the condition as -- the amended
 14 condition as proposed is in the proposed contested case
 15 order condition. So I suggest that we project that on
 16 the screen and that you also have it in front of you,
 17 because sometimes I notice on this screen it is
 18 difficult because it doesn't seem to capture the full
 19 content.
 20 So if you were -- if you have -- in the
 21 proposed contested case order, if you start at page
 22 205 -- and I would suggest we literally just go through
 23 it paragraph by paragraph and we allow Mr. Anuta to come
 24 back up, and when there are sections of the proposed
 25 condition for which he has proposed an amendment or a

1 our hard copies starting on page 205.
 2 CHAIR HOWE: Correct.
 3 MR. ROWE: We have other proposed changes by
 4 Stop.
 5 Do we want to go through these and then
 6 listen here what Stop's suggestions are.
 7 MR. RATCLIFFE: This is my idea and you can
 8 handle it however you want.
 9 If it were me, I would go through paragraph
 10 by paragraph and Mr. Anuta can identify whether or not
 11 Stop has proposed any revision to that particular
 12 paragraph.
 13 If he hasn't, then there's really nothing to
 14 consider except do you accept what's proposed?
 15 If Stop has proposed a revision to a
 16 particular paragraph, Mr. Anuta can explain why he
 17 thinks it's necessary and Idaho Power would be allowed
 18 to respond and the Department as well.
 19 MR. ROWE: So I guess maybe it's an
 20 opportunity for both to come up to the table.
 21 CHAIR HOWE: Mr. Anuta and Ms. Rackner, it
 22 might be best if both of you come up as we work
 23 through -- sounds like paragraph by paragraph the
 24 sections of the conditions.
 25 Okay. So I guess I'll start with paragraph

1 revision, he'll be allowed to explain his position and
 2 then Idaho Power and the Department be allowed to
 3 respond.
 4 MS. TARDAEWETHER: I have the proposed
 5 contested case order up here. I also -- because this
 6 is -- under the -- in the order where the hearing
 7 officer discusses the condition, she does highlight
 8 where there are changes from the proposed order under --
 9 down here at the bottom, which, Patrick, that's where
 10 you pointed us to.
 11 MR. ROWE: Actually, I wouldn't go -- I
 12 would show what has been changed.
 13 MS. TARDAEWETHER: Well, I guess what I'm
 14 offering is that Sarah has provided this and this is --
 15 and I know initially -- give it a minute here.
 16 MR. ROWE: Kellen, can you go to page 205?
 17 MS. TARDAEWETHER: Sure.
 18 MR. ROWE: And I think it is important that
 19 the Council understand the changes that have already
 20 been made compared to what was in the proposed order,
 21 because there have been significant revisions.
 22 MS. TARDAEWETHER: Okay. I'm just going to
 23 shrink it. I'll keep it a little bit.
 24 MR. ROWE: So we have the changes that are
 25 proposed by the hearings officer on the screen and in

1 1. Begins with "prior."
 2 Are there any suggested changes from Stop on
 3 that paragraph?
 4 MR. ANUTA: I'm trying to get there on my
 5 computer.
 6 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay.
 7 MR. ANUTA: Unfortunately, my printer didn't
 8 print all of the pages, so I normally would have it in
 9 front of me.
 10 And from a process standpoint, I might
 11 suggest that another way to do this would be to pull up
 12 the Stop recommended conditions, which has all the same
 13 language that you have there and then has, in red, our
 14 proposed additions, because that would show you what
 15 we're actually proposing.
 16 I know what PDF page those are in our
 17 exceptions. I don't know where in your record exactly
 18 those exceptions are and which page of the -- those you
 19 should look at to get the same ones.
 20 But, for example, on that first noise
 21 control condition one, we did propose a paragraph in
 22 advance of that -- (audio disruption) -- the 41 NSR
 23 property owners and then it lists.
 24 We suggested that it should start with prior
 25 to construction all NSRs within one mile of the facility

1 will be notified in writing that they may be impacted
2 and that they will be informed of the mitigation process
3 and the complaint process. And then we outline specific
4 notice suggestions.

5 MS. TARDAEWETHER: I'm sorry.
6 What does counsel want me to project on the
7 screen?

8 Are we pulling up and are we looking at
9 their -- the proposed contested case order condition
10 language or am I navigating to the document? Because
11 I'm not sure what you're looking at.

12 What does Council want to look at?

13 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Do we want -- do we want a
14 red-lined version of changes that have been proposed?

15 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: I don't have that in
16 front of me. What I have is the proposed contested case
17 order.

18 VICE CHAIR HOWE: That's what I have here.

19 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: Yeah. So if we can
20 project on the screen --

21 VICE CHAIR HOWE: The changes.

22 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: -- what Mr. Anuta is
23 referring to then, at least, I can compare the two.

24 SECRETARY CORNETT: For the record, Todd
25 Cornett.

1 notice is adequate that the -- that it goes to everyone
2 within one mile so that everybody who might be affected
3 knows what the mitigation and the complaint process is.
4 That's the intent of this.

5 MR. ROWE: Karl, just before we get into the
6 rationale for your proposed changes, I just want to
7 clarify one thing.

8 "Initiate discussions" is already in the
9 proposed contested case order. That was something that
10 Idaho Power and the Department had recommended.

11 So that's -- so I don't know that it's
12 accurate to state that that's something you have
13 proposed changing.

14 MS. TARDAEWETHER: For the record, Kellen
15 Tardaewether. So I'm just going to --

16 VICE CHAIR HOWE: You don't have a mic.

17 MS. TARDAEWETHER: For the record, Kellen
18 Tardaewether. So I'm just going to kind of toggle in
19 between. I'm going to go from the proposed contested
20 case order beginning of the condition and then we're
21 going to go over to the proposed condition.

22 Because as represented by Mr. Anuta, the
23 redline should be to -- anyhow, I feel like there might
24 be items missing.

25 For instance, the bold is 18 -- NSRs 118 and

1 We're just trying to figure out the process
2 right now.

3 (Discussion for presentation.)

4 SECRETARY CORNETT: For the record, Todd
5 Cornett.

6 So could somebody please articulate exactly
7 what we're seeing.

8 So the red text is what you're proposing to
9 add in addition to the hearing officer's proposed
10 condition; is that correct?

11 MR. ANUTA: That is correct.

12 For the record, this is Karl Anuta.

13 The red text you see here are the changes
14 that Stop proposes in the condition that the hearings
15 officer put in the proposed contested case order where
16 we're suggesting adding language that's in red. We're
17 suggesting removing language that's in red strike out.

18 So, for example, if you look at what we've
19 proposed there as sub (c), it says, "prior to
20 construction the certificate holder will," and then
21 "work" was struck out and "initiate discussions" was put
22 in.

23 So this language is what we suggested for
24 the beginning of the noise control condition one. And
25 the premise here is that we want to make sure that the

1 132 were added. And then over here, I don't see 118 and
2 132. I feel like maybe we should be looking at the
3 proposed contested case order.

4 MR. ANUTA: We erred -- when I was putting
5 this together we did not capture the changes. And I
6 suspect that's because the version that I'm using here
7 was based -- was what we submitted and we somehow missed
8 that change. Because "initiate discussions" is in here
9 and the proposed one.

10 MS. RACKNER: And just --

11 MR. ROWE: Go ahead, Lisa.

12 MS. RACKNER: Well, what I'm wondering is
13 I'm a little concerned because when we were going --
14 going through Stop's proposed changes, it did feel to us
15 that a lot of -- am I not using -- okay. It did feel to
16 us that a lot of them had already been addressed, maybe
17 in different words, and I'm wondering -- I'm a little
18 concerned about what we're doing right now, which is
19 looking at different versions of conditions. Some of
20 which may -- the redlining may be right; some of it
21 which the redlining might be wrong.

22 And I'm wondering if -- if we want to go
23 through this and consider Stop's proposals, if we could
24 focus on what the hearing officer adopted.

25 And then, Karl, if you could say, well, this

1 is why we think it's inadequate and this is the change I
2 would propose.

3 Maybe kind of separate and apart from the
4 redlining that you provided. We could at least start on
5 a conceptual basis where you could say I'm -- because,
6 again, it gets to the point where we thought -- well, we
7 thought we covered this. And it's just in different
8 words.

9 But if you look at it and say, no, this
10 is -- this is the change that needs to happen in order
11 to make it more effective, then we can have a
12 conversation about that. Or well, I don't know whether
13 the Council wants to have a conversation about it.
14 Maybe you want to just talk to each other, but that
15 feels to me like the better approach here, given where
16 we are with lots of different pieces of paper with
17 different redlining around.

18 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: Yeah. This is
19 Hanley.

20 I want to talk about what your concepts are
21 that are different than what the hearings officer has
22 already suggested in her draft proposed order.

23 I don't want to go word by word here.

24 I want to know what concept do you feel is
25 not captured in the hearings officer's proposed

1 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. Ms. Rackner, what
2 would be your response to that?

3 MS. RACKNER: So this gets to a point where
4 I was saying we think your concern is covered in a
5 different condition.

6 This particular condition is specific to
7 those landowners for whom we do predict an exceedance
8 and requires us to mitigate and -- and to work on a
9 mitigation plan with them.

10 So it wouldn't be appropriate to address all
11 the folks going -- all the NSRs in the area for whom no
12 exceedance is -- is expected.

13 But in, I believe, it's condition three, is
14 it -- can -- here -- and I can pull up all -- I have so
15 many documents pulled up on my little tiny screen here.
16 Let me see what I can find.

17 VICE CHAIR HOWE: I think Kellen has got it
18 right here.

19 MS. RACKNER: Okay. So it is condition two.

20 So in condition two -- and maybe you could
21 look at that, Karl, and see if that satisfies your
22 concern.

23 That requires us to -- to create a new
24 version of X-7, which is the list in the application
25 that includes all landowners up to one mile and to send

1 condition?

2 CHAIR HOWE: Yeah. And this is Kent. And I
3 agree with that. I think we have the proposed contested
4 case order on the screen, which this is. Right?

5 That's the final document that we're wanting
6 to know do we need to change or add.

7 Mr. Anuta can tell us paragraph by paragraph
8 if that has the language that they are hoping to have.

9 MR. ROWE: And then allow Lisa to respond.

10 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Correct. Does that work?

11 Okay. So if we start with this paragraph
12 that we're looking at on the screen, do you have
13 suggestions that you would like to see made to that
14 paragraph?

15 MR. ANUTA: Karl Anuta. Yes.

16 Stop would propose that this paragraph be
17 expanded to cover not just the 41 NSRs listed, but all
18 potential NSRs within one mile of the facility and that
19 there be -- that there be a written notice that includes
20 the parameters of the mitigation, what are the options,
21 and what's the complaint process that will ultimately
22 exist there.

23 And we felt that the generic -- that the
24 language that the hearings officer used in her first
25 paragraph there did not capture that level of detail.

1 notices to those. And inform the recipient that they
2 are the owner of an NSR and tell them about the
3 requirements of the conditions which include the
4 complaint and mitigation conditions.

5 And also let them know that prior to
6 construction, the certificate holder will develop and
7 submit to the Department an operational noise complaint
8 response plan.

9 So that's the place where we propose
10 language. I think that gets, Karl, to your concern.

11 MR. ANUTA: May I respond? I'm happy to do
12 so.

13 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Yes.

14 MR. ANUTA: Okay. I didn't want to take up
15 extra time, if -- the -- that does get some of the
16 issue. That does not, in our view, get all of the
17 issue. Because that we added -- in addition to
18 notifying everyone within one mile, we added a specific
19 paragraph that proposed the specifics of the notice --
20 the notice and what it would cover. I think the
21 language that the hearings officer covered was not quite
22 as detailed or -- and it was more of a broad brush. And
23 so we were trying -- apologies.

24 MS. RACKNER: Could you maybe --

25 MR. ANUTA: Thank you. That's the first

1 time in many years somebody has told me to speak up.
2 It's usually the opposite.

3 MS. RACKNER: And, Karl, could you -- and by
4 the way, I guess I would ask the Council's permission,
5 do you mind hearing a conversation between us just to
6 try to --

7 So, Karl, would you mind pointing out
8 what -- what you think is missing from what the hearing
9 officer adopted?

10 MR ANUTA: Let me find that section. I did
11 not see -- and perhaps I missed it in condition two -- a
12 list of what the notice to the landowners within one
13 mile would include. Like, the list that we included in
14 our (b) of our proposed condition one.

15 If you can point me to that --

16 MS. RACKNER: Yeah, just look at 2A. The
17 certificate holder will send notices to all landowners
18 listed in the updated attachment X-5, which notice shall
19 inform the recipient that the recipient is the owner of
20 an NSR and the requirements of noise control conditions
21 1 and 2.

22 And by the way, there are stray numbers in
23 the proposed contested case order. But I believe this
24 means noise control conditions one and two as adopted by
25 the Council.

1 attention, Councilmember Beier, to subsection (c) of
2 amended noise control condition one, which talks
3 about -- which talks about what Idaho Power will propose
4 and also is specific to any folks -- again, this was in
5 response to something Stop B2H brought up, was that if
6 there is someone who has a health condition that they
7 believe would be exacerbated by sound levels, then they
8 can request a much more robust -- an even much more
9 robust set of mitigation. So I think it's in there.
10 Because I think it's everything that we -- that -- that
11 we were ordered to do and required to do and we offered
12 to do.

13 I believe it's all in there. And -- and
14 I -- I do wonder if maybe one of the ways to address
15 Mr. Anuta's concerns is that if the full set of
16 conditions just gets provided to the landowners. So
17 every landowner can just look through and say this is
18 everything Idaho Power is required to do. You have
19 rights. You can take advantage of them.

20 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: If I might make a
21 suggestion. I've got an idea there. But go ahead,
22 Council.

23 COUNCILMEMBER BEIER: For the record, I'm
24 comfortable with that approach. I think that we
25 implement the conditions and need to enforce them and

1 So the noise conditions one and two talk
2 about mitigation obligations and also talk about the
3 complaint process.

4 COUNCILMEMBER BEIER: This is Councillor
5 Beier.

6 It seems as if the list that B2H is
7 proposing of what is in the notice is a little bit more
8 specific as to spelling out what Idaho Power has agreed
9 to in terms of mitigation.

10 And I think it's -- I think, as stated, the
11 information is there. It's just not as specific as what
12 B2H is proposing for notice language to the expanded
13 list of -- help me on the acronym, but NSRs.

14 So it's whether or not I think the Council
15 and the Department feel like we need that next granule
16 level of information in this condition.

17 The only thing that I don't see aligning is
18 the details of the mitigation information that would be
19 required in the -- in the condition. I think the
20 complaint process is clearly outlined in condition two.

21 So that information is there. Though, not
22 necessarily in the particulars of a notice requirement.

23 Excuse me, if I'm misinterpreting.

24 MS. RACKNER: No. I don't think you're
25 misinterpreting. But I would like to just direct your

1 having the public know what those conditions are should
2 be helpful.

3 MS. RACKNER: And before you respond, I just
4 want to say one more thing, which is, that given where
5 we are in the process, particularly, where we're
6 thinking about making changes to wording on the fly, as
7 a lawyer, that makes me a little nervous.

8 And so I -- I think the best way to make
9 sure everybody knows exactly what their rights are is to
10 give them the full set of robust conditions as opposed
11 to us now trying to revise the conditions themselves and
12 to try to provide some different notice.

13 I do have one other alternative that I think
14 we have out there, which is that if the Council is not
15 comfortable with just providing the full list of
16 conditions to each landowner, we could have an agreement
17 that we will work with ODOE as to a different notice.
18 Again, I just feel like we're safer, though, just going
19 with those conditions.

20 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Counsel Ratcliffe.

21 MR. RATCLIFFE: Yeah. So one thing I want
22 to point out here is we, if memory serves -- and I
23 think, Kellen, maybe perhaps you could correct me if I'm
24 wrong.

25 But I think we have one change to a

1 condition that has already been accepted by the Council
2 through the straw poll.

3 We have another one that is on the table
4 still that we're planning to do, you know, at the end of
5 this process related to the blasting notice.

6 And my recommendation, again, is the changes
7 to conditions constitute material changes that require a
8 material change hearing before we get to final order on
9 this.

10 So if that alleviates any concerns here
11 about, you know, having a chance to wordsmith conditions
12 and make sure that Department staff and I have not made
13 errors in trying to translate. There will be an
14 opportunity to comment on the changes to conditions that
15 get made before this gets to a final order.

16 MS. RACKNER: Thank you.

17 MR. ANUTA: And since I've been sitting here
18 trying to bite my lip, if you don't mind, I have a
19 number of different thoughts on the process issue.

20 My suggestion would be you listen to
21 Stop's reasons for wanting a change to the existing
22 order and what we're suggesting and you can go work with
23 the Department or suggest that the Department look at
24 our changes or Ms. Rackner's suggested change now of
25 providing all the conditions, and then come up with a

1 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. I think we've --
2 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: Hear from Patrick.
3 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Good idea.

4 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: I don't read --

5 MR. ROWE: We have filed --

6 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: -- condition two
7 that way.

8 MR. ROWE: I'm sorry, Hanley. You don't
9 read condition two in what way.

10 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: Condition two does
11 require that you go back to condition one.

12 MR. ROWE: That's the way I read it. I
13 mean, this condition was, as Ms. Rackner pointed out,
14 put in in response to concerns raised by Stop.

15 I read the condition as -- like, the plain
16 language of it says certificate holder -- not the
17 Department. The Department does not want to get into
18 the business of sending these notices. That's on Idaho
19 Power.

20 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: We all agree on
21 that.

22 MR. ROWE: Certificate holder will send the
23 notices to the landowners. In the attachment,
24 Ms. Rackner indicated that attachment is landowners
25 within one mile. That notice shall tell those folks you

1 proposed final order that will then go out to hearing or
2 a change hearing if -- as Mr. Ratcliffe calls it.

3 From a substantive standpoint, the
4 difference between what we proposed and what Ms. Rackner
5 is proposing is that most people, when they get in the
6 mail a list of conditions that is written in legalese,
7 they are going to go, what? What does that mean?

8 So what we were proposing was a notice to
9 people that they had some rights, here's the outline of
10 what those rights are, and here's the processes that are
11 available.

12 And that was the intent of our changes to
13 condition one which we were trying to get at the
14 entirety of the folks.

15 And as I read condition two, it doesn't
16 necessarily require that kind of notice to everybody in
17 the -- that kind of notice being the kind we proposed of
18 here's your rights outlined in a simplistic form and
19 here's where you can find more information -- that does
20 not appear, as I saw it, in condition two.

21 Instead, it focuses in on the process and
22 the plan, and that's great, and it sets out those
23 things, but it didn't provide the notice. And that's
24 why we proposed the language at the beginning of
25 condition one.

1 own a noise-sensitive receptor and what the requirements
2 of noise control conditions one and two are.

3 Now, I agree it's not clear how they will
4 tell the landowners what the requirements of those
5 conditions are.

6 So what Council needs to determine is are
7 you satisfied with this?

8 Is it appropriate, as Ms. Rackner suggested,
9 to provide them the language of the condition? Or do
10 you want to do something that Mr. Anuta has suggested,
11 yeah, or potentially both, and have, you know, kind of
12 an easy-to-understand summary of it?

13 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Yeah, I think that's what
14 we want to pose to the Council right now, yeah, to move
15 forward.

16 So Councillor Condon.

17 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Cindy Condon.

18 I would prefer both. I mean, there are
19 people who -- I think Mr. Anuta is correct. Can get
20 lost in the conditions themselves and a list would be
21 appropriate. There are others that would want to say
22 where did this list come from and dive deeper.

23 And so I would prefer we have notice in
24 plain language for the public to -- to clearly
25 understand plus the conditions.

Page 636

1 MR. ANUTA: Stop would certainly agree with
 2 that.
 3 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Councillor Jenkins.
 4 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: I don't have a
 5 problem with that. I don't know how Todd is going to
 6 reflect that.
 7 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. Sounds like we got
 8 somewhere right then.
 9 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Cindy Condon. I
 10 just -- I'm not clear on all the exhibits. And I just
 11 want to make sure that attachment X-7. What's the title
 12 of X-7? Does it include everyone within one mile?
 13 MS. RACKNER: Yes. Everyone within one
 14 mile. And -- and it needs to be updated because it is
 15 old and a few things have changed over time.
 16 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Right. And just a
 17 follow-up. To distinguish between X-4 and -5 that are
 18 referred to in condition one, those are the identified
 19 NSRs.
 20 MS. RACKNER: Yes. And exceedances. Yes.
 21 Or it may not just be exceedances, but actual, I
 22 believe --
 23 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: I just want to
 24 understand the difference.
 25 MS. RACKNER: Yeah. Those are the folks for

Page 637

1 whom exceedances.
 2 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Yeah. Okay. Thank
 3 you.
 4 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. So we've got --
 5 have we dealt with condition one or just the first
 6 paragraph?
 7 MR. ANUTA: Stop did have a few other
 8 additional proposed changes to condition one.
 9 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay.
 10 MR. ANUTA: And those would be in
 11 paragraph -- what was in Exhibit 1 -- or excuse me, in
 12 condition one, the first paragraph if I -- or excuse me,
 13 the second paragraph. We had suggested adding language
 14 in what was, I think, sub (b), if I'm reading it right.
 15 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Ms. Tardaewether, we are
 16 on condition one --
 17 MR. ANUTA: Yeah, condition 1(b). There we
 18 go.
 19 We had suggested adding some language in
 20 the -- about six, seven lines down. There's a sentence
 21 that says if this review is deferred to the
 22 Department -- to the Department, Stop had suggested
 23 adding language to clarify that appeals from the
 24 Department would be taken to EFSC. That's sort of
 25 implicit in your rules, as I read them. But we wanted

Page 638

1 it to be clear in the material that -- in the condition
 2 that it would go to EFSC ultimately.
 3 If you look at the lines up there, it's
 4 the -- where it says -- the sentence on the left side
 5 that the line that starts with "review to the
 6 Department."
 7 We suggested that the word "appeals would be
 8 taken to EFSC" be added after that to make it clear in
 9 the condition that any appeal would go to EFSC,
 10 ultimately.
 11 Next one down. Review of the Department.
 12 MR. ROWE: Patrick Rowe, DOJ.
 13 I guess I'm not quite following that,
 14 because the way it is set up is that the dispute does go
 15 to the Council, unless the Council Chair decides, we
 16 don't want to handle this one. We're going to defer it
 17 to the Department.
 18 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Right. That's the way I
 19 read that part.
 20 MR. ROWE: I'm sorry.
 21 COUNCILMEMBER BEIER: Councillor Beier.
 22 The default assumption is that any dispute
 23 comes to the Council. If the Council made a decision to
 24 direct the Department to weigh on it, that's separate.
 25 But the default assumption is any dispute comes directly

Page 639

1 to the Council.
 2 MR. ROWE: That's the intention and that's
 3 the way I read this language --
 4 MR. ANUTA: Our concern was it -- it
 5 actually says that the Council Chair can defer the
 6 dispute to the Department, not the Council. And we
 7 wanted the Council to have the last word rather than
 8 just saying, oh, well, there's a dispute it goes -- and
 9 then the Council Chair, for some reason, I'm sure it
 10 probably wouldn't happen, but if they did, just defer
 11 it. And the rest of the Council is going, wait, we want
 12 to hear that one.
 13 MR. ROWE: I follow you there. And Todd may
 14 want to weigh in on this some more on that.
 15 The intention of that is because Council has
 16 a ton of business and we don't have any sense right now
 17 of how many of these types of disputes might get
 18 referred to the Council.
 19 Council Chair coordinates prior --
 20 coordinates with the Department prior to every month's
 21 meeting as to the agenda for that meeting.
 22 So if in a particular month there's a dozen
 23 of these disputes and Council already has a lot of
 24 business on that month's agenda, the Council Chair has
 25 the discretion to decide -- would have the discretion to

1 refer that.
2 If that -- if those 12 disputes
3 automatically go to the Council, then the idea of trying
4 to be efficient with that month's Council meeting is
5 lost, because now the 12 disputes are already in front
6 of the Council. That was the intention behind that.

7 So do you understand why it says "Council
8 Chair" rather than "Council"?

9 MR. ANUTA: And we understood. We're
10 uncomfortable with just having the chair do the
11 deferral. And Stop is also uncomfortable with the idea
12 that if there was a deferral and the Department says,
13 oh, here's our decision, there should still be an appeal
14 back to the Council, ultimately. That was the Stop's
15 position, is that the Council should be the last word.

16 MR. ROWE: Okay. The Department is
17 comfortable with this provision. So now it is clearly
18 in your hands, Council.

19 And I don't know, Ms. Rackner, if you have
20 anything you'd like to add.

21 MS. RACKNER: No. Not at all.

22 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. Where is the
23 Council on this suggestion?

24 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: This is Hanley. And
25 usually in the situations where the Council Chair makes

1 chair, I wouldn't have any issues. But we're making the
2 decision -- this is a long-term decision, I guess I -- I
3 have -- I do have concern about that.

4 SECRETARY CORNETT: For the record, Todd
5 Cornett.

6 Just from a practical standpoint, Council
7 also sets policy. So if in some circumstances the
8 Council Chair did defer that to staff and there were no
9 appeal rights but then -- and as Councilmember Jenkins
10 indicated, you know, in my secretary report at the
11 following Council meeting, I would provide that update.

12 And if Council was uncomfortable with that,
13 you would set the policy to say we do not want to have
14 any of these done by staff. We want all these done by
15 Council.

16 So there is -- there is a check in there.
17 Council has that -- as a body, has that authority to put
18 a check on the Council Chair if you believe that that --
19 you know, is being abused for whatever reason.

20 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. So to try to keep
21 us moving on, does the Council feel we need to make any
22 changes to that language? No.

23 Okay. And Councilor Chocktoot.

24 COUNCILMEMBER CHOCKTOOT: Yes.

25 VICE CHAIR HOWE: You're okay with it?

1 the decision, it is referred to the next Council meeting
2 as an information item where that has happened. So if
3 we have an issue, it's probably going to come up within
4 the next Council meeting.

5 So I'm comfortable with this language. I'm
6 not concerned that the Council Chair is going to abuse
7 that opportunity.

8 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Others?

9 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Cindy Condon.

10 I guess I do have a bit of concern that --
11 so there's -- there's no appeal. If the Department
12 makes a decision, reviews and makes a decision, so
13 there's no right to come back to the Council.

14 Am I -- as I read it, once it's been
15 deferred to -- to the Department, we have now washed our
16 hands of it. I mean, with no opportunity to voice as a
17 Council.

18 MR. ROWE: The way the condition is written,
19 yes. But again, the default is to the Council. This is
20 only in a situation where the Council Chair determines
21 that for this particular -- these disputes or this
22 particular meeting we're going to have the Department
23 handle it. The assumption is it's going to the Council.

24 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Yeah. It's
25 difficult, I guess, for me -- I mean, with the current

1 COUNCILMEMBER CHOCKTOOT: Yes.

2 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. So I think we can
3 move on. We have a majority of the Council is okay with
4 that language.

5 So the next -- what do we do? Did that take
6 care of condition one completely?

7 MR. ANUTA: This is Mr. Anuta.

8 That takes care of the Stop recommendations
9 for condition one.

10 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. Let's go to
11 condition two.

12 And your suggestion on the first paragraph,
13 are there any?

14 MR. ANUTA: Let me find my version. It's
15 not the same language.

16 MS. TARDAEWETHER: For the record, Kellen
17 Tardaewether. I have a clarification question.

18 So, Mr. Anuta, you were proposing that the
19 notice language in front of condition one, but the
20 notice language is actually in condition two.

21 So are we addressing the -- having the
22 notice conversation in the context of potentially
23 changing condition two?

24 Are you comfortable with that, Mr. Anuta?

25 Because then, basically, we aren't trying to

Page 644

1 add the notice portion to condition one.
 2 MR. ANUTA: Whether you add it to one or
 3 two, as long as it is there. If it fits better here,
 4 that's fine. But the more detail -- and actually, I'm
 5 more comfortable with what Mr. Rowe suggested, sending
 6 both a notice that has the kind of summary and then
 7 actually the conditions and putting that here.
 8 SECRETARY CORNETT: Mr. Vice Chair -- for
 9 the record, Todd Cornett -- so whether it goes in
 10 condition one or condition two, I think we can evaluate.
 11 As Jesse indicated, that would be a material
 12 change. The language that I have -- and this is not
 13 actual language because we would have to clarify this
 14 and fit it in.
 15 But as I sort of noted it, notice will
 16 include both an easy-to-understand plain-language
 17 summary as well as their rights with respect -- with --
 18 of their rights with respect to the noise control
 19 conditions as well as the noise control conditions
 20 themselves.
 21 So the full, sort of, spectrum is what I
 22 have reflected. Again, whether it is in condition 2(a)
 23 or in 1, we can kind of look to see where it might be
 24 the most appropriate.
 25 So if that satisfies everybody.

Page 645

1 MR. ANUTA: Yeah. It works for Stop.
 2 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. That works then.
 3 Was there anything else in condition two?
 4 Or do we need to go paragraph by paragraph?
 5 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: So with respect to
 6 that issue, I guess I would ask if Lisa or Patrick have
 7 any comments.
 8 MS. RACKNER: On where the change should be
 9 made, which condition?
 10 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: Combine the two
 11 on --
 12 MS. RACKNER: In condition two.
 13 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: -- on Todd's
 14 proposal.
 15 MS. RACKNER: Oh, we're fine with Todd's
 16 proposal. But we would say that the language belongs in
 17 condition two and not condition one.
 18 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Patrick?
 19 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: Condition two that
 20 currently talks about notices. So it seems like it
 21 would fit better there. Yeah, 2(a).
 22 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Thank you, Councillor
 23 Jenkins. I was moving too fast there. Sorry.
 24 Okay. So on condition two, the remainder of
 25 it --

Page 646

1 MR. ANUTA: I don't see any issues with
 2 paragraph (b). I believe we had some language at the
 3 end of -- let's see.
 4 So yeah, it was -- I think the -- my
 5 language is confusing, maybe, because it is not in the
 6 right place. But I know what we were intending.
 7 Our intent here was to try and make sure
 8 that in addition to the -- the plan outlining all those
 9 stuff and providing the information that specifies what
 10 needed to be done to file a complaint, we wanted to make
 11 sure that the materials outlined the process for
 12 reaching a resolution of that complaint.
 13 I think with the changes that you've
 14 suggested to part 2(a), that actually covers it, because
 15 it outlines all of it with the conditions.
 16 So I think that there's nothing there that
 17 needs to be there in addition.
 18 And I'm looking down. I think -- it wasn't
 19 until -- I think it was (e) sub (3) that we had another
 20 change that we were proposing. And that was a bigger
 21 issue. That was down in the section that talked about
 22 the -- identifying the process for a noise complaint.
 23 And there were three subparts.
 24 Kellen, if you could scroll down to sub (e)
 25 I think it is.

Page 647

1 There we go. There's subpart (1), there's
 2 subpart (2), and then in subpart (3) it said -- it talks
 3 about how the -- if they were not included in the area
 4 in X-5, the certificate holder shall -- yeah -- model
 5 the sound levels and we -- we suggested adding "model
 6 and monitor the sound levels."
 7 Because our -- Stop was concerned that just
 8 modeling the sound levels wouldn't necessarily give you
 9 an accurate answer as to what was going on and what
 10 should happen. You needed to also monitor them.
 11 So our suggestion was to add "and monitor"
 12 there wherever in the sentence is appropriate.
 13 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Councillor Jenkins.
 14 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: This is Hanley.
 15 Are you suggesting sample or what do you
 16 mean by "model"?
 17 Is that long-term model -- I mean "monitor."
 18 Do you mean long-term monitoring or just
 19 simply do a sample?
 20 MR. ANUTA: We were suggesting monitoring of
 21 some sort. We had not defined how long that monitoring
 22 would take place, but presumably since what you're
 23 trying to get at here is what's going on with this
 24 particular NSR. You would need, at least, enough
 25 monitoring to have some sense of what's the noise levels

1 over some period of time. We did not specify a period
 2 of time.
 3 Our intent was not to make it permanent
 4 monitoring. It was monitoring to figure it out. Okay.
 5 What's the issue here and then what -- how can we fix it
 6 down the road.
 7 Because this process is all for figuring
 8 out, okay, what do we do about those people that we
 9 didn't have on the list as expected NSRs.
 10 MS. RACKNER: So from our point of view,
 11 this could become completely burdensome and difficult
 12 to do what Mr. Anuta is suggesting.
 13 We have modeling that should show whether or
 14 not there is an exceedance. If the complainant is
 15 concerned about the result of that modeling, then the
 16 complainant can do their own monitoring and provide that
 17 to Idaho Power to at least substantiate that there
 18 is an -- that there is an issue there.
 19 So, you know, our concern is, again, we have
 20 a 300-mile line. And a lot of NSRs. And while we
 21 certainly respect that nobody will bring a complaint
 22 unless they honestly believe that there's been an
 23 exceedance, we also anticipate that a lot of people who
 24 hear corona may assume there is an exceedance and we may
 25 get a lot of complaints.

1 we're going to do some of our own monitoring. Probably
 2 longer term. Maybe more state-of-the-art equipment, but
 3 at least it doesn't shift in every single instance over
 4 to Idaho Power the responsibility to do very expensive
 5 noise monitoring. So that's our concern about it.
 6 MR. ANUTA: And if I might point out, this
 7 is a policy issue for the Council because shifting the
 8 burden is precisely what Stop is looking for here.
 9 We think the burden should be on the
 10 billion-dollar utility who is building the line to
 11 monitor in some fashion whether there's a problem or
 12 not. It should not be on the landowner who doesn't have
 13 the thousands of dollars to do, as Ms. Rackner
 14 described, the monitoring.
 15 So that sort of shifting the burden was
 16 precisely what Stop was trying to do with this suggested
 17 language.
 18 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Comments from Council?
 19 MR. ROWE: Patrick Rowe, DOJ.
 20 I'll quickly make my comment and then
 21 Councillor Condon has a question.
 22 As Ms. Rackner pointed out, they could do,
 23 you know, quote/unquote, "down-and-dirty monitoring,"
 24 which is -- I'm not -- I can't say I have personal
 25 experience with these, but I understand there are simple

1 Modeling the kind of monitoring that's
 2 responsible takes thousands of dollars for each
 3 monitoring position. And that's probably an
 4 underestimate. You're -- Idaho Power pays the bills, so
 5 I don't know.
 6 So our concern is that it could become just
 7 completely infeasible if in every case somebody hears
 8 corona and has this concern. They are able, then, to
 9 shift the burden over to Idaho Power to do comprehensive
 10 modeling.
 11 And I will say that kind of the spot-check
 12 idea. I mean, we -- our acoustical engineers just
 13 couldn't get behind the idea that you could set a
 14 responsible ambient based on going out for an hour.
 15 So we don't know that -- we don't know that
 16 that's going to be a solution to try to do something
 17 quick and easy there.
 18 Now, if the complainant does some monitoring
 19 on their own, whatever it is, I mean, there's all kinds
 20 of levels of monitoring. Idaho Power performs kind of
 21 expensive state-of-the-art monitoring, but there's a lot
 22 of ways to do less expensive monitoring. If the
 23 complainant does some monitoring, even if it's quick and
 24 dirty that demonstrates an exceedance that hasn't been
 25 addressed, Idaho Power at that point could decide, okay,

1 phone apps that do noise monitoring. Idaho Power could
 2 then come out and do more sophisticated monitoring and
 3 then that dispute would be presented to the Council for
 4 resolution.
 5 MS. RACKNER: And I will just say that is
 6 what we had in mind that something quick and easy that
 7 anybody with a smartphone could do.
 8 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. That being the
 9 case, then where is the Council on the language?
 10 Does it achieve what we've just kind of been
 11 discussing?
 12 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: So let me make sure
 13 who we are dealing with here. These are people who have
 14 not been identified through the prior modeling process
 15 as having a noise impact facility.
 16 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Right.
 17 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: So what this
 18 condition proposes is that there be additional modeling
 19 done by Idaho Power. And then if the landowner still
 20 has an issue, they can provide evidence and then it
 21 comes to us or the Chair. I don't have a problem with
 22 that process.
 23 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Where is the rest of the
 24 Council?
 25 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: So I think -- I was

Page 652

1 sort of hung up on sub issue (3). But what happens next
 2 is pretty clearly outlined in subsections four and five
 3 that says, if there's alternative data, here's the
 4 responsibility of IPC and ultimately the Council, so I'm
 5 comfortable with the language.
 6 VICE CHAIR HOWE: I'm seeing head nods.
 7 Do you need to say something, Councillor
 8 Condon?
 9 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Yeah. I had
 10 indicated I had a question. Actually, I was just going
 11 to comment -- make the same comment that Mr. Rowe made
 12 but wanted to verify that that was true.
 13 I think there is a phone app -- actually, I
 14 think I've used it -- that measures decibels. And then
 15 if that's enough, if that is what Idaho Power would
 16 accept, then hopefully the people impacted would know
 17 that that's a measure -- you know, I think if the public
 18 reads monitoring or whatever, they might think, Oh, my
 19 gosh, I have to, you know, buy monitoring equipment,
 20 whatever. I just think the public should be made aware
 21 this is what we'll accept.
 22 So because we're -- or, at least, I'm
 23 thinking given this conversation that that's acceptable.
 24 You know, a phone app or some -- something
 25 less than.

Page 653

1 MS. RACKNER: Yeah. And -- and I will say,
 2 because I don't have a lot of personal experience with
 3 what all the options are out there.
 4 I -- I really can't say in this moment that
 5 that -- maybe it's the monitor -- a monitoring
 6 methodology of the complainant's choice. Or which may
 7 include -- I don't know. Yeah, we're a little bit --
 8 trying to do this in realtime. But -- but we are
 9 certainly comfortable.
 10 That was the idea that our modeling that we
 11 did to our mind -- not that this is legal -- legally the
 12 case, but kind of created this rebuttable presumption
 13 that there wasn't no exceedance at this NSR. But if the
 14 person at the NSR is able to show in any way, like, no,
 15 we really think that the ambient anti-degradation
 16 standard has been exceeded by more than 10 dBA, whether
 17 it's a cell phone monitoring, then it would be incumbent
 18 upon Idaho Power to present its own monitoring data.
 19 And if there's a dispute, then, again,
 20 hopefully they can resolve it. A lot of disputes can be
 21 resolved. But ultimately, it could come to the Council
 22 to look at the data presented by the complainant versus
 23 what Idaho Power brings.
 24 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. I think we've
 25 reached agreement, then, on condition two.

Page 654

1 MR. RATCLIFFE: Mr. Anuta, I think there may
 2 be one of your proposals you haven't pointed out to
 3 Council. And that goes with regard to a revision to
 4 condition 2(a). You had made a proposal about
 5 submitting the -- they are going to -- Idaho Power will
 6 outline a complaint plan. And I believe you had made a
 7 proposal that -- that be submitted to the Department for
 8 approval. And once approval is obtained, distributed to
 9 all NSR properties within one mile.
 10 So I just wanted to point that out to you if
 11 you wanted to discuss that with Council.
 12 MR. ANUTA: We thought that made sense. I
 13 don't know if Idaho Power objects to that at all.
 14 MS. RACKNER: I don't know that we object to
 15 that. I think we felt in our briefing that it was a
 16 little redundant because we were -- the conditions
 17 themselves are going to explain that there's a complaint
 18 process through ODOE and they can contact ODOE.
 19 But I don't know that we have an objection
 20 to the details of the complaint process going out to
 21 everybody, so that they have it in the first place.
 22 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. Good. And then
 23 Councillor Condon had a question on (c).
 24 MR. ROWE: Is that an instruction from
 25 Council that you would like this condition to state that

Page 655

1 the complaint will -- complaint plan will be distributed
 2 to the NSR property owners?
 3 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Yes.
 4 MS. RACKNER: And again, that's the same
 5 list -- I'm just saying that as we write it up, that
 6 would be the same list of the X-7 that will have been
 7 updated.
 8 MR. ROWE: Yes, that's the way I'm seeing
 9 it.
 10 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Do I see head nods? Okay.
 11 Yes.
 12 And then, Councillor Condon, you had a
 13 question on (c).
 14 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Yes, Cindy Condon.
 15 On condition (2)(c), I just want to be clear. In the
 16 fourth line from the bottom, it reads -- well, I'll read
 17 the added language in (C) and will specify the
 18 information that the complainant -- so this is the NSR;
 19 right?
 20 The complainant must include in its
 21 complaint including the date the certificate holder
 22 received the complaint, the nature of the complaint,
 23 weather conditions of the date for which the complaint
 24 is based, including wind speed, temperature, relative
 25 humidity, and precipitation.

Page 656

1 So we're expecting that the public will
 2 collect all that information with their home weather
 3 center.
 4 Is that the --
 5 MS. RACKNER: We thought a smartphone app.
 6 I've got that all on my phone.
 7 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: And could be. I'm
 8 just wondering if at the moment -- I don't have my
 9 complaint procedure in front of me. I've missed the
 10 day. It's the next day -- I mean, so I guess looking
 11 up -- I don't know how you get wind speed for
 12 ten o'clock in the morning two days earlier. I just
 13 want to make sure it's reasonable as opposed to making
 14 it a little bit too detailed -- or more detailed than it
 15 needs to be.
 16 MS. RACKNER: And I believe this was
 17 Department language, so maybe better responded to by
 18 Kellen or Patrick.
 19 MR. ROWE: I honestly can't remember if it
 20 was Department language or not. I know we were
 21 discussing this quite a bit.
 22 I understand the concern. And I can't tell
 23 you if that type of information is available just
 24 through the app.
 25 If you're concerned about the -- the

Page 657

1 rationale for it is because those -- those are the
 2 factors that impact -- have an impact on noise. That's
 3 the idea behind it. I suppose you could -- rather than
 4 make it mandatory, you could make it a discussion and
 5 then if they don't have that information but then Idaho
 6 Power is able to pull that information from whatever
 7 sources they have, then when the dispute is presented to
 8 Council, there's potentially more evidence favoring
 9 Idaho Power's analysis.
 10 So -- but I think we would be -- I think at
 11 a minimum, we should let folks know that these are the
 12 types of things that you ought to be thinking about
 13 collecting if you don't want to make it mandatory. I
 14 would be all right with that.
 15 MS. RACKNER: Yeah, I believe we would, too,
 16 because I also thought that this was the type of
 17 information you could look up for any one day on the
 18 internet as well.
 19 Now, I know not everybody has internet
 20 access, but --
 21 MR. ANUTA: Or knows how to operate a
 22 smartphone sufficient to gather all that data.
 23 For whatever it is worth, Stop would
 24 suggest -- this was not one we had picked up on before,
 25 but since Councillor Condon has flagged it, that you

Page 658

1 simply modify this to say if complainant has available
 2 the wind speed, that gives them both the information
 3 about what kind of things you're looking for but makes
 4 it optional rather than mandatory.
 5 COUNCILMEMBER TRUITT: Jordan Truitt, for
 6 the record.
 7 Wondering if in the notification that a
 8 brief description of how and where some of this
 9 information could be accessed to somebody who may not
 10 know how to look up on NOAA's website what the previous
 11 24-hour conditions were. Just a brief tutorial on how
 12 to collect some of the parameters as much as possible.
 13 Because you still -- if there's a complaint,
 14 I believe you still have to quantify the complaint with
 15 relative data that has to support your complaint.
 16 If it's just, it was loud last night, how do
 17 you -- how do you support that?
 18 And so I do recognize that is, for many,
 19 difficult information to gather. But if there's a
 20 starting point on how to get there, that might help.
 21 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: This is Hanley.
 22 And what I would suggest there is just
 23 simply saying such as including wind speed, temperature,
 24 yeah.
 25 MS. RACKNER: I believe that's the easiest.

Page 659

1 I think the most important thing would be for the -- to
 2 know the date and the time that the person believes they
 3 experienced the exceedance. Because then at that point,
 4 Idaho Power or the Council can go back and try to -- and
 5 perhaps discern what was happening in that location at
 6 that evening.
 7 THE COURT: Okay. Sounds like we have some
 8 Council direction on that one. All -- all in agreement,
 9 such as language being added.
 10 MS. RACKNER: And I'd like to make a request
 11 for a five-minute break, if we could.
 12 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Yeah, I was trying to get
 13 us -- we're done with condition two.
 14 MR. ANUTA: We did have some additional
 15 language further on down in subpart (5).
 16 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. Let's go ahead and
 17 take a break now and we'll come back.
 18 MS. RACKNER: I am okay with finishing up
 19 the condition. I was just observing that it was almost
 20 three hours.
 21 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Thank you.
 22 THE COURT: Okay. Subsection (5).
 23 MR. ANUTA: Subsection (5) of subpart (e).
 24 And so further down, Kellen, if you're in
 25 (e), there should be a 5 -- no, you're -- you're in (f).

Page 660

1 So there we go.
 2 This was a discussion of what happens if
 3 there's a dispute. And this was the same issue that we
 4 raised earlier. We had suggested at the end of this
 5 that you clarify that the EFSC chair may direct the
 6 Department to make the determination. We had suggested
 7 adding language at the end of that.
 8 But if there has been a delegation, the
 9 Department decision can still be appealed to EFSC, and
 10 that goes back to Stop's point of we didn't want the
 11 Department to be the final decision-maker.
 12 And your earlier discussion may be
 13 sufficient for that issue. But we -- I wanted to flag
 14 that we wanted to clarify there as well, that ultimately
 15 even if there is a deferral, it should come back to the
 16 Council because that's the ultimate last word.
 17 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Counsel Rowe, that
 18 language that you referred to before, I think clarified
 19 that it -- it comes to Council.
 20 MR. ROWE: Well, the default is to Council.
 21 CHAIR HOWE: Right. Right.
 22 MR. ROWE: The issue here is similar to the
 23 prior one, which is if the Chair is going to direct the
 24 Department to make the determination that the Chair, in
 25 his or her discretion, has determined that -- that

Page 661

1 coming month's business they would prefer that the
 2 Department make the determination.
 3 So to me there's -- I don't understand what
 4 the point of the deferral to the Department would be if,
 5 ultimately, it's coming back to the Council anyhow.
 6 If the idea behind referring it to the
 7 Department is efficiency of Council meetings, it's still
 8 going to end up before the Council under Mr. Anuta's
 9 proposal.
 10 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Right. Right.
 11 So, Mr. Anuta?
 12 MR. ANUTA: That, Mr. Rowe, is absolutely
 13 correct. Our approach is to say it needs to ultimately
 14 go to Council, even if it's been deferred to Department,
 15 that may take care of some of the process.
 16 Some people get deferred and have the
 17 Department make a decision may be fine with that. But
 18 if somebody ultimately wants a Council ruling on their
 19 complaint, they ought to be able to appeal a Department
 20 decision on a deferral back to the Council to really get
 21 a Council vote on it.
 22 But from a policy perspective from Stop, the
 23 Council should be the last word, rather than the Council
 24 Chair making an executive decision, which may be from an
 25 efficiency standpoint totally appropriate, but from the

Page 662

1 standpoint of policy, we wanted the Commission to be the
 2 final backstop, regardless.
 3 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. Where is the
 4 Council on this one? Where we ended up on condition
 5 one?
 6 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: Support where we
 7 ended up on condition one.
 8 This is Hanley.
 9 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. I'm seeing head
 10 nods.
 11 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: I would not be in
 12 favor. I wasn't in favor.
 13 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. Councillor
 14 Chocktoot.
 15 COUNCILMEMBER CHOCKTOOT: Yes.
 16 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. I think we've got a
 17 majority on that one to leave it like it was understood
 18 in condition one.
 19 Okay. I think we'll take a, what, 10-minute
 20 break? Come back at 11:05 and start on condition three,
 21 I guess.
 22 (A break was taken.)
 23 (No audio from 11:05 a.m to 11:08 a.m.)
 24 MS. RACKNER: Okay. The site certificate
 25 and the timelines in the site certificate for responding

Page 663

1 and working with landowners, because if they don't do
 2 what's required by the site certificate, they will be
 3 out of compliance with the site certificate and subject
 4 to enforcement.
 5 But it makes no sense to -- to place them in
 6 that -- (audio disruption) --
 7 MR. ANUTA: -- included a determination that
 8 if they reached this point in the process the applicant
 9 will be considered to be in violation of the site
 10 certificate and subject to enforcement until they work
 11 out with the NSR property owner a mutually agreed upon
 12 mitigation plan in order to create incentive for the
 13 applicant to work out that plan.
 14 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. Ms. Rackner.
 15 MS. RACKNER: So we just disagree. We have
 16 obligations under the site certificates. If we don't
 17 follow the very detailed requirements for what we do in
 18 response to a complaint, then we could be found in
 19 violation of the site certificate.
 20 But to suggest that any complaint,
 21 meritorious or not, somehow places us out of compliance.
 22 Makes virtually no sense. It also gives an enormous
 23 amount of inappropriate, undeserved leverage to a
 24 landowner. Just as Mr. Anuta is suggesting what if
 25 there is someone who could be unreasonable at Idaho

1 Power working on this issue, it's equally possible that
2 there could be a landowner that could also be
3 unreasonable. Those things can happen, which is why you
4 have rules that everybody has to follow and if they
5 follow the rules, they are in compliance.

6 MR. ANUTA: And if I could respond briefly
7 on the point. This part of the process is after it has
8 been determined that there is a noise -- corona noise
9 issue that exceeds the standard. This is after -- it is
10 not just a complaint and then they are working it out.
11 This is further down in the plan where it says that if
12 it is determined pursuant to the process described above
13 that this condition -- that this condition -- the corona
14 noise at the complainant's property exceeds the
15 standard.

16 So this is where there has already been
17 Idaho Power and the complainant working together. They
18 are working it out. There is an exceedance. Stop's
19 position is there needs to be an incentive at that point
20 for Idaho Power to work things out.

21 The process that Ms. Rackner is describing
22 would require the complainant, who has already been
23 found to have a problem, to come to the Council and ask
24 that the Council find that there's a violation of the
25 site certificate because Idaho Power won't work with

1 Okay. Council, you've heard both sides.
2 Do we feel there's language change needed
3 here or not?
4 Councillor Condon?
5 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Cindy Condon.
6 And I might be reading this incorrectly.
7 But so what -- how does Idaho Power read this provision
8 if there isn't a mutually -- I'm not reading that
9 there's a returned -- that what happens if.

10 So what you're proposing is that they're not
11 in violation of the certificate, so -- so then what?

12 MR. ROWE: Councillor Condon, this is
13 Patrick Rowe, Department of Justice. Go down to sub
14 (3).

15 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Yes. Okay.

16 MR. ROWE: So it's (f) sub (3), that -- that
17 outlines the process Ms. Rackner just referred to.

18 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: But doesn't that
19 start with if through the efforts described above the
20 certificate holder executes an agreement with the NSR?

21 MR. ROWE: Going down, the next sentence
22 says, if an agreement can't be reached.

23 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Okay. Apologies.
24 Yes. Thank you.

25 MS. RACKNER: They are long and complicated.

1 them to get a mutually agreeable agreement.

2 Our suggestion is put the burden on the
3 applicant and say, okay, either you reach an agreement
4 or you are in violation automatically.

5 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Ms. Rackner.

6 MS. RACKNER: Well, I'd also like to point
7 out that if we can't reach an agreement, then there is
8 another process, and that process is coming to the
9 Council.

10 So of -- let's say, you have an actual
11 exceedance, but let's say you have a landowner that is
12 saying I -- you know -- that is asking for something
13 that seems completely out of proportion and
14 inappropriate, so the parties cannot come to an
15 agreement. Then that's why we are able to come to the
16 Council. The Council can tell -- at that point can tell
17 Idaho Power either do what the landowner is asking you
18 to do or tell the landowner that feels like an
19 overreach. Here's, instead, what we think should
20 happen. But there's just no reason to be holding Idaho
21 Power in some "out of compliance" until they have --
22 until we have gone through the process.

23 And as long as Idaho Power is faithful to
24 the process, abides by Council rules and determinations,
25 they should be seen to be in compliance.

1 They loop back on themselves. I totally get it.

2 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. So back to the
3 Council, are we feeling there's any language change
4 needed or not?

5 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: I think it is
6 covered. I don't think it is appropriate to find
7 somebody in violation if it is still being disputed.

8 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Right.

9 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: Agreed.

10 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. Councillor
11 Chocktoot.

12 COUNCILMEMBER CHOCKTOOT: Yes.

13 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. We've got that one
14 done.

15 Now, do we move to condition three or --

16 MR. ANUTA: I'm looking to see. I don't see
17 any other changes that we proposed that we didn't
18 already address. And two -- we did suggest language
19 further on down in sub (3) that would suggest that
20 the -- Council remain the appellate body, but this is
21 the same issue that you have discussed before as to
22 whether or not there should be a deferral by the Chair
23 as an option.

24 It's Stop's position that Council should
25 remain the appellate body even if there's a deferral.

1 There are no other suggested changes to condition two
 2 from Stop.
 3 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Let's move on to condition
 4 three, then. First paragraph.
 5 MR. ANUTA: There are a number of specific
 6 changes that Stop recommended to the first paragraph of
 7 condition three. And, conceptually, they all focus on
 8 the same thing.
 9 Stop's position is there should be long-term
 10 inspection, monitoring, and maintenance for the entire
 11 operational life of the project.
 12 And that we suggested some specific things
 13 that should be done to protect the lines and in terms of
 14 maintenance. And we suggested language that would --
 15 that would require the certificate holder to monitor and
 16 inspect the line over time. And that the inspections of
 17 that sort would take place on the schedule that aligns
 18 with the OPUC, utility wildfire plans or more frequently
 19 if the Department felt there were needed to be more
 20 frequent.
 21 And that when -- when Idaho Power completes
 22 an inspection or monitoring of the line, that they
 23 should do a monitoring and maintenance and report and
 24 submit it to the Department so that the Department can
 25 track where things are going.

1 In the proposed contested case order, the --
 2 the hearing officer discusses these revisions and the
 3 Department and Idaho Power's responses, and ultimately
 4 she declines to adopt these revisions.
 5 So in your proposed contested case order,
 6 there's noise condition three, isn't there.
 7 So your noise condition three, as it stands
 8 now, according to the PCCO, is what it says in the
 9 proposed order. Give me a minute, there's a delay here.
 10 So this is the condition as it stands, so I
 11 don't know if Council wants to take a minute to -- I'll
 12 let Jesse or Patrick read what the -- okay.
 13 So there's Mr. Anuta's. And then the
 14 hearing officer provides her basis and rationale under
 15 her discussion of condition three.
 16 Oh, can I -- I'm going to slowly scroll
 17 through.
 18 MS. RACKNER: I'm sorry. Someone let me
 19 know when it is time for me to respond.
 20 MS. TARDAEWETHER: Yes.
 21 VICE CHAIR HOWE: So, Mr. Anuta, is this
 22 what you were working off of?
 23 MR. ANUTA: Correct. That's what I -- the
 24 red language there is what Stop proposed as changes to
 25 three. And I think Ms. Rackner probably has some

1 And then finally that the certificate holder
 2 is required to upgrade and apply new technologies as
 3 they become available to mitigate corona noise issues.
 4 Stop's point there was that we don't know what future
 5 technology in terms of noise mitigation might be for
 6 corona noise, but if there is additional technology that
 7 comes into existence, that Idaho Power should be
 8 required to stay current on that and to apply those
 9 upgraded technologies, maybe there will be a new type of
 10 conductor that will help reduce noise or new type of
 11 metal or tower or something.
 12 We were just trying to get at the idea that
 13 for the life of the project you've got to stay on top of
 14 the technology and apply upgraded technology to help
 15 reduce corona noise for the people being affected by the
 16 project.
 17 MS. TARDAEWETHER: For the record, Kellen
 18 Tardaewether here.
 19 I've got it pulled up on the screen. It
 20 took me a minute just to kind of orient. I want to
 21 orient Council of where we're at.
 22 So in front and on the screen, I have the
 23 amended condition language that Mr. Anuta just verbally
 24 presented with his rationale and the edits just to help
 25 Council.

1 responses to those, conceptually if not specifically.
 2 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Yeah.
 3 MS. RACKNER: Yeah. So what's been proposed
 4 here is pretty completely impractical.
 5 We have a 300-mile transmission line. It
 6 will get bird feces on it at times. The idea that Idaho
 7 Power would immediately need to clean off that bird
 8 feces does not make a lot of sense.
 9 Similarly, we have a 300-mile transmission
 10 line. Now, it seems completely hypothetical to me, but
 11 even if there were some type of new conductor that would
 12 right -- that could reduce corona noise, it would be at
 13 least hundreds of millions of dollars for us to
 14 re-conductor this line, just to buy the conductor
 15 itself, let alone string a new conductor.
 16 For those -- and I do want to say one thing,
 17 is that, yes, the company has to -- on a regular basis,
 18 it has to maintain the line; it has to be trimming
 19 vegetation; it needs to be out there making sure the
 20 line is in good working order.
 21 We also have the situation where we don't
 22 know if anyone is going to be bothered by the noise on
 23 this line at this point. Lots of people live near high
 24 voltage transmission lines and are not bothered at all.
 25 I'm not saying there won't be anyone. There may be

1 legitimate complaints, but we don't know. That's very
2 hypothetical. Given the extreme expense of that type of
3 monitoring or tech -- technological upgrades that
4 Mr. Anuta is referring to and given a chance that we
5 don't really know how the public is going to perceive
6 the corona noise on this line, it just makes perfect
7 sense to do this on a complaint basis.

8 If a human being or group of human beings
9 are bothered by the noise on the line, then that is
10 something Idaho Power needs to address.

11 If there's a nick in the line that's causing
12 corona, that is something Idaho Power needs to address.

13 If its modeling was wrong, such that there
14 is an exceedance where we didn't think there was going
15 to be one, that's something that Idaho Power needs to
16 address.

17 Just the sheer reality of what it's like to
18 build and maintain a 300-mile 500 kV line suggests that
19 the complaint approach is a human being bothered, let's
20 fix that. That that's the best way to deal with this.

21 MR. ANUTA: And Stop and Idaho Power have a
22 clear policy difference on that. We think the utility
23 should be regularly maintaining -- we're not suggesting
24 daily, but they need to be regularly maintaining,
25 monitoring, and upgrading.

1 My lack of knowledge on transmission lines.

2 Do transmission lines generally degrade and
3 get replaced from time to time? And if so, does the
4 Department have a role in that -- is that an amendment
5 process or?

6 I guess the first question is do they
7 degrade over time? And would you expect more corona
8 noise as time goes on?

9 MS. RACKNER: That is nothing that I have
10 ever heard.

11 What I have heard is that damage to the line
12 can cause corona.

13 Now, I will say that transmission lines do
14 get maintained, I mean, for nicks and scrapes and all
15 the types of things that can happen with a 300-mile
16 line. They do need to get maintained on a regular
17 basis. But I have never heard that they degrade over
18 time such that corona would begin to increase. And I'm
19 going to look back and make sure that --

20 Okay. I got the go-ahead that that was
21 correct.

22 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Yeah. My expectation
23 is that Idaho Power maintains its line, its assets, and
24 so that goes without saying. It was just the
25 degradation of the line over time I was --

1 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. Council.

2 MR. ROWE: If I may, Patrick Rowe,
3 Department of Justice. I would also point out that
4 there is another recommended site certificate condition.

5 And the hearing officer pointed this out in
6 her ruling on this -- her analysis of this proposed
7 condition. That recommended organizational expertise
8 condition one addresses transmission maintenance
9 inspection plan and requires Idaho Power to inspect,
10 monitor, and maintain the facility. That coupled with
11 the complaint process that Ms. Rackner has -- that we've
12 been discussing, the Department is comfortable with this
13 condition as is.

14 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: Mr. Chair, this is
15 Hanley.

16 My concern with the upgrades is our purpose
17 is to make sure that the standard is met. It's not to
18 make sure that all possible noise is eliminated.

19 And so, you know, I don't believe that by
20 performing upgrades to reduce the noise is part of the
21 requirement to meet the standard.

22 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Other Councillors? Leave
23 the language?

24 Councillor Condon.

25 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Just a question.

1 MS. RACKNER: Yeah.

2 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. So we're saying no
3 changes to noise control condition three are needed.
4 Okay.

5 Councillor Chocktoot.

6 COUNCILMEMBER CHOCKTOOT: Yeah. I think the
7 document needs to stay the same.

8 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. Thank you.

9 So we move on then to condition four.

10 MR. ANUTA: Actually, Stop had proposed an
11 addition -- an addition either to three or as a new four
12 that essentially requires the development of a
13 monitoring plan and data collection plan for corona
14 noise at the 41 NSRs that have already been identified
15 over the life of the project.

16 So Stop's concept here was that we already
17 know that those -- from the modeling that there's likely
18 to be a problem there. The utility should develop a
19 monitoring plan for over the entire life of the project
20 for those locations that it may be if agreements are
21 reached and upgrades are done, there doesn't seem to be
22 a problem, but the utility should monitor them because
23 their data already shows that there is likely to be a
24 problem at those key NSRs.

25 And that then at the end of each ten-year

1 period of operation, the certificate holder should do an
2 assessment to determine if there is new technology that
3 would further reduce corona noise or problems and advise
4 the Department on that.

5 And to the extent that our -- Stop's view is
6 that your standards are you're trying to protect the
7 public, health, welfare, and safety and noise situation.

8 And so because technology changes, in order
9 to meet that standard, you have to require the -- or you
10 should require the applicant to stay up-to-date on
11 technology and to report to the Department on upgrades
12 or changes in technology.

13 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Ms. Rackner.

14 MS. RACKNER: We had the same response; that
15 we believe that the complaint process is the correct
16 process.

17 And I just do want to remind everybody that
18 those 41 NSRs will have received mitigation at that
19 point.

20 If at any point they believe that the --
21 conditions have changed such that something new is
22 required, they can make that complaint.

23 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. Council, you've
24 heard both sides. Nothing from Council.

25 So any language changes needed?

1 specific changes to condition four or condition five.
2 We recommended that they be removed because they allow
3 for ongoing issues to -- that we didn't think were
4 necessary.

5 VICE CHAIR HOWE: So no changes to condition
6 four or five. I don't think we need to belay that any
7 more and can move on. Is that right?

8 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: This is Hanley.

9 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Oh, okay. Yeah.

10 MS. RACKNER: Did we already make a
11 determination on the exception and variance?

12 MR. ANUTA: That's what this relates to. So
13 our opposition -- so our suggested removal was because
14 these recognize the possibility of a variance or
15 exception and our position earlier, as I articulated
16 was, you shouldn't grant a variance.

17 So to the extent you have granted a
18 variance, if you are going to do that in your final
19 order, you should keep them.

20 But to -- as to our position in our
21 exceptions was because they acknowledge the existence of
22 a variance that we didn't think you should grant, they
23 needed to go away.

24 But if you are going to grant the variance,
25 then you absolutely should keep them.

1 Two heads no over here. Three, four, five.
2 And Councillor Chocktoot.

3 COUNCILMEMBER CHOCKTOOT: If this is the
4 appropriate time for that language change, then I think
5 we need to make it.

6 But for the document itself, I believe it
7 covers it. That's how I read it.

8 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Councillor Chocktoot, we
9 can't hear you, can you speak up a bit?

10 COUNCILMEMBER CHOCKTOOT: You can't hear me?

11 VICE CHAIR HOWE: We're turning your volume
12 up a little to see if that helps. Try again.

13 COUNCILMEMBER CHOCKTOOT: Can you hear me?

14 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Yes, much better.

15 COUNCILMEMBER CHOCKTOOT: Okay.

16 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Yeah, go ahead.

17 COUNCILMEMBER CHOCKTOOT: Okay. If it needs
18 to be changed, I think we need to change it.

19 But how I read it, it covers everything as
20 it is. And for the future, we can't really dictate
21 what's going to happen.

22 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Yes, I think we agree.

23 Okay. So Council's ready to move then on to
24 condition four.

25 MR. ANUTA: Stop did not propose any

1 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. So I think we can
2 move forward through four and five and we're now
3 up to -- whoa --

4 MR. ANUTA: That's it.

5 CHAIR HOWE: We're through. Okay.

6 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: This is Hanley.
7 I want to thank both of you helping us

8 through that process. I think it was very beneficial
9 for us and, hopefully, it was beneficial for you.

10 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. I think I turn it
11 back over to Counsel Ratcliffe.

12 MR. RATCLIFFE: No. I believe where we're
13 at then is a straw poll on issues three and four
14 combined, as well as the overall standard.

15 SECRETARY CORNETT: For the record, Todd
16 Cornett.

17 If Council is ready, I can read the straw
18 poll.

19 VICE CHAIR HOWE: We're ready.

20 SECRETARY CORNETT: So "agree with the
21 findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of
22 approval in the proposed order pertaining to the noise
23 control regulations that are not related to the issues
24 in the contested case and in the proposed order -- in
25 the proposed contested case order pertaining to issues

Page 680

1 NC-3 and NC-4, with the following modifications" -- and
 2 this would be specific changes to condition two,
 3 condition 2(a), to include language at the appropriate
 4 location and the specific language. Notice will include
 5 both an easy-to-understand plain-language summary of
 6 property owner rights with respect to noise control
 7 conditions as well as the noise control conditions.
 8 And then also under 2(a), complaint plan
 9 will be distributed by certificate holder.
 10 Again, appropriate language in appropriate
 11 location.
 12 And then under subsection (c), in the
 13 parenthetical prior to the first word, which is
 14 "including," we would add "such as."
 15 And that is it.
 16 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Sounds good.
 17 SECRETARY CORNETT: Perry Chocktoot.
 18 COUNCILMEMBER CHOCKTOOT: Yes.
 19 SECRETARY CORNETT: Hanley Jenkins.
 20 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: Yes.
 21 SECRETARY CORNETT: Kent Howe.
 22 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Yes.
 23 SECRETARY CORNETT: Cindy Condon.
 24 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Yes.
 25 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Ann Beier.

Page 681

1 COUNCILMEMBER BEIER: Yes.
 2 SECRETARY CORNETT: Jordan Truitt?
 3 COUNCILMEMBER TRUITT: Yes.
 4 SECRETARY CORNETT: Thank you,
 5 Councilmembers.
 6 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. I believe now we're
 7 ready to move on to the land use standard issues. We've
 8 got 9, 5, 7, and 8. And so --
 9 Did I do something wrong there? 9, 5, 7, 8.
 10 That's what's on my list.
 11 MR. RATCLIFFE: Right. I only have 9 and 5.
 12 VICE CHAIR HOWE: I've got them on here, but
 13 not 7 and 8.
 14 (Discussion on agenda items.)
 15 MR. RATCLIFFE: Okay. Yeah. I think that's
 16 right. So 7 and 8 had -- we had kind of -- the intent
 17 was to have covered those along with kind of the
 18 procedural issues at the outset.
 19 Where, you know, the recommendation was that
 20 there wasn't sufficient substantive information in those
 21 exceptions to be able to allow the Council to -- to make
 22 an informed decision on those. So that's why we ended
 23 up with 9 and 5.
 24 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. Ms. Tardaewether,
 25 9 -- 9 and 5.

Page 682

1 MS. TARDAEWETHER: Kellen Tardaewether.
 2 Bear with me as I kind of come out of the
 3 noise and let's go over -- so the Council's Land Use
 4 Standard requires the Council to find that the proposed
 5 facility complies with the local applicable substantive
 6 criteria and statewide planning goals as adopted by the
 7 LCDC or the Land Conservation and Development
 8 Commission.
 9 Applicable substantive criteria from the
 10 affected -- are the criteria from the affected local
 11 government's acknowledged comprehensive plan and land
 12 use ordinances that are required by the state -- that
 13 are required by the statewide planning goals identified
 14 as applicable to a proposed facility.
 15 Based on -- based on the facility type.
 16 And the applicable substantive criteria, the
 17 goalpost in Council's rules for that preliminary
 18 application is submitted.
 19 And so for land use for the jurisdictions
 20 where the land use applies, that was 2013.
 21 The analysis area for land use is one
 22 half-mile from the site boundary. So that is the area
 23 that is -- oops, looked at -- I wasn't ready for that.
 24 And then the -- because this is a long linear facility,
 25 we talked about the jurisdictions it crosses. It's five

Page 683

1 counties in Oregon. It crosses Malheur, Baker, Union,
 2 Umatilla, and Morrow County. There's also some facility
 3 components in North Powder and Huntington, Oregon.
 4 So those are all of the local governments
 5 that must comply with the land use standard.
 6 And so the land use section in the proposed
 7 order is very -- is very long. Right? Because
 8 criteria -- I'm going to go to the next slide here --
 9 that's -- the table is kind of small.
 10 But these are the criteria that are
 11 identified by the local governments. The applicant in
 12 its Exhibit K also identifies criteria that is
 13 applicable to the facility.
 14 I'm going to kind of just go through these
 15 pretty quickly. My presentation is fairly short on land
 16 use just so we can go and talk to the -- I don't know.
 17 The meatier stuff are the items that are related to the
 18 contested case issue. So I'm kind of just doing a quick
 19 overview of land use. And this is kind of the layout in
 20 the section.
 21 There are lots of land use conditions, and a
 22 lot of them are -- I don't -- I'm kind of air quoting
 23 "typical conditions" that would apply to setbacks of
 24 certain -- certain structures. Same with compliance
 25 with local permits, comprehensive and conditional use

1 permit submission under each county as per their
 2 criteria.
 3 So in Umatilla and Union County, as we can
 4 kind of see on the top of each slide, I have a summary
 5 of the -- the zones that are crossed by the facility.
 6 In Umatilla and Union County, the facility
 7 does cross forest lands. So under OAR
 8 660-006-0025(4)(q), it establishes that new electric
 9 transmission lines with right-of-ways up to 100 feet are
 10 conditionally permissible uses within forest lands.
 11 And we're kind of going back to that --
 12 going back to the actual final right-of-way width of the
 13 facility. And it is anticipated to be the 300 feet in
 14 forest lands and that is to ensure that there is enough
 15 vegetative clearance for hazard trees. And this is a
 16 safety and fire prevention part of the operation and
 17 maintenance of the transmission line. So this is
 18 related to that wider right-of-way in forest lands.
 19 The transmission line would satisfy
 20 OAR 660-006-0025 (4)(q). However, the permanent access
 21 roads that would be necessary to service
 22 the transmission line in operation, those would be
 23 located within the hundred foot right-of-way for which
 24 the structures are allowable.
 25 So the applicant requests that the Council

1 maintaining, you know, vegetative clearance in the -- in
 2 the utility right-of-way.
 3 Let me make sure. Okay. Now I'm done.
 4 Sorry.
 5 MR. RATCLIFFE: Thanks.
 6 So issue LU-9, the limited party is Myers.
 7 The issue is whether the applicant
 8 adequately analyzed the risk of wildfires from the
 9 operation of the proposed transmission line especially
 10 during red flag warning weather conditions and the
 11 impact, the proposed transmission lines will have on
 12 Mr. Myers' ability to use an aerial applicator on his
 13 farmland.
 14 So in the Hearing Officer's proposed
 15 contested case order, she first provided a definition of
 16 what a red flag warning is.
 17 It's a forecast warning issued by the
 18 national weather service to inform the public,
 19 firefighters, and land management agencies that
 20 conditions are ideal for wildland fire combustion and --
 21 rapid spread. Red flag warnings are often preceded by
 22 a fire weather watch, which indicates weather conditions
 23 that could occur in the next 12 to 72 hours.
 24 A national weather service has developed
 25 different zones across the nation for providing weather

1 take an exception to the statewide policy embodied in
 2 goal four for the forest lands in Umatilla and Union
 3 Counties.
 4 And Jesse will go over those more in more
 5 detail. But that's just kind of the setup background
 6 for that portion.
 7 So this is in Union County, which has the
 8 same note about the forest lands.
 9 And then Baker County. Shout out to
 10 Umatilla County over here. Hi, guys. And Union. Oh,
 11 Scott left. Okay.
 12 All right. So -- and this is just a really
 13 high-level overview. And that -- that's basically my
 14 presentation, unless Council has any specific questions
 15 to the proposed order, we can pass it off to Jesse.
 16 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Floor is yours,
 17 Mr. Ratcliffe.
 18 MR. RATCLIFFE: Thank you.
 19 MS. TARDAEWETHER: For the record, Kellen.
 20 I did have a couple conditions here. I'll
 21 just leave them up here. This is kind of -- this
 22 relates to the wider right-of-way and forest lands and
 23 then there's also the right-of-way clearing assessment
 24 which talks about -- has that built-in agency
 25 consultation. And this is the applicant's proposal for

1 alerts, such as red flag warnings, to more discrete
 2 areas. These zones are monitored and factored into the
 3 applicant's determination of whether to imitate a public
 4 safety power shutoff. So a little bit of background on
 5 what that is.
 6 So the Hearing Officer's opinion concluded
 7 that the risk of wildfire during red flag warning
 8 weather conditions was adequately evaluated in the 2022
 9 wildfire mitigation plan which was submitted by the
 10 applicant during the contested case.
 11 The potential fire risk zones along the
 12 proposed route were evaluated in that mitigation plan.
 13 The hearing officer found that evidence on
 14 the record demonstrates that the distance between
 15 structures -- the height of structures and soil type
 16 result in low risk of the potential for large dust
 17 devils to interact with the transmission line and cause
 18 a fire.
 19 Based on review of the data regarding fire
 20 size and cause in the area, which is Morrow County, the
 21 likelihood of a catastrophic project-related wildfire
 22 during the operation is very low.
 23 Therefore, there is no need for the
 24 applicant to have a soil rehabilitation plan in place in
 25 response to potential fire-related damage to

1 agricultural soils on Mr. Myers' property.
 2 Hearing officer found that the applicant
 3 provided expert testimony that evaluated the fuel source
 4 on Mr. Myers' property, including herbaceous, grass and
 5 grain vegetation.
 6 Based on this fuel source, any fire on or
 7 near Mr. Myers' property is expected to be low intensity
 8 and fast moving. Given wind conditions in there area,
 9 low-intensity, fast-moving fires do not cause
 10 significant damage to soils.
 11 Hearing officer found that the applicant
 12 identified potential impacts to agricultural operations,
 13 including accessibility to fields for aerial spraying.
 14 Specifically under the agricultural
 15 mitigation plan, the applicant would be required to work
 16 with landowners, microsite the line, siting the line
 17 along the edge of fields or existing rights-of-way and
 18 negotiate right-of-way easements.
 19 Finally, the hearing officer concluded that
 20 ORS 215.275 sub (5) does not require that there be no
 21 impacts from the transmission line to agricultural
 22 operations. The potential impacts to aerial spraying
 23 have been identified and evaluated, and the
 24 preponderance of evidence demonstrates that the
 25 applicant will generally reduce the intensity and

1 this zone as a critical fire risk, again, this zone has
 2 statistically the same number of red flag warnings
 3 issued on average as other zones that were classified as
 4 high -- critical -- high critical fire risk zones.
 5 In addition, the ALJ was incorrect in
 6 finding that high winds pose little risk for wildfires
 7 caused by transmission line ignition.
 8 In my supporting evidence I presented in
 9 multiple filings showing the 500 kV transmission lines
 10 have ignited fires in comparable landscapes. Idaho
 11 Power has confirmed this fact.
 12 Furthermore, the ALJ was incorrect in
 13 finding that if a fire were to occur on my farm, it
 14 would have minimal soil impact. And there's no need for
 15 the IPC to have a soil rehabilitation plan in place.
 16 Quite frankly, contrary to Idaho Power's
 17 expert witness, Mr. Madison, the facts provided in my
 18 direct testimony are a hundred percent accurate and
 19 specifically unique to this cropping system.
 20 As supporting evidence, I provided a signed,
 21 written testimony of a local farmer that experienced the
 22 fire in his cropland. That fire impacted his soil
 23 negatively for over six year.
 24 This is a well-documented testimony that
 25 completely contradicts Mr. Madison's findings. It is

1 frequency of impacts to farmlands.
 2 That, again, is the summary of the hearing
 3 officer's findings and conclusions with respect to this
 4 issue and we're ready for Mr. Myers' oral argument.
 5 MR. MYERS: -- we're directly -- or the
 6 applicant adequately analyzed the risk of wildfires from
 7 operation and during red flag warnings.
 8 I request that you reverse the ALJ's
 9 decision, specifically the ALJ was incorrect in finding
 10 that Idaho Power adequately analyzed the risk of
 11 project-related wildfire during red flag warning,
 12 weather warning conditions, and in operation as well.
 13 It's clear in the IPC's 2022 fire mitigation
 14 plan that they failed to include the zone that
 15 potential -- that poses a highest level of risk. That
 16 zone is over our farm. That's a weather service
 17 designated zone over our farm. It's not a zone that you
 18 talked about prior to this and that groups
 19 weather issues that are similar issued by the weather
 20 service itself.
 21 The -- the IPC failed to include our zone as
 22 a critical fire zone risk or at-risk zone. They failed
 23 to include this. This zone includes our cropland, our
 24 farm. And this zone also makes up 25 percent of the
 25 proposed transmission line link. The IPC misclassifying

1 very clear that a much larger risk exists than what was
 2 assessed.
 3 In essence, the risk on our section of farm
 4 has not been addressed and certainly not as adequately.
 5 Judge Webster was incorrect in finding I did
 6 not timely offer testimony from the article by
 7 Zhaolin Gu into the hearing record. I presented this
 8 article within the filing deadline in my declaration
 9 testimony, and it is critical evidence -- crucial
 10 evidence related to my issue, should not be overlooked.
 11 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Mr. Myers, you need to
 12 wrap up.
 13 MR. MYERS: By leaving out this zone over
 14 our farm plays out in a number of different ways, but we
 15 are at risk of soil damage in a fire. Fires do happen.
 16 These lines do light fires. That's -- that's a fact.
 17 And our environment, locally, is at risk.
 18 Because we don't have a large history of
 19 fires in our area is because we got lucky. And because
 20 local residents are diligent about not mishandling fire
 21 in any way to have a fire take off.
 22 Things will change if a transmission line is
 23 installed. It's a different environment.
 24 You can't say that because we haven't had
 25 fires prior to this, that it's not an issue. We just

Page 692

1 got lucky and we've had people that care about not
 2 lighting a fire by accident. And it does happen.
 3 And we haven't had a lot of -- we're very
 4 rural.
 5 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. Thank you very
 6 much.
 7 Are there questions from Council?
 8 Councillor Beier.
 9 COUNCILMEMBER BEIER: This is Councillor
 10 Beier.
 11 We just touched on the fire component -- the
 12 wildfire component of your exception. But if you could
 13 give us 20 to 30 seconds on the aerial application and
 14 your concerns vis-à-vis the power line and how you apply
 15 to your property.
 16 MR. MYERS: Absolutely. Absolutely.
 17 The IPC has tried to mitigate that with
 18 lines going around fields and so on, they mentioned
 19 that. Right?
 20 In my case, it runs right through a -- a
 21 section and a half of ground that had been continuously
 22 farmed for 60 to 80 years.
 23 I'm stuck with a line going right through my
 24 field. What am I going to do?
 25 I can't -- it's like -- there's no

Page 693

1 mitigation here. It goes right through it. Right
 2 through the middle of it.
 3 I don't even know if I can farm it. I
 4 can't -- what am I -- the pilot is not going to want to
 5 go anywhere near that. I don't know the regulations
 6 there. For my case, it is a disaster. There's no great
 7 option. I appreciate that question. Immensely, I
 8 really do.
 9 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Thank you, Mr. Myers.
 10 MS. RACKNER: Good morning. Lisa Rackner
 11 for the record.
 12 Mr. Myers' exceptions raise a number of
 13 issues and I'm going to try to briefly address each of
 14 them.
 15 But before I do that, I just want to provide
 16 a little bit of context about the company's wildfire
 17 mitigation plan and public safety shutoff plan for
 18 de-energizing lines. The company needs to --
 19 Sorry about that. The company filed its
 20 most recent -- it's 2022 plan with the Public Utility
 21 Commission and that plan was approved.
 22 Now, our understanding from Mr. Myers'
 23 exceptions was his concern that the public safety power
 24 shutoff plan doesn't include risk zone 641. That was an
 25 issue he brought up for the first time.

Page 694

1 Our understanding is that risk zone 641
 2 includes Marrow and Umatilla County. And I do want to
 3 ensure the Councilmembers that in the wildfire
 4 mitigation plan itself, the company has thoroughly
 5 addressed wildfire risk in those counties.
 6 With respect to the public safety shutoff
 7 plan, again, that's the plan for de-energizing lines in
 8 certain emergency situations, that is a living document.
 9 It only covers the transmission lines that have been
 10 built. It's because it's dynamic and it has to always
 11 change. So B2H has not been added to that -- to that
 12 plan yet.
 13 But it certainly will before it's energized.
 14 And the company will have an appropriate plan for
 15 that -- the PSPS.
 16 So Mr. Myers also alleges that the hearing
 17 officer erred by failing to consider evidence concerning
 18 the risk of fire ignition with respect to 500 kV lines.
 19 However, there was substantial evidence in
 20 this case by our expert addressing this issue. And as
 21 Idaho Power's expert witness explained, fires from
 22 high -- extra high voltage lines, like a 500 kV line,
 23 are extremely rare. They are much less likely to cause
 24 fires because they are subject to stricter safety and
 25 engineer requirements. They are high above the tree

Page 695

1 line and they are a much wider right-of-way around --
 2 around it.
 3 So the hearing officer correctly found that
 4 the risk that a fire would be started from a 500 kV line
 5 was extremely -- was extremely low.
 6 With respect to -- I know Councilmember
 7 Beier wanted to know about the aerial spraying and the
 8 issue there.
 9 My understanding is that -- is that there
 10 is -- B2H is planned right now to be routed through
 11 Mr. Myers' farmland; that that was unavoidable. There
 12 were a number of other constraints that led that to be
 13 the case.
 14 My understanding is that micro-siting of that
 15 line is available, but to the extent there is some
 16 impact on the aerial spraying operations planned on his
 17 plan (sic), and we acknowledged that there will be --
 18 that will become part of right-of-way negotiations and
 19 there will be discussions about -- compensation for the
 20 diminution of value of his farmlands for that reason.
 21 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Thank you, Ms. Rackner.
 22 Are there questions from Council?
 23 Okay. Counsel Rowe.
 24 MR. ROWE: Anything I add will just be in
 25 addition to comments that Ms. Rackner made.

Page 696

1 The hearing officer considered Mr. Myers'
 2 arguments. She found that Idaho Power had adequate --
 3 (audio disruption) --
 4 Okay. Sounds like everybody is back on
 5 board.
 6 This is Patrick Rowe, Department of Justice.
 7 Just two brief comments.
 8 Again, the hearing officer did find that
 9 Idaho Power had adequately analyzed the risk of
 10 wildfire. She cited to the wildfire mitigation plan.
 11 With regard to the aerial spraying issue, in
 12 addition to the measures that Ms. Rackner referenced
 13 with regard to potential compensation to Mr. Myers, the
 14 Department would also point out the recommended land use
 15 condition 14 would require the certificate holder to
 16 finalize and implement an agricultural mitigation plan.
 17 That plan is described in attachment K-1 of the
 18 application for site certificate. It includes measures
 19 to avoid, mitigate, repair, and/or provide compensation
 20 for impacts that may result from the construction or
 21 operation of the project on privately owned agricultural
 22 land.
 23 THE COURT: Okay. Council, does anyone feel
 24 there are changes needed to the language of land use
 25 condition number nine?

Page 697

1 Councillor Condon.
 2 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Cindy Condon.
 3 And this is to, I think, Mr. Myers and
 4 Ms. Rackner.
 5 I'm a little bit confused and I think it has
 6 been mentioned. But the substantial disagreement about
 7 the zone being adequately -- this specific zone that
 8 Mr. Myers -- on Mr. Myers' property.
 9 It just sounds diametrically opposed. No --
 10 no review or no analysis and then --
 11 MS. RACKNER: I think that the -- I think
 12 it's a disagreement about what it's called.
 13 So in the wildfire mitigation plan, Idaho
 14 Power did analyze the area that B2H is going to be going
 15 through.
 16 So -- and we felt that that was adequate and
 17 we do feel that that was adequate. In his exceptions
 18 for the first time, Mr. Myers' brought up -- he said,
 19 well, you didn't look at this whole zone. And that was
 20 the first time we had ever heard that. He also was
 21 specific that we hadn't brought it up in the power
 22 safety shutoff portion, which is kind of -- which is a
 23 different document.
 24 But to the extent, perhaps, he meant, you
 25 didn't consider it at all in the wildfire mitigation

Page 698

1 plan itself, I think the answer is we didn't say we're
 2 looking at the zone. We said we're looking at the route
 3 that B2H goes through, which would be the zone of
 4 concern for the purposes of our analysis. So -- so I
 5 think we may just be crossing each other.
 6 To -- so, I guess, that's the answer if
 7 Mr. Myers is really referring to the wildfire mitigation
 8 plan itself.
 9 If Mr. Myers is, as he says in his
 10 exceptions, really concerned about, well, what's in your
 11 public safety shutoff plan? What is your plan for
 12 de-energizing lines in the Morrow County/Umatilla County
 13 area?
 14 Then the answer is Mr. Myers is correct. We
 15 don't have that in our public safety shutoff plan yet,
 16 because that's a living document, as is the wildfire
 17 mitigation plan.
 18 But, particularly, the electrical
 19 consequences of shutting off a plan. It's just very
 20 technical and it is going to be very specific to the
 21 line that you are talking about and what that line is
 22 connected to. So B2H would not yet be included.
 23 It is a living document. It will be
 24 included.
 25 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Thank you. And I do

Page 699

1 understand the difference between the power safety
 2 shutoff.
 3 But is Mr. Myers still here? I just want to
 4 be clear. I -- in his remarks today, at least I don't
 5 remember that he mentioned specifically the power
 6 safety. I heard it as the wildfire mitigation analysis.
 7 MS. RACKNER: That's what he said today and
 8 that's why I answered the way I did.
 9 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: I just want to be
 10 clear that we might be able to get some agreement that,
 11 no, it was adequately or not analyzed.
 12 MS. RACKNER: I don't see Mr. Myers in the
 13 room.
 14 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Thank you.
 15 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. With that, does
 16 Council feel there's any changes needed to land use
 17 condition nine?
 18 Hearing none, I think we're ready for the
 19 straw poll.
 20 SECRETARY CORNETT: So it would be to "agree
 21 with the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and
 22 conditions of approval in the purposed contested case
 23 order pertaining to issue LU-9."
 24 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Sounds good.
 25 SECRETARY CORNETT: Kent Howe.

Hearing - Day 3 - 8/31/2022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 700</p> <p>1 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Yes. 2 SECRETARY CORNETT: Ann Beier. 3 COUNCILMEMBER BEIER: Yes. 4 SECRETARY CORNETT: Hanley Jenkins. 5 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: (No audible 6 response.) 7 SECRETARY CORNETT: Jordan Truitt. 8 COUNCILMEMBER TRUITT: Yes. 9 SECRETARY CORNETT: Perry Chocktoot. 10 COUNCILMEMBER CHOCKTOOT: Yes. 11 SECRETARY CORNETT: Cindy Condon. 12 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: No. 13 SECRETARY CORNETT: Thank you, 14 Councilmembers. 15 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. Counsel Ratcliffe, 16 it's back to you. 17 MS. TARDAEWETHER: Okay. So our other land 18 use issue is land use issue five. 19 The limited party is Irene Gilbert. 20 The issue statement is whether calculation 21 of forestlands must be based on soil class or whether it 22 is sufficient to consider acreage where forest is the 23 predominant use. 24 This was addressed by the hearing officer on 25 a ruling on motion for summary determination, as a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 702</p> <p>1 planning staff to determine the predominate use of each 2 of the 61 parcels located in the timber grazing zone and 3 used SSURGO soil data, the Union County tax law data, 4 and GIS software in making that determination. 5 And the hearing officer found that the 6 amount of impacted forestland acreage specifically is 7 not material to the goal four compliance analysis and 8 that overall there were no issues of material fact on 9 this issue. 10 So that's the summary of the hearing 11 officer's ruling on motion for summary determination as 12 it appears in the proposed contested case order. And 13 that brings us to oral argument from Ms. Gilbert. 14 MS. GILBERT: To appear here would be 15 humorous if it were not so sad. Let me get to my -- 16 The contested case here and the dismissal 17 was with summary determination and findings of fact from 18 the Administrative Law Judge are absolutely not correct. 19 Summary judgment is not permissible if the 20 opposing party demonstrates there are factual disputes 21 going to the merit of the challenged agency decision. I 22 did do that. And she indicated -- the statements that 23 she made are just flat out incorrect. 24 This contested case is regarding whether 25 local land use rules that failed to comply with the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 701</p> <p>1 number of the other issues that the Council has been 2 considering over the past few days have. 3 Once again, that means that the hearing 4 officer reached a conclusion that there were no 5 materials -- issues of fact and that the issue is 6 appropriate for disposition on interpretation of the 7 law. 8 The Hearing Officer's ruling concluded that 9 Ms. Gilbert did not provide an adequate explanation as 10 to how or why the Union County comprehensive plan or the 11 Union County zoning ordinance are not compliant with 12 goal four of the state's land use process. 13 The hearing officer found that Ms. Gilbert 14 did not previously claim that Union County applied an 15 incorrect cubic foot per acre per year standard, or that 16 Union County incorrectly identified the soil class in 17 its comprehensive planning map, nor did she cite any 18 applicable statute or administrative rule requiring 19 Union County or the applicant to use a soil capacity 20 standard of 20 cubic feet per acre per year when 21 determining the predominant use and differentiating 22 between farmland and forestland. 23 The hearing officer concluded that Union 24 County Planning Direct testimony from Mr. Mark Hartell 25 confirms that the applicant worked with the Union County</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 703</p> <p>1 state land use rules can be used to determine 2 forestland. There are three of you with the experience 3 in land use law. 4 Can you ethically make a determination that 5 a county planner can use county rules over state 6 statutes when they conflict with one another. 7 Scott Hartell, in his deposition, said this 8 is the only document that he used to identify what was 9 forestland in the combined area. 10 It's -- the -- it shows only land that has 11 67 -- 67 cubic feet per square acre or greater as 12 forestland, did not even evaluate most of the land that 13 is being called range or agricultural land. 14 So anyway, there are multiple disputes of 15 law. The overlying issue is whether the 2008 and 2011 16 land use rule changes apply when a local government 17 fails to update local land use regulations within one 18 year as is required by the statute. 19 Is the developer required to determine soil 20 capacity for all soils in the combined ag. timber 21 classification? 22 The answer is yes. The Union County planner 23 stated that was the only documents that he used to 24 identify forestland. 25 The hearings -- I'm just amazed, anyway.</p>

Page 704

1 The Council needs to approve an exception to the summary
 2 determination on this issue and allow a contested case
 3 to move forward or remand to the hearings officer to
 4 correctly identify forestland per the LCDC rules.
 5 Evaluation of changes to related Council
 6 rules -- they need to evaluate the changes to the
 7 related council rules that are impacted by this
 8 forestland decision, including LC-7 and LC-8.
 9 Lisa Rackner even stated that it would be a
 10 relatively small number of issues that could be handled
 11 through summary determination and then the
 12 Administrative Law Judge went ahead and approved all 33
 13 that were requested.
 14 We have disagreements of fact.
 15 The proper identification of forestland is
 16 critical to landowners. It has a significant impact on
 17 the payment Idaho Power must pay the landowners when
 18 they condemn land for the transmission line. One
 19 Malheur County landowner said he was offered 3500
 20 dollars, 3,500 for a 100 year right-of-way for a road
 21 that crosses approximately one mile of his property.
 22 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Ms. Gilbert, you need to
 23 wrap it up.
 24 MS. GILBERT: Yes, I know.
 25 Anyway, leaving these landowners vulnerable

Page 705

1 to that kind of offer is not ethical. It's not -- it's
 2 just not okay.
 3 So I guess, thank you.
 4 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Thank you.
 5 Any questions from Council?
 6 Okay. Thank you.
 7 MS. GILBERT: This one will go to the
 8 Supreme Court.
 9 MS. RACKNER: So as Ms. Gilbert says, this
 10 was an issue that the hearing officer disposed of on a
 11 motion for summary determination.
 12 In her DPO comments and petition,
 13 Ms. Gilbert had argued that Idaho Power and Union County
 14 failed to appropriately determine forestlands in Union
 15 County based on soil class as is required by the Union
 16 County rules but, instead, made an evaluation of what
 17 land should be designated based on the current use of
 18 that land.
 19 But as the company demonstrated in its
 20 motion for summary determination, that simply wasn't the
 21 case.
 22 So as some important background, the only
 23 impacted forest acres in Union County are located in
 24 hybrid forest farm zones.
 25 Union County requires Idaho Power to

Page 706

1 determine whether the impacted parcels in the -- in the
 2 hybrid zones should be considered forestland or farmland
 3 and then apply the relevant land use standards based on
 4 the predominant use of the impacted parcel.
 5 Per the Union County zoning ordinance
 6 predominant use is determined by soil type. And that's
 7 exactly how Idaho Power, working with Union County, did
 8 determine it.
 9 So the un rebutted evidence in the record
 10 shows that to determine the appropriate soil
 11 classifications for each lot, Idaho Power worked with
 12 Union County to analyze the soil data based on the
 13 Natural Resources Conservation Services Soil Survey
 14 Geographic database, which people refer to as "SSURGO,"
 15 which was consistent with what was stated in
 16 Mr. Hartell's deposition.
 17 Any lot with soils consistent with
 18 forestlands were designated as such. Now, there were
 19 some parcels for which there was no soil data available.
 20 And Idaho Power just conservatively assumed that was
 21 forestland.
 22 Now, when Union County reviewed these
 23 determinations, including a review -- they included a
 24 review of the current use of the land, but there were no
 25 parcels for which that predominant use changed forest to

Page 707

1 agricultural land. So contrary to Ms. Gilbert's
 2 arguments, the determination of forestland were made
 3 entirely based on soil type.
 4 Now, in her reply brief on summary judgment,
 5 Ms. Gilbert did raise a different argument. Instead of
 6 asserting that Idaho Power failed to rely on soil type,
 7 she now argued that Idaho Power used the wrong approach
 8 for its soil analysis. And she argue that Union County
 9 failed -- and Idaho Power failed to apply what she
 10 believes to be a state planning rule that any parcel
 11 consisting primarily of soil types with timber
 12 production capacity of 20 cubic feet per acre must be
 13 considered forestland.
 14 However, Ms. Gilbert never identified any
 15 state statute or regulation to support that position and
 16 that's why the hearing officer rejected her argument.
 17 And I see I'm out of time. But if you have
 18 any other questions, I'd be happy to hear them.
 19 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Thank you, Ms. Rackner.
 20 Questions from Council?
 21 Okay. Counsel Rowe.
 22 MR. ROWE: Patrick Rowe, Department of
 23 Justice on behalf of Department of Energy.
 24 As has been discussed, the issues related to
 25 Union County zoning -- zoning code issue, evidence on

Page 708

1 the record shows that the applicant properly consulted
 2 with Union County on how to interpret and apply the
 3 requirements of that code.
 4 Union County Planning Director testified in
 5 the contested case and affirmed that the applicant's
 6 approach to evaluating both farm and forestlands in
 7 Union County was appropriate.
 8 So the Department agrees that it was -- it
 9 was appropriate for the hearing officer to dismiss this
 10 issue on summary determination.
 11 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Any questions from
 12 Council?
 13 Okay. Does Council feel that there's any
 14 changes needed to land use condition five?
 15 Hearing none. We're ready for a straw poll.
 16 SECRETARY CORNETT: Okay. So this will be
 17 for both the land use standard and issue LU-5.
 18 So agree with the findings of fact,
 19 conclusions of law, conditions of approval in the
 20 proposed order pertaining to land use stand -- land use
 21 standards that are not related to the issues in the
 22 contested case and in the proposed contested case order
 23 pertaining to issue LU-5.
 24 Jordan Truitt.
 25 COUNCILMEMBER TRUITT: Yes.

Page 709

1 SECRETARY CORNETT: Hanley Jenkins.
 2 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: Yes.
 3 SECRETARY CORNETT: Kent Howe.
 4 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Yes.
 5 SECRETARY CORNETT: Cindy Condon.
 6 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Yes.
 7 SECRETARY CORNETT: Ann Beier.
 8 COUNCILMEMBER BEIER: Yes.
 9 SECRETARY CORNETT: Perry Chocktoot.
 10 COUNCILMEMBER CHOCKTOOT: Yes.
 11 SECRETARY CORNETT: Thank you,
 12 Councilmembers.
 13 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. We have a few
 14 remaining items. Adoption of minutes and some other
 15 things.
 16 Do we want to break for lunch and come back
 17 or go through?
 18 SECRETARY CORNETT: Entirely Council's
 19 discretion. So we have a couple remaining things for
 20 this agenda item and then the two minutes -- the draft
 21 minutes for the two Council meetings. So it is entirely
 22 your choice if you want to push through or if you want
 23 to take a break and come back.
 24 VICE CHAIR HOWE: What's Council's pleasure?
 25 Get a little food and come back and work through it?

Page 710

1 Working lunch. Okay. We'll take a
 2 15-minute break and be back -- do we need 15? Or do we
 3 want 10? Start at 12:30 or 12:35?
 4 Okay. 12:35 we'll come back.
 5 (A break was taken.)
 6 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. I'm calling the
 7 Council back to order. So we're ready.
 8 I'll turn it over to Secretary Cornett.
 9 SECRETARY CORNETT: For the record, Todd
 10 Cornett.
 11 Thank you, Mr. Vice Chair.
 12 So we have one holdover issue, and that is
 13 the -- give me one second -- that is the structural
 14 standard.
 15 So at the beginning of day one, on the
 16 structural standard, Council had some questions. There
 17 was some interest in a condition related to notification
 18 related blasting.
 19 And so thanks to Christopher Clark, we
 20 tasked him with doing some research. He found some
 21 information related to the Oregon Department of
 22 Transportation. Provided that to us. Sarah was able
 23 to package that into condition language.
 24 So I have proposed condition language.
 25 Yeah, actually, I can just read it or if you would like

Page 711

1 me to share it on the screen.
 2 What's your preference?
 3 Okay. Maybe I will just email it to you.
 4 Okay. Give me one minute, please.
 5 Okay. It should only be just a minute.
 6 Give you a chance to eat a little bit more, too.
 7 So with the -- I'll work on the preamble.
 8 So this would be to "agree with the findings
 9 of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval
 10 in the proposed order pertaining to the structural
 11 standard that are not related to issues in the contested
 12 case with the following modifications to be included in
 13 the draft framework blasting plan, Section 3.3.2,
 14 blasting and notification and safety procedures, which
 15 is an existing section of the plan under recommended
 16 soil protection condition one."
 17 And then the specific language we'll bring
 18 up on the screen.
 19 Okay. And I will -- you can see it, but I
 20 will read it.
 21 So this would be in addition to the
 22 notification that was previously in there -- in the
 23 newspaper. Not in place of it, but in addition to.
 24 So at least 14 days prior to any blasting
 25 necessary during construction of the facility,

Page 712

1 certificate holder shall ensure that its construction
 2 contractor identifies all landowners of record and
 3 occupants within 1250 feet of blasting actions and
 4 provide notifications to those landowners and
 5 occupants -- which I spelled incorrectly -- the blasting
 6 schedule, potential hazards -- potential risks and
 7 hazards, and of measures that will be taken to monitor
 8 and minimize any ground shaking impacts.
 9 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Any comments from Council?
 10 COUNCILMEMBER BEIER: For the record, this
 11 is Councilmember Beier.
 12 And thanks to staff for addressing this
 13 issue.
 14 I know we heard testimony earlier today that
 15 this really doesn't get at the heart of the issue, but
 16 at least people will have notice and -- and understand
 17 that there will be some impacts to their neighborhoods.
 18 So thank you to staff.
 19 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Councillor Condon.
 20 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Thank you.
 21 I'm just wondering if it would be beneficial
 22 to have it as part of the notice contact information.
 23 So, you know, should you have -- have
 24 concern -- concerns -- you know, contact information --
 25 contact Idaho Power, the blasting company. I don't know

Page 713

1 who would be contacted. But I'm wondering if that would
 2 be helpful.
 3 CHAIR HOWE: What does the rest of the
 4 Council think of that suggestion?
 5 COUNCILMEMBER TRUITT: Jordan Truitt.
 6 I guess I suppose it -- I guess it depends
 7 on who sends the notification out and who the
 8 appropriate contact would be, whether it's a blasting
 9 contractor or -- but, yeah.
 10 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Does that look good,
 11 Council?
 12 Okay. Okay.
 13 So what action do you need from Council?
 14 SECRETARY CORNETT: A straw call as well.
 15 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Roll call? Okay.
 16 SECRETARY CORNETT: Cindy Condon.
 17 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Yes.
 18 SECRETARY CORNETT: Kent Howe.
 19 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Yes.
 20 SECRETARY CORNETT: Jordan Truitt.
 21 COUNCILMEMBER TRUITT: Yes.
 22 SECRETARY CORNETT: Perry Chocktoot.
 23 COUNCILMEMBER CHOCKTOOT: Yes.
 24 SECRETARY CORNETT: Ann Beier.
 25 COUNCILMEMBER BEIER: (No audible response.)

Page 714

1 SECRETARY CORNETT: Hanley Jenkins.
 2 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: Yes.
 3 SECRETARY CORNETT: Thank you,
 4 Councilmembers.
 5 MR. RATCLIFFE: All right. So that has
 6 taken us through all of the exceptions and oral
 7 argument. We have also gone through all of the
 8 standards now between the July and August meetings.
 9 Where that is going to take us to is now,
 10 based on the results of those straw polls, some work on
 11 the part of myself and the staff to incorporate some of
 12 the recommended changes that the Council would like to
 13 see.
 14 We'll be putting together a document that
 15 will incorporate those changes. And where we have, you
 16 know -- as the Council is probably familiar with, when
 17 we get to this kind of draft final order stage, there
 18 are a number of kind of scrivener's corrections that are
 19 just meant to reflect that this is a final document
 20 instead of a proposed document, so there will be those
 21 sorts of changes.
 22 But in addition where we do have these
 23 proposed changes to conditions in particular, that will
 24 trigger this material change hearing where, you know,
 25 there will be an opportunity to comment on the -- those

Page 715

1 proposed changes specifically.
 2 So when we get back together again, there
 3 are going to be a couple of components here.
 4 You know, it will be a review of the draft
 5 final order and then this material change hearing, and
 6 then that will ultimately culminate in the Council's
 7 vote on the site certificate.
 8 But before we get to leave this agenda item,
 9 there's one other housekeeping thing that I want to note
 10 here.
 11 MR. ROWE: Jesse, I'm sorry to interrupt --
 12 sorry to interrupt. Before we get off the scrivener
 13 error issue, I just want to point out that I've just
 14 been conferring with Secretary Cornett that if any of
 15 the parties or limited parties have scrivener error
 16 corrections that they would like to suggest, that they
 17 do so and we believe a week from today would be
 18 appropriate.
 19 MR. RATCLIFFE: Okay.
 20 MR. ROWE: And that would be scrivener
 21 corrections to the proposed contested case order or to
 22 the proposed order.
 23 MR. RATCLIFFE: All right. Thank you for
 24 that clarification.
 25 So the one other housekeeping thing I wanted

1 to note was in reference to a comment that I made
2 towards the beginning of the meeting where I was going
3 over some of the procedural issues that had been raised
4 on the contested case record. And one of the issues had
5 been some conditions that have been proposed at closing
6 argument.

7 And we just went through some of those
8 conditions here with Mr. Anuta and Idaho Power with
9 regard to the noise standard.

10 Most of the other conditions the hearing
11 officer had addressed as saying I don't think these are
12 timely filed, however, you know, here are the other
13 reasons that I am not planning to adopt them if she
14 didn't plan to adopt them.

15 And, essentially, the reasoning on all of
16 those was the conditions that show up in the proposed
17 contested case order and the proposed order are
18 sufficient as they are. The ones that have been
19 adopted. They are sufficient as they are to demonstrate
20 a finding of compliance with whatever the Council
21 standard is that -- that's in play, whether it's land
22 use or waste minimization or whatever it is.

23 There are a handful of those conditions that
24 she did not add that extra sentence on to; however, by
25 implication, the reasoning is the same. She didn't

1 SECRETARY CORNETT: That's a good question.
2 For the record, Todd Cornett.

3 So what we're -- the next Council meeting --
4 which I think I may have missed that in my secretary
5 report -- we're looking at September 27th, which is
6 Tuesday. We'll be in Salem. So either remote or in
7 Salem, you know, as available for Councilmembers. And
8 we would then be getting the draft of the final order --
9 at least two weeks ahead of time -- out. We'll try to
10 get it out earlier than that, but we're already on the
11 clock. So that would hopefully give Councilmembers and
12 Idaho Power and limited parties an opportunity to look
13 at that. We will identify any material changes.

14 So, you know, structurally, you know, you're
15 looking at the proposed order and the proposed contested
16 case order.

17 What then happens is those get folded kind
18 of together in a way to become the draft of the final
19 order, which you will then be looking at. And as we
20 talked about earlier, any material changes that are
21 identified -- and we will call those out specifically so
22 people don't have to comb through it to kind of figure
23 out where those are. There will be a material change
24 hearing, so those who want to make comment on those can.

25 And then if Council is ready, you could be

1 adopt the conditions because she had separately
2 concluded that those standards had been satisfied with
3 the conditions that were in the proposed order or
4 proposed contested case order.

5 And so I just wanted to -- to note that for
6 Council that that is probably, you know, something that
7 I would suggest that in coming back to you with the
8 draft final order that we take that implicit, you know,
9 reasoning from the -- the hearing officer and make that
10 explicitly consistent with her statements with respect
11 to the other -- other conditions, just so that we don't
12 have a reasoning gap there, as it exists in the proposed
13 contested case order.

14 So if there are any questions on that, ask
15 away, but that's all I have on that one.

16 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Any questions from
17 Council?

18 Any action needed today from Council?

19 MR. RATCLIFFE: No, other than just kind of
20 a head nod that -- that we're headed in the right
21 direction on that one.

22 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Yeah. Okay. Councillor
23 Beier.

24 COUNCILMEMBER BEIER: Timing? Calendar?
25 Just curious.

1 issuing a final decision during that Council meeting in
2 September.

3 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Cindy Condon.

4 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Cindy Condon.

5 Just a quick question. Monday -- I think it
6 was Monday -- we discussed some language where "would"
7 was replaced for "will." And agreed to change it there.

8 And -- I should have brought it up at the
9 time, but I think that's used throughout the proposed
10 order. And if staff could just take a look at that for
11 the same reasons.

12 SECRETARY CORNETT: Yeah. Again, for the
13 record, Todd Cornett.

14 So Sarah Esterson responded to that. And
15 the way she had responded to that, you know, the -- the
16 documents, as they are moving through the process, are
17 either the Department's documents, so the draft proposed
18 order; that's our. The proposed order, that's our. The
19 proposed contested case order; that's the Hearing
20 Officer's. The final order is your document.

21 And so the way we structure some of the
22 recommendations on findings, we recommend Council -- so
23 there's a lot of language like that that gets converted
24 from those, you know, documents that are moving up
25 through the process that are not your documents to the


1 final version which is your document. So we will make
 2 those changes within the final -- or at least the draft
 3 of the final order.
 4 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Thank you.
 5 VICE CHAIR HOWE: And so kind of head nods
 6 from Council regarding the superfluous conditions being
 7 removed and brought back to us in the September meeting?
 8 MS. TARDAEWETHER: Sorry. I just wanted to
 9 follow up on the -- the -- the will/would -- and for the
 10 record, Kellen Tardaewether. Did I say that?
 11 And Todd is absolutely correct. A lot of
 12 the tenses and the recommends and the order language,
 13 all of those change when -- in the final order. And I
 14 think that we -- we have flagged where you identified it
 15 with -- you know, relative to that sentence and wanting
 16 to change it to a "shall."
 17 But this is like the -- using "would"
 18 instead of "will," it is -- I guess we do that for all
 19 of our -- all of our projects and all of our documents,
 20 so -- and it doesn't necessarily mean that every "would"
 21 is going to turn into a "shall." Because some of it is
 22 just actually temporal.
 23 It's just like -- because even in the final
 24 order it's still -- they are going to -- it is still
 25 going to do -- so -- so I just want to be very clear.

1 will be an opportunity for comment. And that -- I was
 2 trying to scroll through the details of how that hearing
 3 is supposed to work.
 4 I didn't get to it on the fly quite fast
 5 enough here. But I think that the -- the point here is
 6 that for the interested parties that when we send out
 7 notice of the meeting, those -- all those details about
 8 the opportunity for -- for argument and comment on the
 9 material changes will be included.
 10 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: So, Mr. Chair, does
 11 that material change hearing occur on the 27th?
 12 SECRETARY CORNETT: For the record, Todd
 13 Cornett.
 14 What constitutes material changes, you know,
 15 can be fairly narrow. So it is not everything that the
 16 Council decided is going to be a material change. But
 17 we will, you know, thoroughly evaluate that and again
 18 call out those material changes.
 19 So at this point, I can't tell you if it's 3
 20 or 15. You know, but we will call those out and those
 21 will be available for oral comment.
 22 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Didn't we decide a year
 23 ago the "shalls" become "must"?
 24 SECRETARY CORNETT: Yeah. There was some
 25 conversation about that. I do not recall. We would

1 It's some -- not every would is going to turn into a
 2 shall, because some places it just won't make sense.
 3 It's just kind of the tense -- we do it. Anyhow, it's
 4 just a tense of how we include in the documents.
 5 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Thank you.
 6 And I -- I just want to reiterate. So
 7 "would" to me is a conditional element. So the would
 8 do, if applies, and so "will" or "shall" or "must" is
 9 not as conditional. And so I just want to be clear
 10 about that. That's the issue.
 11 SECRETARY CORNETT: Yeah.
 12 For the record, Todd Cornett. Thank you.
 13 We absolutely totally agree with that.
 14 And to Kellen's point, you know, if it is in
 15 a condition and it is being a mandatory, in those, we
 16 absolutely, will/shall. You know, but again, depending
 17 upon other circumstances, you know, it may be -- the
 18 word "would" may be the appropriate word.
 19 So we will evaluate all of those in context,
 20 you know, of the structure of the findings, the
 21 conditions, whatever it is. And any of those changes
 22 will be in strike out, so you will be able to see those.
 23 MR. RATCLIFFE: And I'm just responding.
 24 Mr. Anuta just handed me a note about the
 25 material change hearing. And it is a hearing. There

1 have to go back and look at that.
 2 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Just remember that.
 3 SECRETARY CORNETT: Yeah.
 4 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. Then is the next
 5 item --
 6 SECRETARY CORNETT: If I may -- if you'll
 7 allow me, just before we conclude agenda item B. So the
 8 work involved for this agenda item was monumental. And
 9 I know everybody knows that. But I think it is worth
 10 stating for the record that the amount of effort put in
 11 by everybody -- by the limited parties, by Idaho Power,
 12 by Department of Justice, by my staff, by Council, this
 13 has been monumental. The amount of time and effort
 14 preparing for this meeting and then going through this
 15 meeting is very, very significant.
 16 So I just want to call out to everybody, you
 17 know, my appreciation for the commitment, the time, the
 18 complete effort put into this.
 19 I know not everybody is in agreement on all
 20 of the outcome, but I just want to recognize the serious
 21 effort that went into this. So thank you to everybody
 22 who participated in there.
 23 VICE CHAIR HOWE: I second that.
 24 Okay. So we're ready to move to approval of
 25 minutes as -- going back to the June 23rd/24th meeting

1 minutes and the July 22 meeting minutes.
 2 Do we have a motion?
 3 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: This is Hanley.
 4 I so move, and as prepared.
 5 VICE CHAIR HOWE: For both dates?
 6 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: Yes.
 7 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Is there a second?
 8 COUNCILMEMBER TRUITT: This is Jordan.
 9 I will second.
 10 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Okay. Ready to call the
 11 roll, Secretary Cornett?
 12 SECRETARY CORNETT: Give me one second.
 13 Kent Howe.
 14 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Yes.
 15 SECRETARY CORNETT: Ann Beier.
 16 COUNCILMEMBER BEIER: (No audible response.)
 17 SECRETARY CORNETT: Hanley Jenkins.
 18 COUNCILMEMBER JENKINS: Yes.
 19 SECRETARY CORNETT: Jordan Truitt.
 20 COUNCILMEMBER TRUITT: Yes.
 21 SECRETARY CORNETT: Perry Chocktoot.
 22 COUNCILMEMBER CHOCKTOOT: Yes.
 23 SECRETARY CORNETT: Cindy Condon.
 24 COUNCILMEMBER CONDON: Yes.
 25 SECRETARY CORNETT: Motion carries, Mr. Vice

1
 2 CERTIFICATE
 3
 4
 5 STATE OF WASHINGTON)
) ss.
 6 COUNTY OF KITSAP)
 7
 8 I, CRYSTAL R. McAULIFFE, a Certified Court
 9 Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby
 10 certify that the foregoing transcript of the Energy
 11 Facility Siting Council Meeting on AUGUST 31, 2022, is
 12 true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and
 13 ability.
 14 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
 15 and seal this 9th day of September, 2022.
 16
 17 
 18
 19 CRYSTAL R. McAULIFFE, RPR, CCR #2121
 20 Oregon CCR 22-0002
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

1 Chair.
 2 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Is there any other
 3 business for the good of the order?
 4 SECRETARY CORNETT: Mr. Chair, there is no
 5 more business from staff's perspective.
 6 VICE CHAIR HOWE: Anything from Council?
 7 Okay. The time is now 12:57 p.m., and the
 8 August 29th, 30th, and 31st, 2022 meeting of the Energy
 9 Facility Siting Council is now adjourned.
 10
 11 (Adjourned at 12:57 p.m.)
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

<p>A</p> <p>a.m 540:10 543:2 599:22 662:23,23</p> <p>abatement 556:9</p> <p>abides 665:24</p> <p>ability 564:4 585:6 686:12 726:13</p> <p>able 575:21 590:3 649:8 653:14 657:6 661:19 665:15 681:21 699:10 710:22 721:22</p> <p>absolutely 587:5 596:21 615:21 661:12 678:25 692:16,16 702:18 720:11 721:13,16</p> <p>abstract 615:3</p> <p>abuse 641:6</p> <p>abused 642:19</p> <p>accept 562:13 604:18 618:14 652:16,21</p> <p>acceptable 545:16 652:23</p> <p>accepted 562:14 611:3 632:1</p> <p>access 545:8 657:20 684:20</p> <p>accessed 658:9</p> <p>accessibility 688:13</p> <p>accident 692:2</p> <p>accommodate 560:22</p> <p>accurate 613:11 622:12 647:9 690:18 726:12</p> <p>accurately 564:13</p> <p>accusatory 545:14</p> <p>achieve 586:25 651:10</p> <p>acknowledge 600:16 605:22 606:18 678:21</p> <p>acknowledged</p>	<p>614:19 682:11 695:17</p> <p>acknowledging 607:22</p> <p>acoustic 557:21</p> <p>acoustical 587:25 649:12</p> <p>acre 701:15,20 703:11 707:12</p> <p>acreage 700:22 702:6</p> <p>acres 705:23</p> <p>acronym 629:13</p> <p>Act 562:24 563:8</p> <p>acted 561:25</p> <p>action 713:13 717:18</p> <p>actions 712:3</p> <p>activities 588:5</p> <p>actual 575:24 576:19 579:11 636:21 644:13 665:10 684:12</p> <p>add 554:19,20 567:23 596:1 608:12 621:9 625:6 640:20 644:1,2 647:11 680:14 695:24 716:24</p> <p>added 623:1 627:17,18 638:8 655:17 659:9 694:11</p> <p>adding 621:16 637:13,19,23 647:5 660:7</p> <p>addition 613:12 621:9 627:17 646:8,17 675:11 675:11 690:5 695:25 696:12 711:21,23 714:22</p> <p>additional 567:1 572:8 607:16 608:3,12 611:1</p>	<p>613:10 637:8 651:18 659:14 669:6</p> <p>additions 619:14</p> <p>address 560:7 600:14 626:10 630:14 667:18 672:10,12,16 693:13</p> <p>addressed 561:18 623:16 649:25 691:4 694:5 700:24 716:11</p> <p>addresses 560:7,24 568:2 673:8</p> <p>addressing 544:23 590:9 602:17 643:21 694:20 712:12</p> <p>adequate 590:15 611:9 622:1 696:2 697:16,17 701:9</p> <p>adequately 610:14 686:8 687:8 689:6 689:10 691:4 696:9 697:7 699:11</p> <p>adjacent 553:20 604:8</p> <p>adjourned 725:9 725:11</p> <p>administer 547:24</p> <p>administered 584:14 594:19</p> <p>administering 578:19</p> <p>administrating 573:6</p> <p>administration 595:4</p> <p>administrative 545:17 562:24 563:8 567:21 575:15 595:3 701:18 702:18 704:12</p>	<p>admitted 605:17 606:6</p> <p>adopt 604:15 670:4 716:13,14 717:1</p> <p>adopted 567:5,8 584:22 589:13 615:9 623:24 628:9,24 682:6 716:19</p> <p>Adoption 709:14</p> <p>advance 613:5,5,6 619:22</p> <p>advantage 630:19</p> <p>advice 585:12</p> <p>advise 676:3</p> <p>aerial 686:12 688:13,22 692:13 695:7,16 696:11</p> <p>affidavit 585:10</p> <p>affirmed 708:5</p> <p>ag 703:20</p> <p>agencies 570:2,3 584:18 686:19</p> <p>agency 563:11 576:24 578:23 585:4 600:7 685:24 702:21</p> <p>agency's 576:25</p> <p>agenda 544:1 545:1 545:7 639:21,24 681:14 709:20 715:8 723:7,8</p> <p>ago 573:4 722:23</p> <p>agree 570:25 571:2 574:15 597:14 605:4 606:9 612:24 625:3 634:20 635:3 636:1 677:22 679:20 699:20 708:18 711:8 721:13</p> <p>agreeable 665:1</p> <p>agreed 592:12,14 604:15 614:23 629:8 663:11</p>	<p>667:9 719:7</p> <p>agreement 631:16 653:25 659:8 665:1,3,7,15 666:20,22 699:10 723:19</p> <p>agreements 675:20</p> <p>agrees 608:6 708:8</p> <p>agricultural 688:1 688:12,14,21 696:16,21 703:13 707:1</p> <p>ahead 553:14 597:9 611:19 612:1 623:11 630:21 659:16 677:16 704:12 718:9</p> <p>air 582:2,12 683:22</p> <p>airplanes 554:6</p> <p>alerts 687:1</p> <p>aligning 629:17</p> <p>aligns 668:17</p> <p>ALJ 689:9 690:5 690:12</p> <p>ALJ's 689:8</p> <p>alleges 694:16</p> <p>alleviates 632:10</p> <p>allow 600:5 616:23 625:9 678:2 681:21 704:2 723:7</p> <p>allowable 558:5 559:7,11 588:2 607:9,11 684:24</p> <p>allowed 545:12 550:13 580:1 582:11,14 584:24 617:1,2 618:17</p> <p>allows 560:9 562:22</p> <p>alluded 605:18</p> <p>alternative 631:13 652:3</p> <p>amazed 703:25</p> <p>ambient 550:14,17 551:12 552:16</p>
--	---	---	--	--

553:17,23 554:2,4 554:7,10,15,17,19 554:21 558:1 572:22,24 573:19 573:23 577:15 598:18,22 599:3 600:4 602:7 603:1 603:14,18 604:11 605:3 649:14 653:15 amended 547:14 560:19,19 562:2 563:19 572:10 611:8,13,16,20 616:13 630:2 669:23 amendment 609:15 609:22 616:25 674:4 amendments 609:1 612:7 amount 577:24,25 588:3 589:20 663:23 702:6 723:10,13 amplified 550:7 amplify 550:3 analysis 559:22 561:21 562:1 565:16 566:6,19 566:25 567:3 568:5,9,20,23 569:24 570:3,6,17 570:18 579:7 585:20 586:7 590:11 598:11 602:10 608:5,18 657:9 673:6 682:21 697:10 698:4 699:6 702:7 707:8 Analyst 541:9,11 541:12 545:25 546:9 analyze 566:20 568:6 569:4	697:14 706:12 analyzed 686:8 689:6,10 696:9 699:11 and/or 555:21 572:21 696:19 angle 583:15 Ann 541:6 543:21 571:8 597:19 611:23 680:25 700:2 709:7 713:24 724:15 announcements 544:16 answer 564:18 647:9 698:1,6,14 703:22 answered 699:8 anti-ambient 550:18 555:3 558:3 599:7 607:9 607:12 anti-degradation 572:22 585:23 598:22 653:15 anticipate 648:23 anticipated 684:13 Anuta 542:11,11 562:9,10 564:20 564:23 565:6 578:11,11 580:21 601:5,5 603:8,21 612:3,3 614:8,19 615:15 616:23 618:10,16,21 619:4,7 620:22 621:11,12 622:22 623:4 625:7,15,15 627:11,14,25 628:10 632:17 635:10,19 636:1 637:7,10,17 639:4 640:9 643:7,7,14 643:18,24 644:2 645:1 646:1 647:20 648:12	650:6 654:1,12 657:21 659:14,23 661:11,12 663:7 663:24 664:6 667:16 668:5 669:23 670:21,23 672:4,21 675:10 677:25 678:12 679:4 716:8 721:24 Anuta's 585:8 587:3 595:21 630:15 661:8 670:13 anybody 546:19 579:13 651:7 anyway 576:6,23 703:14,25 704:25 APA 562:24 563:4 563:11 564:17 565:9 apart 624:3 apologies 627:23 666:23 apologize 567:13 583:25 app 652:13,24 656:5,24 apparent 549:25 appeal 576:16,21 638:9 640:13 641:11 642:9 661:19 appealed 660:9 appeals 637:23 638:7 appear 633:20 702:14 appearing 612:3 appears 702:12 appellate 579:4 667:20,25 applicable 546:15 547:12 551:8 561:11 565:23 566:2 572:9 682:5	682:9,14,16 683:13 701:18 applicant 548:20 553:2,7 554:10 555:1,2,6,15,20 556:3,21 560:6,15 561:5 578:17 580:6,8 585:9,12 598:16 599:14,18 610:23 611:4,5,9 616:4 663:8,13 665:3 676:10 683:11 684:25 686:7 687:10,24 688:2,11,15,25 689:6 701:19,25 708:1 applicant's 557:23 561:9 573:10 579:7 599:5 600:10 685:25 687:3 708:5 applicants 554:8,9 application 547:10 555:6 558:17 559:6,25 560:1,6 560:11,17,21,21 561:4,11,25 565:22 566:2,3 568:13,18 584:12 586:21 598:24 626:24 682:18 692:13 696:18 applications 595:19 applicator 686:12 applied 554:21 584:24 701:14 applies 682:20 721:8 apply 548:3 549:7 551:4,4 555:7,7 556:20 563:19 568:18 573:13 581:20 600:12 669:2,8,14 683:23	692:14 703:16 706:3 707:9 708:2 applying 551:6 554:14 580:14 585:25 appreciate 596:2 693:7 appreciating 607:18 appreciation 723:17 approach 604:15 615:20 624:15 630:24 661:13 672:19 707:7 708:6 appropriate 545:13 566:3 575:18 586:20 598:12 608:6 626:10 635:8,21 644:24 647:12 661:25 667:6 677:4 680:3 680:10,10 694:14 701:6 706:10 708:7,9 713:8 715:18 721:18 appropriately 574:9 600:9 705:14 approval 571:3 597:16 654:8,8 679:22 699:22 708:19 711:9 723:24 approve 600:7 704:1 approved 604:1 693:21 704:12 approving 580:8 598:13 approximately 586:1,5 704:21 apps 651:1 area 559:23 561:22 562:2,2 565:16
---	--	--	--	--

<p>566:7,19,25 567:3 568:5,9,21 570:17 573:22 586:3 601:22 603:14,17 604:7,7,9 605:3 606:15 613:25 614:1 626:11 647:3 682:21,22 687:20 688:8 691:19 697:14 698:13 703:9 areas 552:4 555:2 569:25 570:3,6 613:20 687:2 argue 563:17 707:8 argued 605:7 705:13 707:7 argues 579:2 arguing 607:10 argument 562:7 566:17 575:6 581:7 584:7 601:4 603:11 611:2,17 611:19 612:2 689:4 702:13 707:5,16 714:7 716:6 722:8 arguments 575:11 575:23 576:9,16 603:15 696:2 707:2 article 691:6,8 articulate 621:6 articulated 678:15 asking 564:23 582:17,20 665:12 665:17 aspect 573:12 aspects 556:15 assembly 547:22 581:22 asserting 707:6 assertion 595:21 assess 584:12 assessed 691:2 assessing 592:5</p>	<p>assessment 552:3 553:4,10 676:2 685:23 assets 674:23 Assistant 546:1 associated 549:16 549:18,20 551:23 552:1,6,25 553:1 571:21 Associates 600:9 assume 648:24 assumed 554:17 706:20 assumption 638:22 638:25 641:23 assumptions 554:14 585:25 assure 600:21 at-risk 689:22 attachment 628:18 634:23,24 636:11 696:17 attention 630:1 attenuate 589:17 attenuated 587:20 attenuating 589:15 attorney 546:2 605:22 audible 700:5 713:25 724:16 audio 577:22 614:11 619:22 662:23 663:6 696:3 August 540:8 543:1 543:7 714:8 725:8 726:11 authority 556:19 561:3 562:1 563:24 565:15 566:6 568:12,19 568:24 572:16,19 573:9,11 578:15 578:21,23 579:1,5 594:15,25 595:8,9 642:17</p>	<p>authorization 595:23 authorize 555:16 561:8 575:18 authorizes 600:7 automatic 600:20 automatically 609:21 640:3 665:4 available 602:18 633:11 656:23 658:1 669:3 695:15 706:19 718:7 722:21 Avenue 542:5,12 average 585:24 603:13 690:3 averaging 599:9 avoid 586:22 600:20 696:19 aware 652:20</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">B</p> <hr/> <p>b 549:9 628:14 637:14 646:2 723:7 B2H 542:10 545:1 559:20 561:2 562:7,11 566:12 571:22 586:4,6,23 588:1 592:13 598:9 601:4,6 604:17 605:7 610:12,23 611:2 612:2,4 629:6,12 630:5 694:11 695:10 697:14 698:3,22 B2H's 600:2 603:11 614:22 615:3 back 543:6 544:4 544:20 552:10 557:10,11 564:1 592:6 594:14 605:23 613:14</p>	<p>616:24 634:11 640:14 641:13 659:4,17 660:10 660:15 661:5,20 662:20 667:1,2 674:19 679:11 684:11,12 696:4 700:16 709:16,23 709:25 710:2,4,7 715:2 717:7 720:7 723:1,25 back-traffic 554:6 background 546:21 552:16 558:7 607:13 612:6 685:5 687:4 705:22 backslash 595:1 backstop 662:2 Baker 683:1 685:9 balance 580:14 balanced 580:17,18 613:17 bar 548:7 barking 554:5 based 572:18 575:10 579:10 585:19 599:8 611:4 623:7 649:14 655:24 682:15,15 687:19 688:6 700:21 705:15,17 706:3 706:12 707:3 714:10 baseline 551:12 552:16 553:17 557:22,25 558:1 572:24 598:25 599:21 601:20,20 602:1,11 603:7 613:10,13 baselines 602:12 bases 587:12 basic 562:19 565:11 604:25</p>	<p>basically 570:17 612:18 643:25 685:13 basis 563:13 566:10 570:6,21 586:8 624:5 670:14 671:17 672:7 674:17 Bastash 588:1 599:6 battery 553:2 Bear 548:7 682:2 beginning 621:24 622:20 633:24 710:15 716:2 Begins 619:1 behalf 578:11 607:3 707:23 Beier 541:6 543:21 543:22 571:8,9 593:4,5,6 597:19 597:20 629:4,5 630:1,23 638:21 638:21 680:25 681:1 692:8,9,10 695:7 700:2,3 709:7,8 712:10,11 713:24,25 717:23 717:24 724:15,16 beings 672:8 belay 678:6 believe 570:23 594:2,4 595:2 606:6 610:8 615:11,15,21 626:13 628:23 630:7,13 636:22 642:18 646:2 648:22 654:6 656:16 657:15 658:14,25 673:19 676:15,20 677:6 679:12 681:6 715:17 believes 659:2 707:10</p>
--	--	---	---	---

belongs 645:16	bold 622:25	business 580:3,4	case 540:5 545:21	636:1 648:21
beneficial 679:8,9	bothered 593:1	634:18 639:16,24	559:16 560:4,18	653:9 691:4
712:21	671:22,24 672:9	661:1 725:3,5	562:6 569:13	694:13
best 546:20 615:21	672:19	buy 652:19 671:14	571:4 574:25	certificate 547:10
618:22 631:8	bottom 583:5,16		575:13,17 576:18	560:11 567:8
672:20 726:12	617:9 655:16	C	581:1 584:21,24	572:17 580:10
better 557:18 565:4	bound 563:11	c 541:1 542:1	585:5 596:5	584:13 598:24
624:15 644:3	boundary 559:24	621:19 630:1	597:16 599:13	621:20 627:6
645:21 656:17	559:24 560:8,25	654:23 655:13,15	607:19 608:1	628:17 634:16,22
677:14	561:15 562:4	655:17 680:12	609:5,12,16 610:1	647:4 655:21
beyond 557:4	564:6 568:21	726:2,2	610:16,22 616:14	662:24,25 663:2,3
595:25	682:22	calculation 700:20	616:21 617:5	663:10,19 664:25
big 549:9 570:18	break 659:11,17	Calendar 717:24	620:9,16 621:15	666:11,20 668:15
583:17	662:20,22 709:16	calibrate 605:19	622:9,20 623:3	669:1 673:4 676:1
bigger 548:9	709:23 710:2,5	606:1	625:4 628:23	680:9 696:15,18
646:20	brevity 606:18	calibrated 605:23	649:7 651:9	712:1 715:7
billion-dollar	brief 658:8,11	606:2,4	653:12 670:1,5	certificates 663:16
650:10	696:7 707:4	calibration 606:5	679:24,25 683:18	Certified 726:8
bills 649:4	briefing 584:21	call 543:7,10	686:15 687:10	certify 726:10
binding 584:17	654:15	544:19,19,20	692:20 693:6	chair 541:4 543:5
bird 671:6,7	briefly 584:9 664:6	547:21 550:17	694:20 695:13	543:12,24,25
birds 554:5	693:13	558:9,18 713:14	699:22 702:12,16	544:2,15 546:7
bit 546:12 547:17	bring 591:8,8	713:15 718:21	702:24 704:2	564:20 567:14
588:8 589:3	648:21 711:17	722:18,20 723:16	705:21 708:5,22	569:9 570:22
593:17 601:14	brings 653:23	724:10	708:22 711:12	571:5,7 578:8
611:12 617:23	702:13	called 558:15 604:3	715:21 716:4,17	580:21 583:24
629:7 641:10	broad 576:13 579:5	605:25 697:12	717:4,13 718:16	584:2 588:11
653:7 656:14,21	627:22	703:13	719:19	593:4 595:12
677:9 687:4	broadcast 544:22	calling 710:6	cases 575:16	596:10,18 597:6
693:16 697:5	brought 630:5	calls 633:2	catastrophic	597:12,18 598:3
711:6	693:25 697:18,21	calm 599:23	687:21	603:8 605:10
bite 632:18	719:8 720:7	capacity 573:24	cause 587:17 588:2	606:22 607:1
blasting 544:7	brown 549:2	701:19 703:20	674:12 687:17,20	608:7,23 609:2
583:5 632:5	brush 627:22	707:12	688:9 694:23	610:8 611:21
710:18 711:13,14	bucket 548:4	Capitol 541:13	caused 585:20	614:8 616:7 618:2
711:24 712:3,5,25	build 672:18	capture 616:18	690:7	618:21 619:6
713:8	building 563:16	623:5 625:25	causing 672:11	620:13,18,21
blind 583:19	580:7,19 650:10	captured 606:11	CCR 540:24,24	622:16 625:2,10
block 577:25	built 613:6 694:10	624:25	726:19,20	626:1,17 627:13
blowing 589:25	built-in 685:24	car 583:17,19	cell 544:17 653:17	631:20 634:1,3
board 696:5	bunch 602:22	care 583:12 643:6,8	cement 583:18,20	635:13 636:3,7
boarding 546:13	bundle 553:10	661:15 692:1	center 656:3	637:4,9,15 638:15
Boardman 540:6	burden 649:9	careful 613:24	certain 549:23	638:18 639:5,9,19
545:22	650:8,9,15 665:2	carefully 613:16	683:24,24 694:8	639:24 640:8,10
body 642:17	burdensome	Carey 600:2	certainly 588:17,18	640:22,25 641:6,8
667:20,25	648:11	carries 724:25	588:18 614:15	641:20 642:1,8,18

642:20,25 643:2 643:10 644:8 645:2,18,22 647:13 650:18 651:8,16,21,23 652:6 653:24 654:22 655:3,10 659:12,16 660:5 660:17,21,23,24 661:10,24 662:3,9 662:13,16 663:14 665:5 667:2,8,10 667:13,22 668:3 670:21 671:2 673:1,14,22 675:2 675:8 676:13,23 677:8,11,14,16,22 678:5,9 679:1,5 679:10,19 680:16 680:22,25 681:6 681:12,24 685:16 691:11 692:5 693:9 695:21 699:15,24 700:1 700:15 704:22 705:4 707:19 708:11 709:4,13 709:24 710:6,11 712:9,19 713:3,10 713:15,19 717:16 717:22 719:3 720:5 722:10,22 723:2,4,23 724:5 724:7,10,14 725:1 725:2,4,6 challenged 702:21 chance 601:7 632:11 672:4 711:6 change 563:11 564:15 565:9 610:5 623:8 624:1 624:10 625:6 631:25 632:8,21 632:24 633:2 644:12 645:8	646:20 666:2 667:3 677:4,18 691:22 694:11 714:24 715:5 718:23 719:7 720:13,16 721:25 722:11,16 changed 617:12 636:15 676:21 677:18 706:25 changes 556:11 565:15 592:19 612:10 614:3,20 615:10 617:8,19 617:24 618:3 619:2 620:14,21 621:13 622:6 623:5,14 631:6 632:6,7,14,24 633:12 637:8 642:22 646:13 667:17 668:1,6 670:24 675:3 676:8,12,25 678:1 678:5 680:2 696:24 699:16 703:16 704:5,6 708:14 714:12,15 714:21,23 715:1 718:13,20 720:2 721:21 722:9,14 722:18 changing 622:13 643:23 Chapter 565:20,22 chart 601:24 check 552:9 601:15 642:16,18 checking 589:7 chirping 554:5 Chocktoot 541:5 543:19,20 571:14 571:15 597:21,22 642:23,24 643:1 662:14,15 667:11 667:12 675:5,6	677:2,3,8,10,13 677:15,17 680:17 680:18 700:9,10 709:9,10 713:22 713:23 724:21,22 choice 597:3 653:6 709:22 choose 575:6 chose 604:8 chosen 601:21 Christopher 541:12 544:12 710:19 Cindy 541:6 543:17 569:16 571:16 588:15 597:23 635:17 636:9 641:9 655:14 666:5 680:23 697:2 700:11 709:5 713:16 719:3,4 724:23 circumstances 549:24 555:18,18 579:21 642:7 721:17 cite 701:17 cited 601:24 696:10 citizens 556:7 574:3 575:2 581:5 581:9,10 583:1 612:15 615:23 City 582:24 claim 587:3 701:14 claimed 606:10 claiming 612:19 claims 612:13 clarification 643:17 715:24 clarified 660:18 clarify 622:7 637:23 644:13 660:5,14 Clark 541:12 544:12 710:19	class 581:15 700:21 701:16 705:15 classification 703:21 classifications 706:11 classified 690:3 clean 586:25 671:7 clear 562:13 577:6 581:22 612:23 635:3 636:10 638:1,8 655:15 672:22 689:13 691:1 699:4,10 720:25 721:9 clearance 684:15 686:1 clearing 685:23 clearly 544:24 566:5 577:14 584:23 585:13 616:2 629:20 635:24 640:17 652:2 clicking 545:7 clock 603:25 718:11 close 602:5 closer 599:19 closing 580:3,5 611:2 716:5 code 707:25 708:3 collect 598:18 656:2 658:12 collected 599:17 collecting 657:13 collection 675:13 comb 718:22 Combine 645:10 combined 679:14 703:9,20 combustion 686:20 come 552:21 572:12 583:10 589:11 590:15 591:5 612:2	616:23 618:20,22 632:25 635:22 641:3,13 651:2 653:21 659:17 660:15 662:20 664:23 665:14,15 682:2 709:16,23 709:25 710:4 comes 576:24 638:23,25 651:21 660:19 669:7 comfortable 593:13,19,22 596:9 630:24 631:15 640:17 641:5 643:24 644:5 652:5 653:9 673:12 coming 583:18,19 661:1,5 665:8 717:7 comment 545:3 569:7 570:1,2,4 582:22,24 608:25 632:14 650:20 652:11,11 714:25 716:1 718:24 722:1,8,21 comments 545:15 588:19 607:4 616:10 645:7 650:18 695:25 696:7 705:12 712:9 commerce 548:11 Commission 556:23 562:10 573:3,5 581:12 662:1 682:8 693:21 commitment 723:17 committed 566:10 589:18 commonly 558:18 company 563:15
---	--	--	--	--

582:9,11 586:22 589:14,18 591:3 592:11 671:17 693:18,19 694:4 694:14 705:19 712:25 company's 603:13 603:16 693:16 comparable 690:10 compare 620:23 compared 617:20 comparison 557:21 compensation 695:19 696:13,19 complainant 616:4 648:14,16 649:18 649:23 653:22 655:18,20 658:1 664:17,22 complainant's 653:6 664:14 complaint 574:19 589:4 590:25 591:4 593:2 600:24 613:3 615:23 616:2,3,6 620:3 622:3 625:21 627:4,7 629:3,20 646:10 646:12,22 648:21 654:6,17,20 655:1 655:1,21,22,22,23 656:9 658:13,14 658:15 661:19 663:18,20 664:10 672:7,19 673:11 676:15,22 680:8 complaints 574:18 602:16 648:25 672:1 complete 723:18 completely 603:16 643:6 648:11 649:7 665:13 671:4,10 690:25 completes 668:21	compliance 548:6 557:3 567:12 568:10 579:21 580:2 584:16 586:1,4 598:11,14 599:7 663:3,21 664:5 665:21,25 683:24 702:7 716:20 compliant 701:11 complicated 666:25 complied 580:20 complies 572:7 584:13 682:5 comply 580:6 683:5 702:25 component 574:21 692:11,12 components 683:3 715:3 comprehensive 649:9 682:11 683:25 701:10,17 computer 619:5 concept 624:24 675:16 concepts 624:20 conceptual 624:5 conceptually 668:7 671:1 concern 569:7 604:4,7 626:4,22 627:10 639:4 641:10 642:3 648:19 649:6,8 650:5 656:22 673:16 693:23 698:4 712:24 concerned 566:13 583:4,6 590:2,5 590:24 623:13,18 641:6 647:7 648:15 656:25 698:10 concerning 588:16	694:17 concerns 566:22,24 590:9 592:13 607:21,22 614:23 614:24 630:15 632:10 634:14 692:14 712:24 conclude 602:10 723:7 concluded 600:4 611:7 687:6 688:19 701:8,23 717:2 concludes 559:13 conclusion 547:9 561:23 597:5 600:5 701:4 conclusions 571:3 597:15 679:21 689:3 699:21 708:19 711:9 concurred 600:10 condemn 704:18 condition 574:13 589:7 590:20 592:10 608:11,22 609:15 613:22 614:5 615:8 616:13,14,15,25 617:7 619:21 620:9 621:10,14 621:24 622:20,21 625:1 626:5,6,13 626:19,20 628:11 628:14 629:16,19 629:20 630:2,6 632:1 633:13,15 633:20,25 634:6,9 634:10,11,13,15 635:9 636:18 637:5,8,12,16,17 638:1,9 641:18 643:6,9,11,19,20 643:23 644:1,10 644:10,22 645:3,9 645:12,17,17,19	645:24 651:18 653:25 654:4,25 655:15 659:13,19 662:4,7,18,20 664:13,13 667:15 668:1,3,7 669:23 670:6,7,10,15 673:4,7,8,13 675:3,9 677:24 678:1,1,5 680:2,3 696:15,25 699:17 708:14 710:17,23 710:24 711:16 721:15 conditional 683:25 721:7,9 conditionally 684:10 conditions 549:25 550:1,6 557:1,4 567:4,8 571:3 574:12,24 581:12 581:16 587:19,21 588:7 589:6 591:2 593:18 596:3,8 597:2,15 600:21 602:16,21 609:24 610:14,20,24 611:1,8,14,16,20 612:7,11,19,25 613:2,16,18 614:13,18,21 615:3 618:24 619:12 623:19 627:3,4 628:20,24 629:1 630:16,25 631:1,10,11,16,19 632:7,11,14,25 633:6 635:2,5,20 635:25 644:7,19 644:19 646:15 654:16 655:23 658:11 676:21 679:21 680:7,7 683:21,23 685:20 686:10,20,22	687:8 688:8 689:12 699:22 708:19 711:9 714:23 716:5,8,10 716:16,23 717:1,3 717:11 720:6 721:21 Condon 541:6 543:17,18 569:15 569:16,16 571:16 571:17 588:13,14 588:15 591:21 592:2,5 593:3 597:23,24 635:16 635:17,17 636:9,9 636:16,23 637:2 641:9,9,24 650:21 651:25 652:8,9 654:23 655:12,14 655:14 656:7 657:25 659:21 662:11 666:4,5,5 666:12,15,18,23 673:24,25 674:22 680:23,24 697:1,2 697:2 698:25 699:9,14 700:11 700:12 709:5,6 712:19,20 713:16 713:17 719:3,4,4 720:4 721:5 724:23,24 conduct 545:19 conducted 545:11 555:1 conductor 669:10 671:11,14,15 conferring 715:14 confirmed 599:6 690:11 confirms 588:1 701:25 conflict 703:6 confused 697:5 confusing 646:5 connected 698:22
--	---	---	---	--

consequence 588:22	619:25 621:20 627:6 696:20	continuing 545:20 610:9	597:25 598:2,4,6 620:24,25 621:4,5	correctly 564:1 576:20 695:3 704:4
consequences 698:19	711:25 712:1	continuously 692:21	642:4,5 644:8,9 679:15,16,20	cost 556:9 580:19
Conservation 682:7 706:13	construe 565:12	contractor 712:2 713:9	680:17,19,21,23 681:2,4 699:20,25	council 540:2,4 541:15 543:9
conservative 549:7 554:14,18 559:2,6 559:9 585:25 587:24 604:9	consult 573:2	contradicts 690:25	700:2,4,7,9,11,13 708:16 709:1,3,5 709:7,9,11,18	544:9,11,14,22,23 545:7,10,13,16 546:7,11 547:1,3 547:7,19 548:5 551:3,19 555:7 556:17,22 557:13 558:7,8,11 559:3 560:9 561:19 562:18 563:25 564:21 567:15 568:9,18 569:10 569:15 570:4 571:25 572:6,19 573:1,8,16 574:21 575:18 578:9,14 580:22 582:25 584:19 588:12 590:16,16 591:11 593:9 595:13,22 597:7,12 600:16 601:1 603:9 606:23 607:6,18 608:8,24 611:15 611:21 613:1 614:9 616:5,8 617:19 620:12 624:13 628:25 629:14 630:22 631:14 632:1 635:6,14 638:15 638:15,23,23 639:1,5,6,7,9,11 639:15,18,19,23 639:24 640:3,4,6 640:7,8,14,15,18 640:23,25 641:1,4 641:6,13,17,19,20 641:23 642:6,8,11 642:12,15,17,18 642:21 643:3
conservatively 706:20	consultant 600:9	contrary 595:21 690:16 707:1	710:8,9,10 713:14 713:16,18,20,22 713:24 714:1,3 715:14 718:1,2 719:12,13 721:11 721:12 722:12,13 722:24 723:3,6 724:11,12,15,17 724:19,21,23,25 725:4	
consider 555:7 556:6,8,22 581:3 585:4 587:13 596:13 618:14 623:23 694:17 697:25 700:22	consultation 685:25	control 546:3,24 548:10 552:8 557:4 568:10 572:20 574:1 594:20 597:5 600:14 609:24 610:24 611:1,13 612:7 614:1 619:21 621:24 628:20,24 630:2 635:2 644:18,19 675:3 679:23 680:6,7	corona 549:19,23 549:25 550:3,5,7 550:7 553:7,9,24 554:20 555:21 577:15 585:20 587:15,21 592:25 610:21 648:24 649:8 664:8,13 669:3,6,15 671:12 672:6,12 674:7,12 674:18 675:13 676:3	
consideration 553:15 557:9 570:5	contact 585:12 654:18 712:22,24 712:25 713:8	controlling 550:9	554:20 555:21 577:15 585:20 587:15,21 592:25 610:21 648:24 649:8 664:8,13 669:3,6,15 671:12 672:6,12 674:7,12 674:18 675:13 676:3	
considered 574:9 600:11 613:1 663:9 696:1 706:2 707:13	contacted 713:1	controversy 586:4	674:18 675:13 676:3	
considering 701:2	contemplate 551:25	conversation 624:12,13 628:5 643:22 652:23 722:25	correct 591:13 592:8 605:20 609:5,14 610:2 612:20 615:15 616:5 618:2 621:10,11 625:10 631:23 635:19 661:13 670:23 674:21 676:15 698:14 702:18 720:11	
consistent 545:13 568:19,25 706:15 706:17 717:10	contended 613:22	conversations 570:11	correction 608:15 608:21	
consisting 707:11	content 565:22 616:19	converted 719:23	corrections 714:18 715:16,21	
consolidate 597:10	contested 540:4 545:21 559:16 560:4 562:6 569:13 571:4 574:25 575:16,17 576:18 581:1 596:5 597:16 599:13 607:19 608:1 609:5,12,16 609:25 610:16,22 616:14,21 617:5 620:9,16 621:15 622:9,19 623:3 625:3 628:23 670:1,5 679:24,25 683:18 686:15 687:10 699:22 702:12,16,24 704:2 708:5,22,22 711:11 715:21 716:4,17 717:4,13 718:15 719:19	convinced 613:18		
consolidated 596:24	Continued 542:1	coordinates 639:19 639:20		
consolidating 572:16		Coordinator 541:12		
constitute 632:7		copies 618:1		
constitutes 722:14		corner 583:19		
constraints 556:11 586:22 695:12		Cornett 541:7 543:11,13,15,17 543:19,21,23 544:2 570:22,24 571:1,6,8,10,12 571:14,16,18 596:18,19 597:11 597:14,19,21,23		
constructing 549:15 551:23				
construction 549:16 551:22,25 552:2,6 565:11 589:8 590:12 591:1,3 613:5,7				

<p>650:7,18 651:3,9 651:24 652:4 653:21 654:3,11 654:25 657:8 659:4,8 660:16,19 660:20 661:5,7,8 661:14,18,20,21 661:23,23 662:4 664:23,24 665:9 665:16,16,24 666:1 667:3,20,24 669:21,25 670:11 673:1 676:23,24 679:17 681:21 682:4 684:25 685:14 692:7 695:22 696:23 699:16 701:1 704:1,5,7 705:5 707:20 708:12,13 709:21 710:7,16 712:9 713:4,11,13 714:12,16 716:20 717:6,17,18 718:3 718:25 719:1,22 720:6 722:16 723:12 725:6,9 726:11 Council's 546:14 547:7,11,11 552:19 557:9 572:5,13,15 573:11 628:4 677:23 682:3,17 709:18,24 715:6 Councillor 588:13 593:4,5 605:12 629:4 635:16 636:3 638:21 642:23 645:22 647:13 650:21 652:7 654:23 655:12 657:25 662:13 666:4,12 667:10 673:24 675:5 677:2,8</p>	<p>692:8,9 697:1 712:19 717:22 Councillors 673:22 Councilmember 543:14,16,18,20 543:22 569:16 571:9,11,13,15,17 588:14 591:21 592:2,5 593:3,5 594:13 597:8,20 597:22,24 598:1,5 605:13 606:21 608:9,25 609:11 609:25 610:4,6 611:23 620:15,19 620:22 624:18 629:4 630:1,20,23 634:2,4,6,10,20 635:17 636:4,9,16 636:23 637:2 638:21 640:24 641:9,24 642:9,24 643:1 645:5,10,13 645:19 647:14 651:12,17,25 652:9 655:14 656:7 658:5,21 659:21 662:6,11 662:15 666:5,15 666:18,23 667:5,9 667:12 673:14,25 674:22 675:6 677:3,10,13,15,17 678:8 679:6 680:18,20,24 681:1,3 692:9 695:6 697:2 698:25 699:9,14 700:3,5,8,10,12 708:25 709:2,6,8 709:10 712:10,11 712:20 713:5,17 713:21,23,25 714:2 717:24 719:4 720:4 721:5 722:10 724:3,6,8</p>	<p>724:16,18,20,22 724:24 Councilmembers 541:3 571:19 598:7 681:5 694:3 700:14 709:12 714:4 718:7,11 counsel 567:17 569:9 595:14 596:10 607:1 610:9 616:9 620:6 631:20 660:17 679:11 695:23 700:15 707:21 counties 601:23 602:1,12 603:3 612:15 683:1 685:3 694:5 county 576:7 577:20 579:20 598:23 599:15 602:11 603:2,7 683:2 684:1,3,6 685:7,9,10 687:20 694:2 698:12 701:10,11,14,16 701:19,24,25 702:3 703:5,5,22 704:19 705:13,15 705:16,23,25 706:5,7,12,22 707:8,25 708:2,4 708:7 726:6 County/Umatilla 698:12 couple 560:19 567:24 576:3,6 583:22 607:4 685:20 709:19 715:3 coupled 673:10 course 607:19,25 court 541:17,22 576:7,11 579:4 659:7,22 696:23 705:8 726:8</p>	<p>courteous 545:11 cover 577:3 613:24 614:15,25 625:17 627:20 covered 564:6 624:7 626:4 627:21 667:6 681:17 covers 646:14 677:7,19 694:9 create 544:25 564:3 604:14 613:2,4,17 626:23 663:12 created 653:12 creates 600:20 Creek 602:3 criss-crossing 553:20 criteria 573:19 682:6,9,10,16 683:8,10,12 684:2 critical 586:24 689:22 690:1,4,4 691:9 704:16 criticisms 605:7 cropland 689:23 690:22 cropping 690:19 cross 684:7 crossed 612:16 684:5 crosses 548:25 682:25 683:1 704:21 crossing 698:5 crucial 691:9 crux 601:9 CRYSTAL 540:24 726:8,19 cubic 701:15,20 703:11 707:12 culminate 715:6 curious 717:25 current 641:25 669:8 705:17</p>	<p>706:24 currently 585:1 593:25 610:2 645:20 curtailment 580:3</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">D</p> <hr/> <p>daily 586:8 588:5 672:24 damage 674:11 687:25 688:10 691:15 data 551:11 586:8 586:11,15 598:18 599:14,17,21,22 600:2,4 601:11 605:1 652:3 653:18,22 657:22 658:15 675:13,23 687:19 702:3,3 706:12,19 database 706:14 date 655:21,23 659:2 dates 724:5 day 540:9 554:12 586:12,14,18 599:22 602:6 656:10,10 657:17 710:15 726:15 days 577:16,20,24 577:25 578:2 579:19 586:9,10 656:12 701:2 711:24 dBAs 550:15,20 554:22 558:4,22 558:23 559:7 572:24 594:7 598:21 599:4,24 599:24,24,25 601:21 602:2 603:6 604:12,12 604:13 607:13 653:16 dBAs 602:1</p>
---	---	--	---	--

<p>de-energizing 693:18 694:7 698:12 deadline 691:8 deaf 607:21 deal 672:20 dealing 651:13 dealt 637:5 decibels 550:15 652:14 decide 575:20 590:16 616:5 639:25 649:25 722:22 decided 722:16 decides 638:15 decision 576:11 638:23 640:13 641:1,12,12 642:2 642:2 660:9 661:17,20,24 681:22 689:9 702:21 704:8 719:1 decision-maker 556:18 660:11 decisions 547:4,20 573:11 576:7,8 declaration 691:8 declines 670:4 deem 557:1 581:16 deemed 574:19 deeper 635:22 default 638:22,25 641:19 660:20 defer 638:16 639:5 639:10 642:8 deference 576:24 deferral 640:11,12 660:15 661:4,20 667:22,25 deferred 637:21 641:15 661:14,16 define 561:21 defined 647:21 definitely 565:15</p>	<p>definition 558:13 686:15 degradation 550:17,18 554:21 555:3 558:3 573:19 577:15 599:8 607:9,13 674:25 degrade 674:2,7,17 delay 547:17 670:9 delegation 660:8 demonstrate 716:19 demonstrated 585:24 705:19 demonstrates 649:24 687:14 688:24 702:20 denied 575:10,23 580:10 deny 556:19 575:9 Department 540:1 541:3,8,16,20,21 545:25 546:1,9,25 555:15 556:2,5,12 556:13 559:21 560:10,20 561:8 561:10,18,25 563:21 564:1 567:18,19 568:12 568:17,20,24 569:4,17 571:24 574:8,9 578:14 581:3 582:5,16 593:8,11 595:22 598:13 600:8 607:2,3 608:6,13 608:20 610:23 611:3,5,8 612:12 612:22 613:21 617:2 618:18 622:10 627:7 629:15 632:12,23 632:23 634:17,17 637:22,22,24 638:6,11,17,24</p>	<p>639:6,20 640:12 640:16 641:11,15 641:22 654:7 656:17,20 660:6,9 660:11,24 661:2,4 661:7,14,17,19 666:13 668:19,24 668:24 670:3 673:3,12 674:4 676:4,11 696:6,14 707:22,23 708:8 710:21 723:12 Department's 558:18 559:25 560:5,12 561:3 562:21 573:16 579:7 610:3,19 719:17 depending 721:16 depends 713:6 deposition 703:7 706:16 deprive 586:24 DEQ 547:20,24 548:2 551:16 558:9 572:14 573:3,5 577:3,3 578:15 580:14 585:1,10,12 594:16,19,23 595:2,3,17,22 606:3 607:8 DEQ's 547:4 558:24 572:1,20 575:19 585:22 588:2 described 608:2 609:22 650:14 664:12 666:19 696:17 describing 609:19 664:21 description 658:8 designated 689:17 705:17 706:18 detail 591:2 592:7</p>	<p>592:9 593:20 596:4 611:12 614:13 625:25 644:4 685:5 detailed 591:4 627:22 656:14,14 663:17 details 576:12 611:21 629:18 654:20 722:2,7 deterioration 574:3 determination 573:3 660:6,24 661:2 663:7 678:11 687:3 700:25 702:4,11 702:17 703:4 704:2,11 705:11 705:20 707:2 708:10 determinations 665:24 706:23 determine 572:7,19 577:7 600:3 635:6 676:2 702:1 703:1 703:19 705:14 706:1,8,10 determined 572:9 582:18 608:17 660:25 664:8,12 706:6 determines 565:23 641:20 determining 568:10 701:21 develop 627:6 675:18 developed 549:3 686:24 developer 577:23 703:19 development 675:12 682:7 developments 614:1 deviate 546:12</p>	<p>devices 554:11 devils 687:17 dial 544:20 diametrically 697:9 dictate 677:20 difference 600:15 600:16 633:4 636:24 672:22 699:1 different 585:14 590:18 623:17,19 624:7,16,17,21 626:5 631:12,17 632:19 686:25 691:14,23 697:23 707:5 differentiating 701:21 difficult 576:1 616:18 641:25 648:11 658:19 difficulty 580:19 dig 593:17 diligent 691:20 diminution 695:20 direct 563:6 629:25 638:24 660:5,23 690:18 701:24 direction 551:9,13 659:8 717:21 directive 594:17 595:18 directly 594:22 638:25 689:5 Director 708:4 dirty 649:24 disagree 615:7 663:15 disagreement 590:14 591:10 697:6,12 disagreements 704:14 disaster 693:6 discern 659:5</p>
--	--	--	---	--

<p>discovery 594:18 discrete 687:1 discretion 639:25 639:25 660:25 709:19 discuss 654:11 discussed 607:5,8 667:21 707:24 719:6 discusses 617:7 670:2 discussing 609:7 612:11 651:11 656:21 673:12 discussion 593:17 596:7 611:12,20 621:3 657:4 660:2 660:12 670:15 681:14 discussions 621:21 622:8 623:8 695:19 dismiss 708:9 dismissal 702:16 disposed 705:10 disposition 701:6 dispute 563:4 601:9 612:18 638:14,22,25 639:6,8 651:3 653:19 657:7 660:3 disputed 667:7 disputes 574:22 639:17,23 640:2,5 641:21 653:20 702:20 703:14 disrupt 545:16 disruption 577:22 614:11 619:22 663:6 696:3 disrupts 545:19 distance 554:5 687:14 distinguish 636:17 distributed 654:8</p>	<p>655:1 680:9 dive 635:22 Division 560:1 568:22 divisions 576:8 DLCD 576:7 document 560:14 620:10 625:5 675:7 677:6 694:8 697:23 698:16,23 703:8 714:14,19 714:20 719:20 720:1 documents 545:9 626:15 703:23 719:16,17,24,25 720:19 721:4 dogs 554:5 doing 547:4 552:18 578:21 616:11 623:18 683:18 710:20 DOJ 638:12 650:19 dollars 649:2 650:13 671:13 704:20 doors 587:19 down-and-dirty 650:23 dozen 639:22 DPO 705:12 DR 542:10 draft 556:4 624:22 709:20 711:13 714:17 715:4 717:8 718:8,18 719:17 720:2 drowned 550:5 duplicative 615:8 duration 599:10 dust 687:16 dynamic 694:10</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">E</p> <hr/> <p>e 541:1,1 542:1,1 555:18 646:19,24</p>	<p>659:23,25 726:2,2 ear 604:14 607:22 earlier 592:7 609:19 656:12 660:4,12 678:15 712:14 718:10,20 easements 688:18 easiest 658:25 easy 649:17 651:6 easy-to-understa... 635:12 644:16 680:5 eat 711:6 edge 688:17 edits 669:24 effect 550:7 577:4 585:3 effective 624:11 effects 566:20 575:22 efficiency 661:7,25 efficient 640:4 effort 563:18 723:10,13,18,21 efforts 666:19 EFSC 541:12,15 584:11 585:3 594:15,21 595:18 637:24 638:2,8,9 660:5,9 EFSC's 584:16 EFU 548:25 eight 543:6 550:22 either 583:20 600:16 611:16 614:21 665:3,17 675:11 718:6 719:17 electric 684:8 electrical 698:18 element 721:7 Eleventh 542:5 eliminated 673:18 email 545:6 605:22 711:3 embedded 578:12</p>	<p>embodied 685:1 emergency 563:13 563:14,15,18 694:8 emissions 574:5 581:23 emphasize 566:18 ended 569:5 662:4 662:7 681:22 energized 590:23 592:15,24 615:17 694:13 energizing 613:5 energy 540:1,2 541:3,8,9,20 543:8 545:10,25 546:10 551:5,5 567:19 586:25 598:13 607:3 707:23 725:8 726:10 enforce 594:22 630:25 enforced 584:15 enforcement 663:4 663:10 enforcing 585:2 engages 545:18 engineer 694:25 engineers 649:12 enormous 663:22 ensure 595:19 684:14 694:3 712:1 ensuring 604:25 entire 579:10,14 613:3 668:10 675:19 entirely 707:3 709:18,21 entirety 633:14 entities 561:17 entitled 567:11 environment 573:5 691:17,23 environmental</p>	<p>547:1 573:2 574:7 581:25 EQC 578:15 585:1 594:19 595:23 equally 664:1 equipment 552:24 553:1,3 605:19,24 605:25 606:1,2 650:2 652:19 equities 580:14 erred 571:24 598:13 623:4 694:17 error 566:10 573:17 715:13,15 errors 632:13 especially 686:9 essence 691:3 essentially 569:3 573:8 607:7 675:12 716:15 establish 551:11 554:9 561:21 568:4,5,12,17 570:7,12 established 560:23 562:1 569:22 577:3 establishes 572:6 572:15 684:8 establishing 556:5 561:11 581:3 establishment 557:24 569:24 575:24 Esterson 541:10 719:14 estimated 608:16 ethical 705:1 ethically 703:4 evaluate 548:5 574:18 598:11,14 598:20 599:7 644:10 703:12 704:6 721:19 722:17</p>
--	---	---	--	--

<p>evaluated 556:14 598:24 687:8,12 688:3,23 evaluating 569:5 708:6 evaluation 552:5 556:19 557:8 598:19 600:18,22 704:5 705:16 evening 659:6 event 555:22 578:3 events 585:21 everybody 567:9 613:7 615:25 622:2 631:9 633:16 644:25 654:21 657:19 664:4 676:17 696:4 723:9,11,16 723:19,21 evidence 547:9 573:15 585:16 587:5 588:1 594:16 602:3 651:20 657:8 687:13 688:24 690:8,20 691:9,10 694:17,19 706:9 707:25 exacerbated 630:7 exactly 566:7 594:9 619:17 621:6 631:9 706:7 example 552:23 575:20 606:11 613:24 615:14 619:20 621:18 exceed 550:20 572:23 596:12 607:11,12 exceedance 567:2 577:13,18,18 578:6,6 586:10,13 586:14,18 587:17 589:10,20,21 590:10,23 591:13</p>	<p>591:14,18,19,24 594:6 608:12 626:7,12 648:14 648:23,24 649:24 653:13 659:3 664:18 665:11 672:14 exceedances 573:18 574:15 579:16 585:20 587:7,23 588:2,22 594:7,8,12 600:13 602:15,17 608:16 608:17,19 609:17 609:20 636:20,21 637:1 exceeded 653:16 exceeding 577:15 exceeds 555:3 664:9,14 exception 545:22 555:7,16,23 556:5 572:21 573:10,17 575:10,19,21 576:1,18 579:9,14 580:1 582:6 584:20 585:4,15 585:22 587:13 588:7 593:10,14 598:9 600:19 604:17 678:11,15 685:1 692:12 704:1 exceptions 551:15 552:8,14 556:12 556:20 559:16 566:16 571:23 575:5 581:2,3 582:17,21 584:25 593:7 594:21 595:1,6 601:8,25 603:6 605:16 612:9 619:17,18 678:21 681:21 693:12,23 697:17 698:10 714:6</p>	<p>excessive 574:4 exciting 546:17 555:25 excuse 564:25 565:17 566:12 580:25 629:23 637:11,12 executes 666:20 executive 661:24 exempt 551:24 exemption 551:21 555:14,19 563:7 exemptions 551:16 551:18 Exhibit 548:23 553:8 559:23 565:8 637:11 683:12 exhibits 636:10 exist 580:4 625:22 existence 669:7 678:21 existing 548:13 551:11 553:12,15 562:19 563:20 632:21 688:17 711:15 exists 691:1 717:12 expanded 566:24 625:17 629:12 expect 577:21 588:19 674:7 expectation 674:22 expected 588:4 590:11 591:18 626:12 648:9 688:7 expecting 656:1 expelled 545:19 expense 672:2 expensive 649:21 649:22 650:4 experience 558:21 650:25 653:2 703:2 experienced 659:3</p>	<p>690:21 expert 587:25 599:5 604:13,19 604:24,24 608:1 688:3 690:17 694:20,21 expertise 673:7 explain 617:1 618:16 654:17 explained 584:11 584:21 588:1 590:13 604:13 694:21 explanation 552:1 701:9 explicit 551:16 595:24 explicitly 595:18 717:10 expressed 584:12 expressly 600:7 extend 560:25 extending 562:3 569:6 extends 613:3 extent 560:23 676:5 678:17 695:15 697:24 extra 627:15 694:22 716:24 extreme 672:2 extremely 694:23 695:5,5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">F</p> <p>f 659:25 666:16 726:2 face 588:14 facilities 552:19,22 553:13,13 595:19 facility 540:2 541:9 543:8 545:10 546:23 547:11 548:25 549:8,18 550:20 551:5,6,24 552:21,24 553:19</p>	<p>553:19 557:22 560:22 565:24 566:2 568:3 570:10,16 572:7,9 572:20 574:7 579:14 598:21 600:15 607:10 619:25 625:18 651:15 673:10 682:5,14,15,24 683:2,13 684:5,6 684:13 711:25 725:9 726:11 fact 571:2 576:17 576:23 585:21 586:7 597:15 604:18 606:9 611:4 679:21 690:11 691:16 699:21 701:5 702:8,17 704:14 708:18 711:9 factor 570:11 factored 687:2 factors 574:10 657:2 facts 690:17 factual 702:20 failed 604:24 689:14,21,22 702:25 705:14 707:6,9,9 failing 694:17 fails 703:17 fair 616:5 fairly 604:3 683:15 722:15 faithful 665:23 fall 548:3 549:5 familiar 551:20 566:23 714:16 fantastic 589:24 far 544:5,9 582:23 613:20 far-away 554:6 far-ranging 584:8</p>
--	---	---	---	---

farm 689:16,17,24 690:13 691:3,14 693:3 705:24 708:6	filed 559:16 571:23 575:4 598:9 600:24 634:5 693:19 716:12	689:13,22 690:1,4 690:13,22,22 691:15,20,21 692:2,11 694:18 695:4	folded 718:17 foliage 587:23 590:7	600:1,6 604:13 663:18 664:23 687:13 688:2,11 695:3 696:2 701:13 702:5 710:20
farmed 692:22	filing 691:8	fire-related 687:25	folks 548:9 591:15 592:20 609:18 626:11 630:4	four 559:15 576:3 578:2 599:14,23 605:20 652:2 675:9,11 677:1,24 678:1,6 679:2,13 685:2 701:12 702:7
farmer 690:21	filings 690:9	firefighters 686:19	633:14 634:25 636:25 657:11	fourth 655:16
farmland 686:13 695:11 701:22 706:2	filtered 599:10	fires 688:9 690:10 691:15,16,19,25 694:21,24	follow 591:22 604:24 639:13 663:17 664:4,5 720:9	FOUTY 542:10
farmlands 689:1 695:20	final 566:18 625:5 632:8,15 633:1 660:11 662:2 678:18 684:12 714:17,19 715:5 717:8 718:8,18 719:1,20 720:1,2 720:3,13,23	first 559:19 562:12 572:5,13 584:11 589:8 598:15 611:19 612:5 619:20 625:24 627:25 637:5,12 643:12 654:21 668:4,6 674:6 680:13 686:15 693:25 697:18,20	follow-up 636:17 following 544:16 567:25 638:13 642:11 680:1 711:12	fraction 586:19
fashion 650:11	finalize 696:16	fit 644:14 645:21	food 709:25	framework 711:13
fast 645:23 688:8 722:4	finally 567:4 586:20 587:8 669:1 688:19	fits 644:3	foot 684:23 701:15	frankly 690:16
fast-moving 688:9	find 548:5,5 563:13 563:14 591:12 626:16 628:10 633:19 643:14 664:24 667:6 682:4 696:8	five 610:19 652:2 677:1 678:1,6 679:2 682:25 700:18 708:14	forecast 686:17	frequency 689:1
favor 662:12,12	finding 570:25 605:15 689:9 690:6,13 691:5 716:20	five-minute 659:11	foregoing 726:10	frequent 668:20
favoring 657:8	findings 555:12 556:4 571:2 573:9 584:16 597:15 679:21 689:3 690:25 699:21 702:17 708:18 711:8 719:22 721:20	flag 660:13 686:10 686:16,21 687:1,7 689:7,11 690:2	forest 684:7,10,14 684:18 685:2,8,22 700:22 705:23,24 706:25	frequently 587:22 668:18
feasibility 556:8	finds 557:2 581:23	flagged 657:25 720:14	forested 549:1	front 590:6 596:8 616:16 619:9 620:16 640:5 643:19 656:9 669:22
feasible 579:25	fine 597:11 644:4 645:15 661:17	flat 702:23	forestland 701:22 702:6 703:2,9,12 703:24 704:4,8,15 706:2,21 707:2,13	fuel 688:3,6
feature 544:25 545:2	finished 588:21	flattened 583:13	forestlands 700:21 705:14 706:18 708:6	full 544:24 573:24 591:19 600:22 611:25 616:18 630:15 631:10,15 644:21
feces 671:6,8	finishing 544:20 659:18	flexibility 600:20	forever 614:5	fully 588:8
feedback 544:25 570:2	fire 684:16 686:20 686:22 687:11,18 687:19 688:6	Floor 541:13 685:16	forgive 589:6	functional 612:17 613:17
feel 593:12 622:23 623:2,14,15 624:24 629:15 631:18 642:21 666:2 696:23 697:17 699:16 708:13		fly 631:6 722:4	forgot 558:7	fund 547:24
feeling 667:3		focus 575:11 586:11 603:19 623:24 668:7	form 633:18	fundamental 602:4 602:8
feels 624:15 665:18		focused 579:15 586:7 603:13 606:8	formal 600:22	funding 547:23
feet 684:9,13 701:20 703:11 707:12 712:3		focuses 633:21	forth 593:9 605:23	further 561:20 573:1 574:9 602:9 659:15,24 664:11 667:19 676:3
felt 625:23 654:15 668:19 697:16			forward 635:15 679:2 704:3	Furthermore 690:12
field 549:3 554:11 606:5 692:24			foul 573:21,22 585:21 587:16,20	
fields 688:13,17 692:18			found 560:5 561:7 561:15 567:1 573:4,14,18 574:6	
figure 564:13 621:1 648:4 718:22				
figuring 648:7				
file 646:10				

<p>future 556:9 669:4 677:20</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">G</p> <hr/> <p>G 542:11 gaining 551:11 gap 717:12 gather 657:22 658:19 general 546:2 547:7 548:4 549:1 558:11 569:19 generally 547:25 549:4,22 552:23 559:3 570:3 674:2 688:25 generic 625:23 Geographic 706:14 getting 547:6 561:13 718:8 GIBSON 542:5 Gilbert 542:16 571:22 575:7,7 579:18 586:6 700:19 701:9,13 702:13,14 704:22 704:24 705:7,9,13 707:5,14 Gilbert's 707:1 GIS 702:4 give 552:5,9,16 557:15 558:7 568:7 576:12 583:8 585:3,16 615:13 617:15 631:10 647:8 670:9 692:13 710:13 711:4,6 718:11 724:12 given 586:21 599:9 624:15 631:4 652:23 672:2,4 688:8 gives 658:2 663:22 giving 563:7 go 544:3 550:24</p>	<p>551:14 552:10,14 555:24,25 557:10 557:11 563:2,12 564:1 578:17,18 583:21 588:5 590:12 591:12,14 592:6 594:14 595:22 596:4 597:9 602:19,20 608:2 611:12,19 612:1 613:19 616:11,22 617:11 617:16 618:5,9 622:19,21 623:11 623:22 624:23 630:21 632:22 633:1,7 634:11 637:18 638:2,9,14 640:3 643:10 645:4 647:1 659:4 659:16 660:1 661:14 666:13 677:16 678:23 682:3 683:8,14,16 685:4 693:5 705:7 709:17 723:1 go-ahead 674:20 goal 685:2 701:12 702:7 goalpost 682:17 goals 682:6,13 goes 553:11 554:10 579:14 583:15 622:1 639:8 644:9 654:3 660:10 674:8,24 693:1 698:3 going 546:11,12,17 546:18,19,22 547:5,6,15,21 548:11,13 549:10 549:15 550:10 551:2 552:9 553:23 555:10,11 555:25 557:5 559:2 560:16</p>	<p>564:16,25 566:13 567:2,6,7,9,9 570:17 575:9,11 575:21,25 576:21 577:7,7,8,10 578:24 582:10,22 583:8,20,21,22 586:18 589:9 590:12,22 592:16 592:17,19 593:20 594:9 595:4,16 597:2 602:14 605:9 611:12 614:3,13 615:13 617:22 622:15,18 622:19,21 623:13 623:14 626:11 631:18 633:7 636:5 638:16 639:11 641:3,6,22 641:23 647:9,23 649:14,16 650:1 652:10 654:5,17 654:20 660:23 661:8 666:21 668:25 670:16 671:22 672:5,14 674:19 677:21 678:18,24 683:8 683:14 684:11,12 692:18,23,24 693:4,13 697:14 697:14 698:20 702:21 714:9 715:3 716:2 720:21,24,25 721:1 722:16 723:14,25 Golder 600:9 gonna 559:18 good 543:5 546:6,7 552:13 562:9 567:24 575:7 581:8 584:5 589:16 590:16,17 597:12,18 634:3</p>	<p>654:22 671:20 680:16 693:10 699:24 713:10 718:1 725:3 gosh 652:19 government 703:16 government's 682:11 governments 594:21 683:4,11 governs 562:24 grain 688:5 Grande 543:1 582:24 586:3 599:20 grant 556:19,23,23 571:25 573:16 578:15 579:5 581:13 587:13 593:13 594:15 678:16,22,24 granted 555:19 557:5 678:17 granting 579:13 581:12 588:6 600:19 granule 629:15 grass 688:4 grazing 702:2 great 593:9 633:22 693:6 greater 581:8 703:11 grid 586:25 ground 692:21 712:8 grounds 593:9 group 564:11 672:8 groups 689:18 Gu 691:7 guess 567:16 582:10 596:16 617:13 618:19,25 628:4 638:13 641:10,25 642:2 645:6 656:10</p>	<p>662:21 674:6 698:6 705:3 713:6 713:6 720:18 guys 582:21 583:1 583:8 685:10</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">H</p> <hr/> <p>half 564:10,12 566:21 568:21 569:4,18,19 591:25 604:23 692:21 half-mile 560:25 682:22 hamstring 575:15 hand 545:2,4 726:14 handed 721:24 handful 716:23 handle 618:8 638:16 641:23 handled 704:10 hands 640:18 641:16 hang 544:19 Hanley 541:4 543:13 571:10 594:13 595:15 597:8,25 605:14 608:9 609:3 611:24 624:19 634:8 640:24 647:14 658:21 662:8 673:15 678:8 679:6 680:19 700:4 709:1 714:1 724:3 724:17 Hanley's 553:21 554:3 happen 563:5 606:5 624:10 639:10 647:10 664:3 665:20 674:15 677:21 691:15 692:2</p>
---	--	--	--	---

<p>happened 570:13 641:2</p> <p>happening 659:5</p> <p>happens 564:15 569:25 570:8 652:1 660:2 666:9 718:17</p> <p>happy 564:18 615:1 627:11 707:18</p> <p>hard 613:17 615:2 618:1</p> <p>Hartell 701:24 703:7</p> <p>Hartell's 706:16</p> <p>hate 565:17</p> <p>hazard 684:15</p> <p>hazards 574:3 712:6,7</p> <p>he'll 617:1</p> <p>head 652:6 655:10 662:9 717:20 720:5</p> <p>headed 546:15 717:20</p> <p>heads 677:1</p> <p>health 556:6 557:2 574:2 575:1 580:16 581:4,9,17 581:19 582:1 587:11 589:1 610:14 611:9 630:6 676:7</p> <p>hear 566:23 567:24 588:4 590:3 614:12 615:1 634:2 639:12 648:24 677:9,10 677:13 707:18</p> <p>heard 544:9 554:2 558:8 560:13 566:24 614:23 666:1 674:10,11 674:17 676:24 697:20 699:6 712:14</p>	<p>hearing 545:22 546:23 560:5 561:7,15,23 562:5 567:5 568:4 572:4 573:4,14,18 574:6 574:11 589:12,19 592:25 598:15 600:1,11 601:2 604:18 608:4 609:4 610:17,17 610:25 611:7 615:2,9 617:6 621:9 623:24 628:5,8 632:8 633:1,2 670:2,14 673:5 686:14 687:6,13 688:2,11 688:19 689:2 691:7 694:16 695:3 696:1,8 699:18 700:24 701:3,8,13,23 702:5,10 705:10 707:16 708:9,15 714:24 715:5 716:10 717:9 718:24 719:19 721:25,25 722:2 722:11</p> <p>hearings 608:10 612:19 613:19 617:25 621:14 624:21,25 625:24 627:21 703:25 704:3</p> <p>hears 649:7</p> <p>heart 712:15</p> <p>heavy 550:4 587:21</p> <p>heck 578:20</p> <p>height 687:15</p> <p>held 608:4</p> <p>help 593:18 629:13 658:20 669:10,14 669:24</p> <p>helpful 565:18 631:2 713:2</p>	<p>helping 679:7</p> <p>helps 677:12</p> <p>Hemingway 540:6 545:22</p> <p>herbaceous 688:4</p> <p>hereunto 726:14</p> <p>herring 566:17</p> <p>hey 578:23</p> <p>Hi 685:10</p> <p>high 549:20 554:23 579:11 671:23 690:4,4,6 694:22 694:22,25</p> <p>high-level 685:13</p> <p>higher 549:22 589:20 601:22 603:2</p> <p>highest 689:15</p> <p>highlight 617:7</p> <p>Highway 599:1</p> <p>hillside 583:6,16</p> <p>history 691:18</p> <p>hit 583:20</p> <p>hitting 587:22</p> <p>hold 576:21 597:4</p> <p>holder 621:20 627:6 628:17 634:16,22 647:4 655:21 666:20 668:15 669:1 676:1 680:9 696:15 712:1</p> <p>holding 665:20</p> <p>holdover 710:12</p> <p>home 656:2</p> <p>homes 590:1</p> <p>honestly 648:22 656:19</p> <p>hope 592:8</p> <p>hopefully 562:18 601:7 652:16 653:20 679:9 718:11</p> <p>hoping 625:8</p> <p>Horst 542:16 571:22 580:24,25</p>	<p>581:1 583:24,25 584:3</p> <p>hospitals 594:4</p> <p>hour 550:15,19 554:22 555:4 558:4 572:25 578:5 586:13,14 649:14</p> <p>hours 586:17 587:18 599:9 604:23 605:20 606:10 659:20 686:23</p> <p>house 553:21 554:3 583:7,10,13 590:5</p> <p>housekeeping 715:9,25</p> <p>houses 583:17,22</p> <p>Howe 541:4 543:5 543:11,12,25 544:15 564:20 567:14 569:9 570:22 571:5,6,7 578:8 580:21 583:24 584:2 588:11 593:4 595:12 596:10 597:6,12,18 598:2 598:3 603:8 605:10 606:22 607:1 608:7,23 609:2 610:8 611:21 614:8 616:7 618:2,21 619:6 620:13,18 620:21 622:16 625:2,10 626:1,17 627:13 631:20 634:1,3 635:13 636:3,7 637:4,9 637:15 638:18 640:22 641:8 642:20,25 643:2 643:10 645:2,18 645:22 647:13 650:18 651:8,16</p>	<p>651:23 652:6 653:24 654:22 655:3,10 659:12 659:16 660:17,21 661:10 662:3,9,13 662:16 663:14 665:5 667:2,8,10 667:13 668:3 670:21 671:2 673:1,22 675:2,8 676:13,23 677:8 677:11,14,16,22 678:5,9 679:1,5 679:10,19 680:16 680:21,22,25 681:6,12,24 685:16 691:11 692:5 693:9 695:21 699:15,24 699:25 700:1,15 704:22 705:4 707:19 708:11 709:3,4,13,24 710:6 712:9,19 713:3,10,15,18,19 717:16,22 719:3 720:5 722:22 723:2,4,23 724:5 724:7,10,13,14 725:2,6</p> <p>huge 583:6</p> <p>human 672:8,8,19</p> <p>humidity 655:25</p> <p>humorous 702:15</p> <p>hundred 614:4 684:23 690:18</p> <p>hundreds 671:13</p> <p>hung 652:1</p> <p>Huntington 683:3</p> <p>hybrid 705:24 706:2</p> <p>hypothetical 671:10 672:2</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">I</p> <hr/> <p>I-84 553:20,23</p>
---	---	--	---	---

599:1	560:24 576:21	implicit 637:25	incorrect 689:9	initiate 621:21
Idaho 542:3 566:20	591:19 598:16	717:8	690:5,12 691:5	622:8 623:8
566:23,24 567:5	599:3 608:18,22	important 594:24	701:15 702:23	input 547:25
569:5 581:10	609:19,23 636:18	595:10 614:17	incorrectly 666:6	insert 576:23
582:17 585:19,24	651:14 675:14	615:24 617:18	701:16 712:5	insolent 545:15
586:7 587:25	682:13 683:11	659:1 705:22	increase 550:13	inspect 668:16
589:9,12 601:13	688:12,23 701:16	imposed 574:4,12	558:4 598:21	673:9
602:24 603:12,24	707:14 718:21	596:3	602:7,14 674:18	inspection 668:10
604:11 605:8	720:14	impractical 579:22	increasing 581:23	668:22 673:9
607:20 608:5,15	identifies 566:1	615:12 671:4	incumbent 653:17	inspections 668:16
612:13,23 613:21	683:12 712:2	improperly 559:22	indicated 634:24	install 589:22
614:21 615:10,20	identify 547:13	inadequate 624:1	642:10 644:11	installed 691:23
617:2 618:17	560:6 618:10	inadvertently	652:10 702:22	instance 572:13
622:10 629:8	703:8,24 704:4	600:18	indicates 686:22	589:15 615:13
630:3,18 634:18	718:13	inappropriate	individual 576:9,15	622:25 650:3
648:17 649:4,9,20	identifying 646:22	557:4 612:25	579:10	instances 555:5
649:25 650:4	ignited 690:10	663:23 665:14	indulge 587:9	instruction 654:24
651:1,19 652:15	ignition 690:7	incentive 663:12	industrial 549:3	insulation 589:25
653:18,23 654:5	694:18	664:19	industry 548:11	insulting 545:14
654:13 657:5,9	ignoring 586:16	incidents 581:23	588:3	intend 584:23
659:4 663:25	ii 541:4 549:10	include 558:3	infeasible 649:7	596:4
664:17,20,25	imitate 687:3	560:7 627:3	inflexibly 584:23	intended 560:15
665:17,20,23	immediately 671:7	628:13 636:12	inform 627:1	605:4,5
666:7 668:21	Immensely 693:7	644:16 653:7	628:19 686:18	intending 646:6
669:7 670:3 671:6	impact 590:3	655:20 680:3,4	information 546:22	intensity 688:7,25
672:10,12,15,21	651:15 657:2,2	689:14,21,23	548:21,23,24	intent 569:25 570:8
673:9 674:23	686:11 690:14	693:24 721:4	553:8 560:10	570:9 585:3 622:4
689:10 690:10,16	695:16 704:16	included 574:24	561:24 570:5	633:12 646:7
694:21 696:2,9	impact-related	609:4 610:19	629:11,16,18,21	648:3 681:16
697:13 704:17	574:16,19	628:13 647:3	633:19 641:2	intention 639:2,15
705:13,25 706:7	impacted 620:1	663:7 698:22,24	646:9 655:18	640:6
706:11,20 707:6,7	652:16 690:22	706:23 711:12	656:2,23 657:5,6	interact 687:17
707:9 712:25	702:6 704:7	722:9	657:17 658:2,9,19	interest 710:17
716:8 718:12	705:23 706:1,4	includes 558:1	681:20 710:21	interested 722:6
723:11	impacting 615:23	574:21 595:5	712:22,24	interesting 562:17
idea 552:5 577:12	impacts 569:6	600:25 625:19	informed 620:2	586:15
618:7 630:21	575:25 610:20	626:25 689:23	681:22	internal 594:17
634:3 640:3,11	688:12,21,22	694:2 696:18	infrastructure	595:17
649:12,13 653:10	689:1 696:20	including 566:3	586:24	internally 567:21
657:3 661:6	712:8,17	584:15 655:21,24	infrequent 555:21	internet 657:18,19
669:12 671:6	implement 574:15	658:23 680:14	573:20,22 577:11	interpret 577:8
ideal 686:20	574:18 630:25	688:4,13 704:8	578:7 579:19,20	708:2
identical 603:18	696:16	706:23	585:21	interpretation
identification	implementation	inconsistent 572:2	initial 604:1 612:18	547:25 701:6
704:15	548:1	incorporate 714:11	initially 605:2	interpreting
identified 547:13	implication 716:25	714:15	608:16 617:15	576:24

interrupt 715:11 715:12	712:13,15 715:13 721:10	679:6 680:19,20 700:4,5 709:1,2 714:1,2 722:10 724:3,6,17,18	626:21 627:10 628:3,7	718:17,22 720:5 721:3
interrupting 596:14	issued 686:17 689:19 690:3	Jesse 541:16 546:1 590:13 644:11 670:12 685:4,15 715:11	keep 587:11,15 617:23 642:20 678:19,25	kinds 565:2 649:19 kit 590:8,9 KITSAP 726:6
interruption 588:6	issues 544:9 546:4 559:15,18 561:2 575:12,14 576:4 578:12 579:6 580:17 587:5 596:20,25 597:5 599:12 614:25 642:1 646:1 669:3 678:3 679:13,23 679:25 681:7,18 689:19 693:13 701:1,5 702:8 704:10 707:24 708:21 711:11 716:3,4	590:13 644:11 670:12 685:4,15 715:11	keeping 596:11	know 547:13 549:10,14 553:21 561:13 564:9 570:3,16 575:22 581:6 582:12,13 583:5,9,14 588:25 589:6 592:23 594:9,11 595:25 607:5 611:14,18 614:3 615:17 617:15 619:16,17 622:11 624:12,24 625:6 627:5 631:1 632:4,11 635:11 636:5 640:19 642:10,19 646:6 648:19 649:5,15 649:15 650:23 652:16,17,19,24 653:7 654:13,14 654:19 656:11,20 657:11,19 658:10 659:2 665:12 669:4 670:11,19 671:22 672:1,5 673:19 675:17 681:19 683:16 686:1 693:3,5 695:6,7 704:24 712:14,23,24,25 714:16,24 715:4 716:12 717:6,8 718:7,14,14 719:15,24 720:15 721:14,16,17,20 722:14,17,20 723:9,17,19
introduced 599:14		Jesse.d.ratcliffe... 541:18	Kellen 541:9 545:24 546:8 559:14 569:20 592:8 593:16 607:8 617:16 622:14,17 626:17 631:23 643:16 646:24 656:18 659:24 669:17 682:1 685:19 720:10	known 574:14
introduction 546:11 600:2		job 595:15 596:11	Kellen's 721:14	
invalidated 603:16		JOCELYN 542:4	Kent 541:4 543:11 571:6 598:2 625:2 680:21 699:25 709:3 713:18 724:13	
involved 723:8		jocelyn@mrg-la... 542:8	key 675:24	
IPC 580:19 600:20 652:4 689:21,25 690:15 692:17		Joe 542:16 580:25	kg@integra.net 542:13	
IPC's 689:13		Jordan 541:5 543:15 571:12 598:4 658:5 681:2 700:7 708:24 713:5,20 724:8,19	kind 548:11 549:11 550:6 551:19 553:10 554:23 557:10 559:1,5 570:10,10 575:11 589:13 591:4 593:14,21 594:12 597:1 606:20 615:19 622:18 624:3 633:16,17 633:17 635:11 644:6,23 649:1,11 649:20 651:10 653:12 658:3 669:20 681:16,17 682:2 683:9,14,18 683:19,22 684:4 684:11 685:5,21 697:22 705:1 714:17,18 717:19	
IPCs 580:18		Judge 575:15 691:5 702:18 704:12		
Irene 542:16 575:7 700:19		judgment 702:19 707:4		
issue 544:8 559:19 559:21 561:20 562:8,14,14,17 563:6 567:21 568:1,22 569:8,12 571:4,20,21,24 572:5 575:5,21 576:2,2,10,13,16 579:19 584:8,20 585:11,14,14,15 594:14 596:5,21 597:1,17 598:8,10 601:3 610:11,13 627:16,17 632:19 641:3 645:6 646:21 648:5,18 650:7 651:20 652:1 660:3,13,22 664:1,9 667:21 683:18 686:6,7 689:4 691:10,25 693:25 694:20 695:8 696:11 699:23 700:18,18 700:20 701:5 702:9 703:15 704:2 705:10 707:25 708:10,17 708:23 710:12	issuing 561:16 593:10 719:1	July 544:4 714:8 724:1		
	item 544:5 545:1 641:2 709:20 715:8 723:5,7,8	jurisdiction 572:19 584:12,20		
	items 556:13 577:4 622:24 681:14 683:17 709:14	jurisdictions 682:19,25		
	J	Justice 541:16,21 546:1 567:19 607:3 666:13 673:3 696:6 707:23 723:12		
	Jenkins 541:4 543:13,14 571:10 571:11 594:13 597:8,25 598:1 605:12,13 606:21 608:9,25 609:11 609:25 610:4,6 611:23 620:15,19 620:22 624:18 630:20 634:2,4,6 634:10,20 636:3,4 640:24 642:9 645:5,10,13,19,23 647:13,14 651:12 651:17 658:21 662:6 667:5,9 673:14 678:8	justify 576:1		
		K		
		K 548:23 683:12		
		K-1 696:17		
		Karl 542:11,11 562:10 578:11 601:5 612:3 621:12 622:5 623:25 625:15		

600:25 knows 613:8 622:3 631:9 657:21 723:9 kV 672:18 690:9 694:18,22 695:4	685:2,8,22 landscapes 690:10 language 602:23 612:13 613:22 619:13 620:10 621:16,17,23 625:8,24 627:10 627:21 629:12 633:24 634:16 635:9,24 637:13 637:19,23 639:3 641:5 642:22 643:4,15,19,20 644:12,13 645:16 646:2,5 650:17 651:9 652:5 655:17 656:17,20 659:9,15 660:7,18 666:2 667:3,18 668:14 669:23 670:24 673:23 676:25 677:4 680:3,4,10 696:24 710:23,24 711:17 719:6,23 720:12 large 687:16 691:18 larger 691:1 late 554:16,16 557:22 law 542:11 567:22 571:3 572:12 575:15 597:15 679:21 699:21 701:7 702:3,18 703:3,15 704:12 708:19 711:9 laws 547:12 lawyer 631:7 lay 591:4 layout 683:19 LC-7 704:8 LC-8 704:8 LCDC 682:7 704:4 League 576:15 leave 552:15	662:17 673:22 685:21 715:8 leaving 546:14 691:13 704:25 led 695:12 left 638:4 685:11 legal 556:11 562:17 578:13 579:1 653:11 legalese 633:6 legally 653:11 legislative 547:22 573:25 581:22 legislature 581:21 582:4 584:22 legislature's 585:3 legitimate 607:22 672:1 lengthy 552:1 604:3 let's 576:22 643:10 646:3 659:16 665:10,11 668:3 672:19 682:3 level 553:18 554:16 554:23 555:4 559:4 574:22 577:13 582:18,19 589:21 599:6 600:24 601:20,20 602:7 603:2,14 604:12 605:3 606:20 613:14 625:25 629:16 689:15 levels 550:14,24 552:17 553:16 554:7 557:22 572:24 573:23 576:20 579:11 581:24 582:7 587:20 599:3 600:4 602:13 603:1,18 607:14 613:11,13 630:7 647:5,6,8,25	649:20 leverage 663:23 life 574:4,8 581:25 668:11 669:13 675:15,19 light 550:1,2,2 691:16 lighting 692:2 likelihood 687:21 limit 572:23 596:15 limited 559:19 561:4 571:21,22 573:14 576:16 595:5 598:8 599:10,12 610:11 686:6 700:19 715:15 718:12 723:11 line 540:6 545:23 548:22 549:14,16 549:21 553:25 563:16 573:24 579:10 580:7,19 590:23 592:14,23 598:17 600:19 602:6 613:6 614:2 614:3 615:17,18 615:22 616:1 638:5 648:20 650:10 655:16 668:16,22 671:5 671:10,14,18,20 671:23 672:6,9,11 672:18 674:11,16 674:23,25 684:17 684:19,22 686:9 687:17 688:16,16 688:21 689:25 690:7 691:22 692:14,23 694:22 695:1,4,15 698:21 698:21 704:18 linear 560:22 570:10,16 600:15 682:24 lines 550:13 637:20	638:3 668:13 671:24 674:1,2,13 684:9 686:11 690:9 691:16 692:18 693:18 694:7,9,18,22 698:12 link 545:7 689:25 lip 632:18 Lisa 542:4 565:5 584:5 605:15 623:11 625:9 645:6 693:10 704:9 lisa@mrg-law.com 542:7 list 562:20 564:3,13 564:14,14 566:13 567:6 568:1,7 591:17,23 592:17 592:18 605:7 609:17 626:24 628:12,13 629:6 629:13 631:15 633:6 635:20,22 648:9 655:5,6 681:10 listed 565:22 625:17 628:18 listen 618:6 632:20 listening 583:2,2,11 lists 565:7 619:23 literally 616:22 little 546:12 547:17 549:9 561:14 586:19 587:9 588:8 589:3 593:7 601:14 614:14 617:23 623:13,17 626:15 629:7 631:7 653:7 654:16 656:14 677:12 687:4 690:6 693:16 697:5 709:25 711:6
--	--	--	--	---

live 588:24,25 671:23	653:22 657:17 658:10 674:19	lunch 709:16 710:1	materials 560:1 579:7 601:8	545:19 639:21,21 640:4 641:1,4,22
lives 583:5	697:19 713:10	M	646:11 701:5	642:11 716:2
living 694:8 698:16 698:23	718:12 719:10 723:1	Madison 690:17	matter 564:2 585:7	718:3 719:1 720:7
local 594:21 682:5	looked 594:3	Madison's 690:25	maximum 550:22	722:7 723:14,15
682:10 683:4,11	682:23	mail 633:6	550:24 553:6	723:25 724:1
683:25 690:21	looking 549:9	main 595:16	554:20,22 558:2,5	725:8 726:11
691:20 702:25	558:14 559:1	maintain 671:18	558:6 559:7,11	meetings 545:10,16
703:16,17	577:22 592:9	672:18 673:10	582:7,11,14,18,19	661:7 709:21
locally 691:17	620:8,11 623:2,19	maintained 674:14	588:2,3 607:8,11	714:8
located 548:18	625:12 646:18	674:16	McAULIFFE	meets 547:11
599:19 684:23	650:8 656:10	maintaining	540:24 726:8,19	572:20
702:2 705:23	658:3 667:16	672:23,24 686:1	McDOWELL	members 546:7
location 551:13	698:2,2 718:5,15	maintains 674:23	542:5	562:9
598:23 599:3	718:19	maintenance	mean 599:24 633:7	memory 631:22
659:5 680:4,11	loop 667:1	613:25 614:6	634:13 635:18	mentioned 569:1,2
locations 557:25	lost 635:20 640:5	668:10,14,23	641:16,25 647:16	692:18 697:6
598:16 599:15,24	lot 546:19 557:11	673:8 684:17	647:17,18 649:12	699:5
608:12,15,18	563:16 590:7,8	majority 549:19	649:19 656:10	merit 702:21
675:20	591:2 592:7	643:3 662:17	674:14 720:20	meritorious 663:21
lock 612:14	593:21 596:19	making 547:4,19	meaning 607:13	met 559:12 560:16
long 570:15 587:9	606:15 623:15,16	573:3 631:6 642:1	means 577:20	573:19 673:17
614:14 644:3	639:23 648:20,23	656:13 661:24	606:15 628:24	metal 669:11
647:21 665:23	648:25 649:21	671:19 702:4	701:3	methodologies
666:25 682:24	653:2,20 671:8	Malheur 683:1	meant 606:19	598:10 608:4
683:7	683:22 692:3	704:19	697:24 714:19	methodology
long-term 642:2	706:11,17 719:23	management	measure 577:8	575:24 598:13
647:17,18 668:9	720:11	594:17 595:17	652:17	600:10 603:12
longer 570:9	lots 614:14 624:16	686:19	measured 604:11	653:6
578:19,21 582:6	671:23 683:21	mandatory 657:4	measurement	mic 622:16
594:19 595:8	loud 554:2 591:14	657:13 658:4	551:9,10,10,14	microsite 688:16
601:14 650:2	606:16 658:16	721:15	591:7,7,9 600:8	micrositing 695:14
look 546:18 551:1	louder 553:24	manner 545:11	measurements	middle 564:16
555:11 557:19	loudest 554:1	map 594:12 701:17	599:2 605:17	693:2
564:5,24 565:6,10	558:21	mapping 545:8	measures 554:12	midnight 599:22
565:12 576:2	love 567:22	Mark 587:25 599:5	652:14 696:12,18	mile 559:23,24
577:24,25 580:16	low 573:23 687:16	701:24	712:7	560:3,8 561:1,15
583:16 586:2,8	687:22 688:7	Marrow 694:2	meatier 683:17	562:3,20 564:10
589:19 609:8,8	695:5	masked 587:22	mediate 547:25	564:12,12 566:13
612:11 613:15	low-intensity 688:9	massive 612:16	meet 555:2 579:8	566:21,25 567:2,3
619:19 620:12	lower 603:6 604:20	material 632:7,8	579:17 580:9,9	567:7,9 568:3,7,8
621:18 624:9	lowest 559:9	638:1 644:11	589:9 595:20	568:21,23 569:4,7
626:21 628:16	LU-5 708:17,23	702:7,8 714:24	615:6 673:21	569:18,19 570:16
630:17 632:23	LU-9 686:6 699:23	715:5 718:13,20	676:9	570:17 591:23,25
638:3 644:23	lucky 691:19 692:1	718:23 721:25	meeting 540:2	591:25 592:3,17
		722:9,11,14,16,18	543:8 544:3,4,6	592:20 613:4

<p>615:25 619:25 622:2 625:18 626:25 627:18 628:13 634:25 636:12,14 654:9 704:21 miles 579:15 Mill 602:3 millions 671:13 mind 587:11,15 588:24 628:5,7 632:18 651:6 653:11 minimal 589:13 690:14 minimization 716:22 minimize 610:20 712:8 minimum 614:4 657:11 minor 578:3 minute 557:15 617:15 669:20 670:9,11 711:4,5 minutes 544:4 588:8 596:12 614:16 709:14,20 709:21 723:25 724:1,1 misclassifying 689:25 misdirection 603:20 mishandling 691:20 misinterpreting 629:23,25 misleading 586:12 missed 600:18 623:7 628:11 656:9 718:4 missing 622:24 628:8 mistakes 565:3 mitigate 610:20</p>	<p>626:8 669:3 692:17 696:19 mitigated 592:22 604:16 mitigation 567:11 574:16,19,22 589:2,4,11 590:14 591:15,20 593:21 600:25 609:21 620:2 622:3 625:20 626:9 627:4 629:2,9,18 630:9 663:12 669:5 676:18 687:9,12 688:15 689:13 693:1,17 694:4 696:10,16 697:13,25 698:7 698:17 699:6 mitigation/propo... 610:13 model 553:2 647:4 647:5,16,17 modeled 552:20 558:2 modeling 553:14 553:15 555:1 557:21,24 585:20 588:17 594:1 647:8 648:13,15 649:1,10 651:14 651:18 653:10 672:13 675:17 modification 560:11 562:15 563:9 modifications 544:1 566:3 680:1 711:12 modified 559:22 560:20 563:21 613:14 modify 560:10 561:3,8 562:22 563:1 565:21 568:24 570:6</p>	<p>658:1 modifying 561:24 moisture 550:2,3 moment 552:9 653:4 656:8 Monday 719:5,6 money 563:16 monitor 647:6,10 647:11,17 650:11 653:5 668:15 673:10 675:22 712:7 monitored 606:9 687:2 monitoring 554:10 554:11 598:18,25 599:14,15,18,23 600:2 601:9,19 602:4 603:12,17 603:21,22,23,24 603:25 604:2,2,3 604:5,6,19 605:5 606:4,7,13,19 607:17,23 608:3 613:10 614:6 615:16,20 647:18 647:20,21,25 648:4,4,16 649:1 649:3,18,20,21,22 649:23 650:1,5,14 650:23 651:1,2 652:18,19 653:5 653:17,18 668:10 668:22,23 672:3 672:25 675:13,19 monitors 598:18 month 639:22 month's 639:20,24 640:4 661:1 monumental 723:8 723:13 moot 569:3 Morgan 599:19 602:2 603:14,17 604:6 morning 543:5,7</p>	<p>546:6,7 554:16 562:9 575:7 584:5 656:12 693:10 Morrow 683:2 687:20 698:12 motion 700:25 702:11 705:11,20 724:2,25 move 546:3 635:14 643:3 667:15 668:3 675:9 677:23 678:7 679:2 681:7 704:3 723:24 724:4 moving 642:21 645:23 688:8 719:16,24 MP-100 599:16 MP-11 599:1,1 603:13,19,20 604:11,13,21 605:8 607:24 multiple 690:9 703:14 mute 544:18 mutually 663:11 665:1 666:8 Myers 542:17 686:6 689:5 691:11,13 692:16 693:9 694:16 696:13 697:3,8 698:7,9,14 699:3 699:12 Myers' 686:12 688:1,4,7 689:4 693:12,22 695:11 696:1 697:8,18</p>	<p>names 560:23 568:1 narrow 722:15 nation 587:2 686:25 national 686:18,24 Natural 546:2 706:13 nature 560:22 655:22 navigating 620:10 NC-1 559:19 571:4 597:9 NC-2 571:20 581:1 596:25 597:10,17 NC-3 596:25 598:8 680:1 NC-4 557:20 596:5 596:25 597:2 602:22 610:9,11 680:1 NC11 546:4 near 671:23 688:7 693:5 necessarily 629:22 633:16 647:8 720:20 necessary 557:1 581:16 586:25 618:17 678:4 684:21 711:25 need 552:10 576:9 595:22 602:25 609:6 625:6 629:15 630:25 642:21 645:4 647:24 652:7 671:7 672:24 674:16 677:5,18 678:6 687:23 690:14 691:11 704:6,22 710:2 713:13 needed 602:10 646:10 647:10 666:2 667:4</p>
--	--	--	--	--

668:19 675:3 676:25 678:23 696:24 699:16 708:14 717:18 needs 586:22 624:10 635:6 636:14 646:17 656:15 661:13 664:19 671:19 672:10,12,15 675:7 677:17 693:18 704:1 negatively 690:23 negotiate 688:18 negotiations 695:18 neighborhoods 712:17 neither 585:1 NEPA 579:23 587:4,7 nervous 631:7 nestled 553:22 never 564:12 605:4 674:17 707:14 new 548:16,17,18 599:14,15,23 600:17 626:23 669:2,9,10 671:11 671:15 675:11 676:2,21 684:8 newspaper 711:23 nick 672:11 nicks 674:14 night 554:12 557:22 606:13 658:16 night/early 554:16 nights 606:14 nighttime 587:17 nine 696:25 699:17 NOAA's 658:10 nod 717:20 nods 652:6 655:10 662:10 720:5 noise 546:3,12,23	546:24 547:1,2,4 547:20,21 548:2 548:10,13,16,17 549:13,16,17,19 549:19,23,25 550:3,5,10,12,14 550:16,19,21,22 550:24 551:10,12 551:16,16,23,24 552:1,6,8,16,20 553:4,5,5,6,7,8,9 553:16,17,23,24 553:25 554:2,4,7 554:10,15,20,23 555:4,8,9,16,21 556:9,20,22,25 557:24 558:6,9,10 558:15,19,20,22 558:23,24 559:4,9 559:11,17,22 560:7 561:21 562:1 564:4 565:16,17 566:20 567:10 568:7,10 568:20 569:6 570:4 572:1,12,14 572:20,24 573:6 573:12,23 574:1,4 574:11,13,16,18 574:18 575:22,25 576:2,4,5,19 577:13,15 579:11 580:6,14,17 581:15,23 582:4,7 584:15,22 585:2 585:11,18,19,20 586:1,21 587:15 589:15,17 590:3,4 590:5 592:25 593:17 594:19,22 595:4,20 597:5 598:11,17,18,20 598:25 599:2,3,6 599:7,9,14 600:4 600:9,14 602:7 603:1,12,17 607:5	607:7,9,11 608:1 608:5,11 609:24 610:21,24 611:1 611:13 612:7 613:25 614:1 619:20 621:24 627:7 628:20,24 629:1 630:2 635:2 644:18,19 646:22 647:25 650:5 651:1,15 657:2 664:8,8,14 669:3 669:5,6,10,15 670:6,7 671:12,22 672:6,9 673:18,20 674:8 675:3,14 676:3,7 679:22 680:6,7 682:3 716:9 noise-generating 552:24 noise-sensitive 560:2,24 564:5 568:2 569:5 593:24 610:21 635:1 noisy 551:25 590:24 non-wind 551:6 nonlinear 600:15 normally 558:12 584:14 619:8 North 683:3 Northeast 541:13 541:17,22 northwest 581:8 note 606:13 685:8 715:9 716:1 717:5 721:24 noted 574:11 579:18 598:16 609:3 610:17 644:15 notes 552:10 572:5 589:7 notice 561:16,17,18	562:14 563:3 564:9 566:14,16 567:7 568:4 569:25 570:8 583:9,12 592:13 592:15,19 616:1,1 616:17 620:4 622:1 625:19 627:19,20 628:12 628:18 629:7,12 629:22 631:12,17 632:5 633:8,16,17 633:23 634:25 635:23 643:19,20 643:22 644:1,6,15 680:4 712:16,22 722:7 notices 545:6 627:1 628:17 634:18,23 645:20 notification 544:7 560:2 613:4 658:7 710:17 711:14,22 713:7 notifications 712:4 notified 620:1 notifying 627:18 NS 608:21 NSR 558:18,20 559:10 568:8 602:15 608:21 619:22 627:2 628:20 647:24 653:13,14 654:9 655:2,18 663:11 666:20 NSRs 574:14 579:10,15 592:3 599:19 600:12,17 600:17,25 603:14 604:16 609:17,23 619:25 622:25 625:17,18 626:11 629:13 636:19 648:9,20 675:14 675:24 676:18	number 565:18 589:7 591:22 594:7 602:15 608:11 615:6,11 632:19 668:5 690:2 691:14 693:12 695:12 696:25 701:1 704:10 714:18 numbers 608:21 628:22 numerous 586:22 <hr/> O <hr/> o'clock 543:6 656:12 o0o- 543:3 OAR 565:20 572:1 574:10 581:1,8,11 598:12 600:6 684:7,20 object 654:14 objection 654:19 objects 654:13 obligated 580:13 obligations 629:2 663:16 observing 659:19 obtained 654:8 obviously 575:20 occupants 712:3,5 occur 573:20 574:15 579:11 587:16 600:13,22 686:23 690:13 722:11 occurrences 593:24 occurs 590:12 October 599:18 ODEQ 582:18 ODEQ's 584:15 ODOE 563:7 565:14,21,23 566:5,11,19 577:12 579:2 585:9,10 591:3
---	---	--	--	---

<p>604:1 614:21 615:9 616:4 631:17 654:18,18 ODOE's 604:23 offensive 545:14 offer 589:14 691:6 705:1 offered 630:11 704:19 offering 617:14 OFFICE 542:11 officer 560:5 561:7 561:15 567:5 573:4,14,18 574:6 574:11 589:13,19 600:1,11 604:18 608:4,10 609:4 610:17,25 611:7 612:19 613:19 615:9 617:7,25 621:15 623:24 624:21 625:24 627:21 628:9 670:2,14 673:5 687:13 688:2,11 688:19 694:17 695:3 696:1,8 700:24 701:4,13 701:23 702:5 704:3 705:10 707:16 708:9 716:11 717:9 officer's 561:23 562:6 572:4 598:15 601:3 610:17 621:9 624:25 686:14 687:6 689:3 701:8 702:11 719:20 oh 548:7 639:8 640:13 645:15 652:18 670:16 678:9 685:10 okay 543:25 544:15 548:8,10 550:11 550:15 551:2,7,7</p>	<p>551:15 552:7,13 556:1 557:10,17 565:4 568:14 569:11 570:22,24 580:23 583:25 584:4 595:14 597:6,13,14 603:10 606:24 609:6,11 610:6,8 612:1 614:10 616:9 617:22 618:25 619:6 623:15 625:11 626:1,19 627:14 634:1 636:7 637:2 637:4,9 640:16,22 642:20,23,25 643:2,3,10 645:2 645:24 648:4,8 649:25 651:8 653:24 654:22 655:10 659:7,16 659:18,22 662:3,9 662:13,16,19,24 663:14 665:3 666:1,15,23 667:2 667:10,13 670:12 673:1 674:20 675:2,4,8 676:23 677:15,17,23 678:9 679:1,5,10 681:6,15,24 685:11 686:3 692:5 695:23 696:4,23 699:15 700:15,17 705:2,6 707:21 708:13,16 709:13 710:1,4,6 711:3,4,5,19 713:12,12,15 715:19 717:22 723:4,24 724:10 725:7 old 636:15 once 590:23 615:17 641:14 654:8</p>	<p>701:3 one-half 559:24 562:3 one-mile 564:7 ones 603:19 619:19 716:18 ongoing 613:24 614:6,6,6 615:16 678:3 online 545:8 oops 682:23 operate 657:21 operating 549:15 549:20 573:24 615:22 operation 549:18 614:2 676:1 684:16,22 686:9 687:22 689:7,12 696:21 operational 598:20 610:21 627:7 668:11 operations 688:12 688:22 695:16 opinion 560:5 562:6 572:4 598:15 601:3 610:17 612:20 687:6 opportunity 601:1 611:6 618:20 632:14 641:7,16 714:25 718:12 722:1,8 opposed 553:20 631:10 656:13 697:9 opposing 702:20 opposite 581:18 628:2 opposition 678:13 option 667:23 693:7 optional 658:4 options 625:20</p>	<p>653:3 OPUC 668:18 oral 562:7 575:5 601:4 611:17,19 611:22 612:2 689:4 702:13 714:6 722:21 order 540:5 543:9 545:21,21 547:14 547:18 548:20 551:17,21 552:2 555:13 556:14,16 556:25 557:3,8 560:4,12,13,18,20 561:12 562:2,6,15 562:23 563:1,20 565:16 566:1,7 568:13,17,20 569:4,13 570:8 571:4 572:10 574:25 575:6,20 580:16 581:14 585:2 596:6 597:16 598:25 609:5,12,13,16 610:1,3,16,18,19 616:15,21 617:5,6 617:8,20 620:9,17 621:15 622:9,20 623:3 624:10,22 625:4 628:23 632:8,15,22 633:1 663:12 670:1,5,9 671:20 676:8 678:19 679:22,24 679:25 683:7 685:15 686:15 699:23 702:12 708:20,22 710:7 711:10 714:17 715:5,21,22 716:17,17 717:3,4 717:8,13 718:8,15 718:16,19 719:10 719:18,18,19,20 720:3,12,13,24</p>	<p>725:3 Order/Proposed 540:4 ordered 630:11 ordinance 701:11 706:5 ordinances 572:8 682:12 Oregon 540:1,24 541:3,8,14,16,17 541:21,22 542:6 542:12 543:1 545:17,25 546:9 547:13 548:3 556:7 562:23 567:19 572:1 574:3 575:2 581:4 581:9,21 582:4,5 598:12 683:1,3 710:21 726:20 Oregonians 588:4 588:9 organizational 673:7 orient 669:20,21 originate 551:22 ORS 572:3,6,15 573:25 581:22 688:20 ought 657:12 661:19 outcome 723:20 outline 620:3 633:9 654:6 outlined 603:5 612:9,21 629:20 633:18 646:11 652:2 outlines 646:15 666:17 outlining 646:8 outset 566:20 681:18 overall 593:22 679:14 702:8 overlap 596:19,24</p>
---	--	---	---	---

<p>overlooked 691:10 overlying 703:15 overreach 665:19 overview 683:19 685:13 owned 696:21 owner 555:15 627:2 628:19 663:11 680:6 owners 560:2 590:20 619:23 655:2 owning 550:8</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">P</p> <p>P 541:1,1 542:1,1 p.m 725:7,11 Pacific 599:2 602:5 package 611:25 710:23 page 545:8 609:7 616:21 617:16 618:1 619:16,18 pages 612:8 619:8 paper 624:16 paragraph 616:23 616:23 618:9,10 618:12,16,23,23 618:25 619:3,21 625:7,7,11,14,16 625:25 627:19 637:6,11,12,13 643:12 645:4,4 646:2 668:4,6 parameters 593:10 625:20 658:12 parcel 706:4 707:10 parcels 702:2 706:1 706:19,25 parenthetical 680:13 park 604:8 part 553:5,14 557:7 558:13 559:15 609:21 611:11</p>	<p>638:19 646:14 664:7 673:20 684:16 695:18 712:22 714:11 participated 723:22 participating 544:17 545:4 participation 575:16 particular 556:24 575:13 578:13 581:13 618:11,16 626:6 639:22 641:21,22 647:24 714:23 particularly 587:18 631:5 698:18 particulars 629:22 parties 571:21,23 573:15 575:4 584:7 587:9 596:12 599:13 665:14 715:15,15 718:12 722:6 723:11 party 559:19 598:9 610:12 686:6 700:19 702:20 pass 563:7 685:15 passed 563:18 Patrick 541:21 567:18 597:1 607:2 608:10 617:9 634:2 638:12 645:6,18 650:19 656:18 666:13 670:12 673:2 696:6 707:22 patrick.g.rowe@... 541:23 pattern 578:2 patterns 556:10 pause 565:1 pay 704:17</p>	<p>payment 704:17 pays 649:4 PCCO 670:8 PDF 612:8 619:16 peaceful 553:22 PEASE 542:4 people 564:11 566:13 570:12 582:1 588:19 590:2,10,21 591:5 591:23 592:23 596:11 602:18,19 633:5,9 635:19 648:8,23 651:13 652:16 661:16 669:15 671:23 692:1 706:14 712:16 718:22 perceive 672:5 percent 573:21 582:10 583:15 586:2,5,9 689:24 690:18 perceptible 604:14 perfect 672:6 perfectly 579:24 performed 603:22 603:24 performing 673:20 performs 649:20 period 545:3 570:1 577:17 578:5 599:11 648:1,1 676:1 permanent 648:3 684:20 permissible 684:10 702:19 permission 628:4 permit 572:16 684:1 permits 572:16 683:25 Perry 541:5 543:19 571:14 597:21 680:17 700:9</p>	<p>709:9 713:22 724:21 person 545:18 550:8 581:15 653:14 659:2 personal 650:24 653:2 persons 557:5 581:15 perspective 612:6 661:22 725:5 persuasive 573:15 pertaining 571:4 597:16 679:22,25 699:23 708:20,23 711:10 petition 705:12 petitioners 576:9 phase 569:25 570:8 phone 544:18,18,19 544:25 651:1 652:13,24 653:17 656:6 phones 544:17 picked 657:24 pieces 576:4 624:16 pilot 693:4 place 604:8,22 611:18 627:9 646:6 647:22 654:21 663:5 668:17 687:24 690:15 711:23 places 573:8 613:23 663:21 721:2 plain 634:15 635:24 plain-language 644:16 680:5 plan 544:7 589:11 604:16 626:9 627:8 633:22 646:8 654:6 655:1 663:12,13 664:11 673:9 675:13,13</p>	<p>675:19 680:8 682:11 687:9,12 687:24 688:15 689:14 690:15 693:17,17,20,21 693:24 694:4,7,7 694:12,14 695:17 696:10,16,17 697:13 698:1,8,11 698:11,15,17,19 701:10 711:13,15 716:14 planned 695:10,16 planner 703:5,22 planning 632:4 682:6,13 701:17 701:24 702:1 707:10 708:4 716:13 plans 668:18 plant 590:6 play 716:21 plays 691:14 please 543:10 544:17,18,19,21 544:23 545:2 621:6 711:4 pleasure 597:6 709:24 plus 635:25 point 552:5 555:24 562:12 566:11 586:12,16 596:2 601:10,19 602:5 604:6 612:10 624:6 626:3 628:15 631:22 648:10 649:25 650:6 654:10 658:20 659:3 660:10 661:4 663:8 664:7,19 665:6,16 669:4 671:23 673:3 676:19,20 696:14 715:13 721:14</p>
---	---	--	--	---

722:5,19 pointed 558:24 597:1 602:15 604:23 617:10 634:13 650:22 654:2 673:5 pointing 612:5 628:7 points 551:10 580:12 595:16 policy 541:12 573:25 585:7 642:7,13 650:7 661:22 662:1 672:22 685:1 poll 569:13 570:23 596:17,21,24 597:10 632:2 679:13,18 699:19 708:15 polled 597:9 polls 714:10 pollute 582:9 pollution 582:2,4 portion 551:8 559:13 564:24 565:7 644:1 685:6 697:22 Portland 542:6,12 pose 635:14 690:6 posed 611:8 poses 689:15 position 562:21 563:10,23 578:16 579:12 599:15,23 617:1 640:15 649:3 664:19 667:24 668:9 678:15,20 707:15 positions 545:12 554:11 599:19 possibility 678:14 possible 553:3 658:12 664:1 673:18 possibly 606:10	609:20 612:22 post-construction 574:17 potential 569:6 610:20 625:18 687:11,16,25 688:12,22 689:15 696:13 712:6,6 potentially 552:20 635:11 643:22 657:8 Powder 683:3 power 542:3 563:15 566:20,23 566:24 567:6 569:5 582:17 585:24 589:9,12 601:13 602:24 603:24 604:11 607:20 608:5,15 612:13,23 613:22 614:21 615:20 617:2 618:17 622:10 629:8 630:3,18 634:19 648:17 649:4,9,20 649:25 650:4 651:1,19 652:15 653:18,23 654:5 654:13 657:6 659:4 664:1,17,20 664:25 665:17,21 665:23 666:7 668:21 669:7 671:7 672:10,12 672:15,21 673:9 674:23 687:4 689:10 690:11 692:14 693:23 696:2,9 697:14,21 699:1,5 704:17 705:13,25 706:7 706:11,20 707:6,7 707:9 712:25 716:8 718:12 723:11	Power's 585:19 586:7 587:25 603:12 605:8 615:10 657:9 670:3 690:16 694:21 PowerPoint 546:13 552:11 557:18 practical 642:6 practice 569:11 pre 574:13 pre-existing 562:15 preamble 711:7 precedent 593:14 precipitation 655:25 precisely 650:8,16 preclude 561:10 preconstruction 574:14 predict 594:2 626:7 predicted 557:22 587:16 589:10 590:22 598:19 600:13 prediction 587:23 594:6 predominant 700:23 701:21 706:4,6,25 predominantly 548:23 predominate 702:1 prefer 611:21 635:18,23 661:1 preference 711:2 preliminary 682:17 premise 621:25 prepared 724:4 preparing 723:14 preponderance 547:9 688:24 prescriptions 563:2 present 542:15 556:9 574:7 575:5 601:4 653:18	presentation 546:13 550:23 621:3 683:15 685:14 presented 573:15 602:3 651:3 653:22 657:7 669:24 690:8 691:7 presenting 601:5 press 545:3 presumably 647:22 presumption 653:12 pretty 546:22 578:25 605:16 652:2 671:4 683:15 prevention 684:16 previous 658:10 previously 548:17 548:18,19 701:14 711:22 primarily 707:11 principles 565:11 print 619:8 printer 619:7 prior 569:22,22 570:13 589:8 591:1,2 592:14 619:1,24 621:19 627:5 639:19,20 651:14 660:23 680:13 689:18 691:25 711:24 prioritized 587:1 privately 696:21 probably 639:10 641:3 649:3 650:1 670:25 714:16 717:6 problem 562:19,23 576:5 579:23 601:18 602:4,8 606:7 636:5 650:11 651:21	664:23 675:18,22 675:24 problems 605:18 676:3 procedural 566:10 575:11,12 681:18 716:3 procedure 656:9 procedures 545:14 557:6 562:24 563:8 575:15 600:8 604:25 711:14 proceed 557:12 proceeded 686:21 proceeding 564:16 599:13 610:22 process 560:17 563:3 567:12 582:23 589:4 590:13,19,25 591:4,15 593:2,22 594:20,25 602:16 602:17 609:21 613:3,7 615:23 616:2,3 619:10 620:2,3 621:1 622:3 625:21 629:3,20 631:5 632:5,19 633:21 646:11,22 648:7 651:14,22 654:18 654:20 661:15 663:8 664:7,12,21 665:8,8,22,24 666:17 673:11 674:5 676:15,16 679:8 701:12 719:16,25 processes 633:10 processing 595:5 produced 605:3 production 707:12 professor 567:22 program 573:7 578:19 594:20
---	---	---	--	--

595:5	549:18 551:17,21	590:15 619:15	public 545:3 557:2	673:25 674:6
project 547:14	552:2,21 553:13	621:8 629:7,12	561:16,17 564:4,8	693:7 718:1 719:5
560:12,13,18,20	555:12 556:14,16	633:5,8 643:18	568:4 569:7	questions 557:13
561:12 562:2,15	557:7 559:23,24	646:20 666:10	575:16 580:16	564:18,21 567:15
562:23 563:19	560:4,22 562:6	protect 557:2	581:17,19 588:24	569:10 578:8
564:6,7 565:16	565:23 566:2	581:16,19 589:1	588:25 610:14	580:22 584:2
566:1,7 568:13,16	568:3 569:13	610:14 611:9	611:9 631:1	588:12 595:12
568:20 569:3	571:4 572:7,20	668:13 676:6	635:24 652:17,20	603:9 605:11
570:7 572:10	574:6,25 589:5,12	protected 552:4	656:1 672:5 676:7	606:22 608:8,23
573:22 585:25	595:19 596:5	protection 556:6	686:18 687:3	614:9 616:8
588:21 612:16	597:16 598:20,25	574:2 575:1 581:4	693:17,20,23	685:14 692:7
616:15 620:6,20	607:10 609:4,13	711:16	694:6 698:11,15	695:22 705:5
668:11 669:13,16	609:15,16,22	protections 612:15	publishes 563:3	707:18,20 708:11
675:15,19 696:21	610:16,18,19,23	protective 588:9	pull 552:3 611:16	710:16 717:14,16
project-related	611:2,3 612:7,9	protocol 604:1	612:11,12 619:11	quick 582:22 609:8
687:21 689:11	613:2,9,12,16,19	provide 547:25	626:14 657:6	649:17,23 651:6
projected 554:20	614:13,21 615:10	551:13 560:15	pulled 626:15	683:18 719:5
608:19 609:17	616:14,14,21,24	562:25 567:7	669:19	quickly 650:20
projecting 553:14	616:25 617:4,8,20	568:12 574:2	pulling 620:8	683:15
projects 720:19	617:25 618:3,11	591:3,20 592:15	purpose 673:16	quiet 553:22 554:4
proper 566:14	618:14,15 619:14	604:9 631:12	purposed 699:22	587:18 606:13
704:15	620:9,14,16 621:9	633:23 635:9	purposes 698:4	quietest 554:17
properly 708:1	621:15,19 622:6,9	642:11 648:16	pursuant 545:17	559:4 599:21
properties 558:10	622:13,19,21	651:20 693:15	568:15,16 664:12	604:8
558:12,16 560:25	623:3,9,14 624:22	696:19 701:9	push 709:22	quite 587:24
568:8 654:9	624:25 625:3	712:4	pushed 544:6	606:14 627:21
property 558:20	627:19 628:14,23	provided 544:13	put 553:3 582:11	638:13 656:21
560:3 619:23	633:1,4,17,24	553:7 555:12	590:7 621:15,21	690:16 722:4
655:2 663:11	637:8 667:17	601:11 617:14	634:14 642:17	quorum 543:23
664:14 680:6	670:1,5,9,24	624:4 630:16	665:2 723:10,18	quote/unquote
688:1,4,7 692:15	671:3 673:6	686:15 688:3	putting 623:4	650:23
697:8 704:21	675:10 679:22,24	690:17,20 710:22	644:7 714:14	quoting 565:17,18
proportion 665:13	679:25 682:4,14	provides 548:21		683:22
proposal 544:11,14	683:6 685:15	555:22 557:23	Q	
645:14,16 654:4,7	686:9,11,14	564:4 565:21	qualities 547:1	R
661:9 685:25	687:12 689:25	670:14	quality 573:2,5	R 540:24 541:1
proposals 614:22	702:12 708:20,22	providing 631:15	574:4,8 581:25	542:1 726:2,8,19
615:16 623:23	710:24 711:10	632:25 646:9	582:6	Rackner 542:4,5
654:2	714:20,23 715:1	686:25	quantify 658:14	564:23 565:5
propose 589:22	715:21,22 716:5	provision 561:8	queasy 593:8,15	567:14,23 569:1,2
619:21 624:2	716:16,17 717:3,4	568:25 640:17	question 547:8	584:5,5 588:11
625:16 627:9	717:12 718:15,15	666:7	569:17 578:13	589:3 592:1,4,6
630:3 677:25	719:9,17,18,19	provisions 566:1	579:1 596:3	594:1 595:13
proposed 540:4	proposes 621:14	proximity 599:1	608:10 643:17	603:11 605:10,11
545:21,21 547:10	651:18	proxy 605:8	650:21 652:10	605:21 606:25
547:17 548:20,22	proposing 553:3	PSPS 694:15	654:23 655:13	608:2 609:18,22

614:12 616:7 618:21 623:10,12 626:1,3,19 627:24 628:3,16 629:24 631:3 632:16 633:4 634:13,24 635:8 636:13,20 636:25 640:19,21 645:8,12,15 648:10 650:13,22 651:5 653:1 654:14 655:4 656:5,16 657:15 658:25 659:10,18 662:24 663:14,15 664:21 665:5,6 666:17,25 670:18 670:25 671:3 673:11 674:9 675:1 676:13,14 678:10 693:10,10 695:21,25 696:12 697:4,11 699:7,12 704:9 705:9 707:19 Rackner's 632:24 radius 564:7 Railroad 599:2 rain 550:2,4,4 587:21,22 raise 545:2,4 566:16 576:13 693:12 707:5 raised 561:2 576:9 599:12 607:21,23 634:14 660:4 716:3 raising 592:13 rang 614:24 range 703:13 rapid 686:21 rare 694:23 Ratcliffe 541:16 546:1 559:14 571:20 584:11 598:8 610:10,11	612:1 614:20 618:7 631:20,21 633:2 654:1 679:11,12 681:11 681:15 685:17,18 686:5 700:15 714:5 715:19,23 717:19 721:23 rationale 622:6 657:1 669:24 670:14 re-conductor 671:14 re-interpreted 577:12 reach 665:3,7 reached 653:25 663:8 666:22 675:21 701:4 reaching 646:12 read 556:3 565:8 601:7 605:16 606:8 633:15 634:4,9,12,15 637:25 638:19 639:3 641:14 655:16 666:7 670:12 677:7,19 679:17 710:25 711:20 reading 612:22 637:14 666:6,8 reads 581:2,11,22 652:18 655:16 ready 546:3 570:23 578:10 596:16 677:23 679:17,19 681:7 682:23 689:4 699:18 708:15 710:7 718:25 723:24 724:10 reality 672:17 really 551:19 552:18 563:6 570:18 576:4	582:13 587:23 589:15 590:4 592:12 593:12 596:9 602:10,23 602:25 605:4,5 606:19 607:7 613:11 614:17 618:13 653:4,15 661:20 672:5 677:20 685:12 693:8 698:7,10 712:15 realm 546:15,24 realtime 653:8 reason 566:9 569:18 570:21 639:9 642:19 665:20 695:20 reasonable 570:11 570:16 656:13 reasonably 588:4 588:19 reasoning 569:19 611:4 716:15,25 717:9,12 reasons 632:21 716:13 719:11 rebuttable 653:12 recall 722:25 receive 544:19 561:17 received 603:19 604:20 655:22 676:18 receptor 558:19 635:1 receptors 560:8 564:5 568:2 569:6 610:22 recipient 627:1 628:19,19 recognize 594:24 594:25 595:7,8,11 658:18 678:14 723:20 recommend 719:22	recommendation 557:8 573:16 596:23 597:3 632:6 681:19 recommendations 556:15 602:22 643:8 719:22 recommended 608:11 610:19 611:8,13 619:12 622:10 668:6 673:4,7 678:2 696:14 711:15 714:12 recommending 559:11 571:25 recommends 720:12 record 546:8 565:5 569:20 570:21,25 584:6 585:11,17 587:6 593:6 594:16 596:19 601:24 619:17 620:24 621:4,12 622:14,17 630:23 642:4 643:16 644:9 658:6 669:17 679:15 685:19 687:14 691:7 693:11 706:9 708:1 710:9 712:2,10 716:4 718:2 719:13 720:10 721:12 722:12 723:10 recorded 599:22 recreation 552:4 red 566:17 612:10 619:13 621:8,13 621:16,17 670:24 686:10,16,21 687:1,7 689:7,11 690:2 red-lined 620:14 redline 622:23	redlining 623:20 623:21 624:4,17 reduce 566:19 669:10,15 671:12 673:20 676:3 688:25 reduced 559:22 redundant 613:23 654:16 refer 615:4 640:1 706:14 reference 716:1 referenced 696:12 referencing 609:14 referred 598:25 599:16 603:21 614:20 636:18 639:18 641:1 660:18 666:17 referring 609:23 620:23 661:6 672:4 698:7 refers 561:14 reflect 636:6 714:19 reflected 560:12 644:22 refrain 566:23 regard 575:17,17 607:16 654:3 696:11,13 716:9 regarding 546:23 575:23 576:10,16 581:2,11 584:16 687:19 702:24 720:6 regardless 662:2 regards 581:1 region 586:24 regular 671:17 674:16 regularly 672:23 672:24 regulation 546:4 556:25 557:3 572:21 581:14
--	--	---	--	---

707:15 regulations 546:25 547:22 548:10,12 552:8 568:11 595:20 600:14 679:23 693:5 703:17 rehabilitation 687:24 690:15 reiterate 721:6 reject 582:21 rejected 582:15 610:25 612:19 707:16 rejection 612:24 relate 575:12 related 544:7 559:16 585:11 632:5 679:23 683:17 684:18 691:10 704:5,7 707:24 708:21 710:17,18,21 711:11 relates 678:12 685:22 relative 556:10 655:24 658:15 720:15 relatively 704:10 relevant 706:3 reliable 605:1 reliance 588:17 relies 599:21 rely 591:6 707:6 remain 667:20,25 remainder 645:24 remaining 544:8 597:5 709:14,19 remand 602:9 704:3 remarks 699:4 remember 544:23 593:25 605:24 656:19 699:5 723:2	remind 547:7 593:23 676:17 reminder 544:3,22 remote 718:6 removal 678:13 removed 678:2 720:7 removing 621:17 render 579:21 586:23 repair 696:19 repeatedly 601:25 replaced 674:3 719:7 reply 707:4 report 642:10 668:23 676:11 718:5 REPORTED 540:24 Reporter 726:9 represent 599:19 representation 555:22 representations 548:21 representative 557:25 600:3 601:10,12,15,16 606:11 607:24 represented 550:25 556:16 622:22 representing 555:20 562:10 request 555:14 561:5,9 573:10 575:9 594:18 595:23 630:8 659:10 689:8 requested 555:6 704:13 requesting 555:8 556:21 557:6 requests 594:20 595:1,6 684:25 require 560:6	564:9 565:12 632:7 633:16 634:11 664:22 668:15 676:9,10 688:20 696:15 required 560:10,16 562:20 568:23 573:2 589:5 600:23,25 606:3 629:19 630:11,18 663:2 669:2,8 676:22 682:12,13 688:15 703:18,19 705:15 requirement 561:16 565:7 568:5 574:14,17 613:4 629:22 673:21 requirements 556:24 560:20,21 561:4,6,9,12,25 563:9 565:22 568:13 572:17,21 579:8 581:14 589:14 615:8 627:3 628:20 635:1,4 663:17 694:25 708:3 requires 560:2 563:4 614:5 626:8 626:23 673:9 675:12 682:4 705:25 requiring 589:19 701:18 research 544:12 710:20 residence 558:14 587:19 residences 593:24 594:2,3,5 residents 691:20 resolution 646:12 651:4 resolve 653:20	resolved 591:11 653:21 resolving 569:12 resources 546:2 552:4 706:13 respect 573:12 585:8 587:3 644:17,18 645:5 648:21 680:6 689:3 694:6,18 695:6 717:10 respectful 545:11 605:9 respectively 599:25 respond 611:6 614:22 617:3 618:18 625:9 627:11 631:3 664:6 670:19 responded 594:17 594:18 656:17 719:14,15 responding 662:25 721:23 response 566:22 569:7 592:12 599:12 604:4 607:25 615:9 626:2 627:8 630:5 634:14 663:18 676:14 687:25 700:6 713:25 724:16 responses 612:22 613:21 670:3 671:1 responsibility 573:6 650:4 652:4 responsible 606:20 649:2,14 responsive 607:20 rest 639:11 651:23 713:3 result 558:3 567:1 575:1 580:2 598:21 648:15	687:16 696:20 results 557:21,23 558:5 604:10,19 606:13 714:10 retained 608:1 return 544:10 returned 666:9 reverse 689:8 review 540:4 545:20 547:8 548:4 574:21 595:18 601:1 610:25 611:6 637:21 638:5,11 687:19 697:10 706:23,24 715:4 reviewed 706:22 reviewing 570:1 600:7 reviews 641:12 revise 631:11 revises 609:16 revision 566:6 617:1 618:11,15 654:3 revisions 608:11 610:23 611:1,3 617:21 670:2,4 right 553:20 565:4 571:5 580:4 583:16,22 596:13 596:21 604:7 610:4 621:2 623:18,20 625:4 626:18 635:14 636:8,16 637:14 638:18 639:16 641:13 646:6 651:16 655:19 657:14 660:21,21 661:10,10 667:8 671:12 678:7 681:11,16 683:7 685:12 692:19,20 692:23 693:1,1 695:10 714:5
---	--	---	---	--

715:23 717:20	Rowe 541:21	558:23,25 559:6	salient 586:17	715:15,20
right-of-way	567:17,18,18	559:25 560:1	Sam 542:17	scrivener's 714:18
684:12,18,23	569:9 595:14,15	561:19 563:20	sample 647:15,19	scroll 551:2 646:24
685:22,23 686:2	596:10 607:1,2,2	564:9,15,24 565:7	sampling 599:11	670:16 722:2
688:18 695:1,18	608:7,14 609:3,14	565:11,12,18	Sarah 541:10	seal 726:15
704:20	610:2,5 616:9,10	566:5 567:10	544:13 569:22	second 547:14
right-of-ways	617:11,16,18,24	568:9,11,18 569:1	570:13 617:14	557:7 560:19
684:9	618:3,19 622:5	570:7 572:1,8,12	710:22 719:14	562:2 574:17
rights 590:19	623:11 625:9	572:13,14 573:9	satisfied 635:7	585:19 607:16
592:21 593:1	634:5,8,12,22	573:12 574:1	717:2	637:13 710:13
613:8 616:2	638:12,12,20	575:19 576:25	satisfies 626:21	723:23 724:7,9,12
630:19 631:9	639:2,13 640:16	577:2,2,3,14	644:25	secondary 579:6
633:9,10,18 642:9	641:18 644:5	578:4,4 580:14	satisfy 684:19	seconds 587:10
644:17,18 680:6	650:19,19 652:11	584:14,15,17	saw 633:20	692:13
rights-of-way	654:24 655:8	585:2 586:1,21	saying 580:9	secretary 541:7
688:17	656:19 660:17,20	591:5 594:22	582:12 626:4	543:10,11,13,15
risk 686:8 687:7,11	660:22 661:12	606:3 607:5,7	639:8 655:5	543:17,19,21,23
687:16 689:6,10	666:12,13,16,21	637:25 664:4,5	658:23 665:12	544:2 570:22,24
689:15,22 690:1,4	673:2,2 695:23,24	665:24 682:17	671:25 674:24	571:6,8,10,12,14
690:6 691:1,3,15	696:6 707:21,22	702:25 703:1,5	675:2 716:11	571:16,18 596:18
691:17 693:24	707:22 715:11,20	704:4,6,7 705:16	says 562:20 568:7	597:11,14,19,21
694:1,5,18 695:4	RPR 540:24 726:19	ruling 661:18	568:16 576:8,14	597:23,25 598:2,4
696:9	rule 545:17 556:24	673:6 700:25	576:15 577:1,6,14	598:6 620:24
risks 712:6	557:3 560:6,9	701:8 702:11	577:17 581:9	621:4 642:4,10
river 582:9	561:14,20 562:16	run 553:18	595:18 602:24	644:8 679:15,20
road 583:14,14,18	562:19,22,22,25	runs 692:20	621:19 634:16	680:17,19,21,23
583:21 648:6	563:1,7,8,12,18	rural 553:21 554:3	637:21 638:4	681:2,4 699:20,25
704:20	563:19,21 565:9	601:22,23 602:12	639:5 640:7,12	700:2,4,7,9,11,13
roadmap 560:15	566:1,4 568:1,6	603:3 692:4	652:3 664:11	708:16 709:1,3,5
roads 684:21	568:15,22 595:3		666:22 670:8	709:7,9,11,18
robust 604:2	598:14 701:18	S	698:9 705:9	710:8,9 713:14,16
614:18 630:8,9	703:16 707:10	S 541:1 542:1	scenario 553:18	713:18,20,22,24
631:10	rule-making	sad 702:15	scenarios 554:1	714:1,3 715:14
rocks 583:10	562:25 563:3	safe 603:3,6	scenic 552:4	718:1,4 719:12
role 674:4	rule-set 548:8	safer 631:18	schedule 668:17	721:11 722:12,24
roll 543:10 713:15	rulemaking 563:8	safety 556:6 574:2	712:6	723:3,6 724:11,12
724:11	563:12 566:9	575:1 580:17	schools 594:3	724:15,17,19,21
room 699:13	rules 541:12	581:4,9 582:1	Scott 685:11 703:7	724:23,25 725:4
round 603:24	545:13 546:16,18	610:15 611:10	scrapes 674:14	section 546:2
route 579:24	547:1,2,4,20	676:7 684:16	screen 547:16	565:20 628:10
582:25 587:4,7	548:1,1,2,2 549:5	687:4 693:17,23	611:17 616:16,17	646:21 683:6,20
687:12 698:2	549:7 551:4,6,8	694:6,24 697:22	617:25 620:7,20	691:3 692:21
routed 695:10	551:12,17,24	698:11,15 699:1,6	625:4,12 626:15	711:13,15
routes 579:22,24	555:8,9,11,16	711:14	669:19,22 711:1	sections 616:24
602:3	556:3,18,20,22	Salem 541:14,17,22	711:18	618:24
row 578:2	557:11,17 558:9	718:6,7	scrivener 715:12	see 548:8 551:3

552:10,11 556:3 565:14 567:13 576:3,22 579:4 605:9 611:14 612:12 621:13 623:1 625:13 626:16,21 628:11 629:17 644:23 646:1,3 655:10 667:16,16 677:12 684:4 699:12 707:17 711:19 714:13 721:22 seeing 621:7 652:6 655:8 662:9 seeks 568:1 seen 547:2 582:23 665:25 sees 559:3 selected 598:23 599:18 604:6 selection 605:8 send 592:19 626:25 628:17 634:22 722:6 sending 634:18 644:5 sends 713:7 Senior 541:9 545:24 546:1,9 sense 585:16 639:16 647:25 654:12 663:5,22 671:8 672:7 721:2 sensible 615:19 sensitive 558:10,15 558:19,20 560:7 sentence 637:20 638:4 647:12 666:21 716:24 720:15 separate 551:4 560:9 561:18 624:3 638:24 separately 561:13 561:24 717:1	September 718:5 719:2 720:7 726:15 series 612:6 serious 723:20 seriously 582:5 serves 631:22 service 684:21 686:18,24 689:16 689:20 Services 706:13 set 546:21 549:7 565:10 568:20 582:7 590:19 597:4 598:17 600:4 601:19,20 602:11 603:2,13 606:20 613:18,18 630:9,15 631:10 638:14 642:13 649:13 726:14 setbacks 683:23 sets 633:22 642:7 setting 572:11 593:9,14 setup 685:5 seven 637:20 shaking 712:8 shalls 722:23 share 711:1 sharing 548:7 sheer 672:17 shift 649:9 650:3 shifting 650:7,15 short 683:15 Shout 685:9 show 547:5 586:8 617:12 619:14 648:13 653:14 716:16 showed 601:12 602:4 showing 690:9 shows 602:1 675:23 703:10 706:10 708:1	shrink 617:23 shutoff 687:4 693:17,24 694:6 697:22 698:11,15 699:2 shutting 698:19 sic 582:6 695:17 side 638:4 sides 666:1 676:24 sign 545:6 signed 544:21 690:20 significant 594:11 617:21 688:10 704:16 723:15 significantly 587:20 594:11 604:20 silence 544:17 similar 660:22 689:19 Similarly 565:25 671:9 simple 563:6 578:16 603:20 650:25 simplistic 633:18 simply 580:8 647:19 658:1,23 705:20 single 650:3 site 540:2 547:10 548:21,22 549:2,3 549:4,4,5,6 551:22 553:16 554:18 559:23,24 560:8,11,25 562:3 567:4,8 568:21 572:17 584:13 588:7 592:9 598:24 610:14 662:24,25 663:2,3 663:9,16,19 664:25 673:4 682:22 696:18 715:7	sites 548:18,19 siting 541:9,11,12 543:9 545:25 546:9 688:16 725:9 726:11 sitting 632:17 situation 553:9 561:5 600:17 641:20 671:21 676:7 situations 555:9 640:25 694:8 six 637:20 690:23 size 687:20 skill 726:12 skip 548:13 slanderous 545:15 slash 559:22 sleep 588:4 sleeping 558:13 slide 683:8 684:4 slowly 670:16 small 600:5 683:9 704:10 smartphone 651:7 656:5 657:22 smoke 582:12 snippets 557:17 software 702:4 soil 687:15,24 690:14,15,22 691:15 700:21 701:16,19 702:3 703:19 705:15 706:6,10,12,13,19 707:3,6,8,11 711:16 soils 688:1,10 703:20 706:17 solar 552:23 sole 573:9 586:11 solely 596:21 solution 649:16 somebody 621:6 628:1 649:7 658:9 661:18 667:7	sophisticated 651:2 sorry 605:13 620:5 634:8 638:20 645:23 670:18 686:4 693:19 715:11,12 720:8 sort 637:24 644:15 644:21 647:21 650:15 652:1 668:17 sorts 714:21 sound 550:4 557:22 564:25 587:19,22 588:2 600:8 603:14,18 604:12 630:7 647:5,6,8 sounds 551:21 554:4 571:5 597:18 618:23 636:7 659:7 680:16 696:4 697:9 699:24 source 550:12 551:10 572:12 688:3,6 sources 548:14,16 548:17,18 557:1 588:3 657:7 Southwest 542:5 spans 554:13 speak 545:3 628:1 677:9 speaker 544:24 speaking 549:22 special 579:21 specific 556:23,25 577:4,9 581:13,15 581:15 589:13 598:16 620:3 626:6 627:18 629:8,11 630:4 668:5,12 678:1 680:2,4 685:14 697:7,21 698:20 711:17 specifically 577:1
--	--	--	--	---

577:17 581:2,8,12 586:2 589:16 614:22 671:1 688:14 689:9 690:19 699:5 702:6 715:1 718:21 specifics 627:19 specifies 646:9 specify 556:12 568:9 648:1 655:17 spectrum 644:21 speed 655:24 656:11 658:2,23 spelled 712:5 spelling 629:8 spot 601:14 603:22 603:22 604:3 spot-check 601:11 601:13 605:25 649:11 spraying 688:13,22 695:7,16 696:11 spread 686:21 square 703:11 ss 726:5 SSURGO 702:3 706:14 staff 541:8 585:13 595:18 632:12 642:8,14 702:1 712:12,18 714:11 719:10 723:12 staff's 725:5 stage 572:11 714:17 stand 708:20 standard 546:4 547:8 548:4 550:18,18,21,22 554:21 555:3 558:4 559:12,17 572:22,23 573:19 577:16,19 579:17 580:9 585:23	596:25 598:22 599:8 600:21 607:10,13 615:6 653:16 664:9,15 673:17,21 676:9 679:14 681:7 682:4 683:5 701:15,20 708:17 710:14,16 711:11 716:9,21 standards 544:8 546:14,16 547:11 548:12 550:10,16 560:16 568:18 580:6,10,20 582:7 588:3 676:6 706:3 708:21 714:8 717:2 standpoint 619:10 633:3 642:6 661:25 662:1 stands 670:7,10 Stanley 600:3 601:12 603:22 604:19,24 605:2 605:17,21 606:17 star 545:3 start 550:11 612:5 616:21 618:25 619:24 624:4 625:11 662:20 666:19 710:3 started 601:21 695:4 starting 618:1 658:20 starts 638:5 state 544:24 545:12 574:8 576:22 581:24 582:1,2,3 584:14 587:1 595:20 622:12 654:25 682:12 703:1,5 707:10,15 726:5,9 state's 701:12	state-of-the-art 649:21 650:2 stated 629:10 703:23 704:9 706:15 statement 700:20 statements 702:22 717:10 states 565:25 574:1 595:3 statewide 682:6,13 685:1 stating 566:12 576:8,8 723:10 statistical 550:14 559:3 statistically 690:2 statue 568:16 statute 568:11,25 577:1,5,6 584:22 701:18 703:18 707:15 statutes 547:11,12 568:17 572:5,8,18 576:25 584:14,17 585:2 703:6 statutory 565:11 stay 669:8,13 675:7 676:10 steep 583:6,17 stop 542:10 550:10 559:20 561:2 562:7,11,13,14 566:12 571:22 578:11 586:6 592:13 598:9 600:1,1 601:4,6 601:11 603:11 604:17 605:7 610:12,22 611:2 612:2,3,6 614:22 615:3 618:4,11,15 619:2,12 621:14 625:16 630:5 634:14 636:1 637:7,22 640:11	643:8 645:1 647:7 650:8,16 657:23 661:22 668:2,6 670:24 672:21 675:10 677:25 Stop's 563:10 594:18 604:4 618:6 623:14,23 632:21 640:14 660:10 664:18 667:24 668:9 669:4 675:16 676:5 storage 553:2 straightforward 563:10,23 578:25 579:13 straw 569:12 570:23 596:17,21 596:24 632:2 679:13,17 699:19 708:15 713:14 714:10 stray 628:22 Street 541:13,17,22 strict 557:3 563:2 586:21 stricter 694:24 strike 621:17 721:22 string 671:15 stringent 549:6 strong 589:16 590:4 stronger 589:21 struck 621:21 structural 710:13 710:16 711:10 structurally 718:14 structure 719:21 721:20 structures 683:24 684:24 687:15,15 stuck 692:23 stuff 578:24 646:9 683:17	sub 551:15 552:7 572:6 621:19 637:14 646:19,24 652:1 666:13,16 667:19 688:20 subject 586:3 663:3 663:10 694:24 submission 684:1 submit 627:7 668:24 submitted 612:6 623:7 654:7 682:18 687:9 submitting 654:5 subpart 647:1,2,2 659:15,23 subparts 646:23 subsection 630:1 659:22,23 680:12 subsections 652:2 substantial 580:2,2 694:19 697:6 substantiate 648:17 substantive 633:3 681:20 682:5,9,16 sufficient 657:22 660:13 681:20 700:22 716:18,19 suggest 587:6 616:15,22 619:11 632:23 657:24 658:22 663:20 667:18,19 715:16 717:7 suggested 601:15 619:2,24 621:23 624:22 632:24 635:8,10 637:13 637:19,22 638:7 644:5 646:14 647:5 650:16 660:4,6 668:1,12 668:14 678:13 suggesting 609:12 621:16,17 632:22
--	---	--	---	--

647:15,20 648:12 663:24 672:23 suggestion 585:8 616:11 630:21 632:20 640:23 643:12 647:11 665:2 713:4 suggestions 618:6 620:4 625:13 suggests 672:18 suite 542:6 591:19 summary 554:23 557:21 562:5 575:3 601:2 635:12 644:6,17 680:5 684:4 689:2 700:25 702:10,11 702:17,19 704:1 704:11 705:11,20 707:4 708:10 superfluous 720:6 supplemental 603:16 604:2,5 607:17 608:3 support 555:22 608:13,20 658:15 658:17 662:6 707:15 supported 587:1 supporting 690:8 690:20 supports 547:9 suppose 657:3 713:6 supposed 577:2 580:11 722:3 Supreme 705:8 sure 562:13 563:14 567:25 582:13,14 584:13 592:24 593:8,12 605:16 607:6,14,18 609:7 609:9 615:21,25 617:17 620:11 621:25 631:9 632:12 636:11	639:9 646:7,11 651:12 656:13 671:19 673:17,18 674:19 686:3 Survey 706:13 suspect 623:6 suspend 595:4 suspended 573:5 SUZANNE 542:10 SW 542:12 system 690:19 <hr/> T T 726:2,2 table 550:22,25 557:20 558:2,6,23 559:10 618:20 632:3 683:9 take 553:15 554:19 559:18 570:4,5 578:14 596:21 609:8 627:14 630:19 643:5 647:22 659:17 661:15 662:19 668:17 670:11 685:1 691:21 709:23 710:1 714:9 717:8 719:10 taken 558:24 572:18 604:17 637:24 638:8 662:22 710:5 712:7 714:6 takes 554:13 582:4 611:17 643:8 649:2 talk 546:19 549:17 551:18,20 552:3 552:15,23 559:7 577:11 585:13,17 588:8 589:3 602:21 615:2 624:14,20 629:1,2 683:16	talked 547:2 555:17 646:21 682:25 689:18 718:20 talking 548:15,16 549:12 553:6 577:16 607:12 609:9 698:21 talks 630:2,3 645:20 647:2 685:24 Tardaewether 541:9 545:24 546:5,6,9 569:20 569:21 617:4,13 617:17,22 620:5 622:14,15,17,18 637:15 643:16,17 669:17,18 670:20 681:24 682:1,1 685:19 700:17 720:8,10 target 552:11 tasked 710:20 tax 702:3 tech 672:3 technical 546:22 561:14 698:20 technological 672:3 technologies 669:2 669:9 technology 613:25 614:3,7 669:5,6 669:14,14 676:2,8 676:11,12 telephone 545:5 tell 563:25 570:7 585:10 592:20 625:7 627:2 634:25 635:4 656:22 665:16,16 665:18 722:19 tells 555:24,24 temperature 655:24 658:23 temporal 720:22	temporary 563:13 ten 656:12 ten-year 675:25 tense 721:3,4 tenses 720:12 term 590:7 650:2 terms 593:22 611:13 629:9 668:13 669:5 testified 708:4 testifying 545:1 testimony 601:25 603:5 606:8 611:22,24 688:3 690:18,21,24 691:6,9 701:24 712:14 text 621:8,13 thank 544:12,15 546:6 564:20,22 565:2 567:14 569:9 571:18 578:7 580:21,23 583:24 584:1 587:8 588:10,11 588:15 591:21 593:3,20 596:10 598:6 603:8,10 605:10 606:21,24 606:25 608:7 610:6 614:8 616:7 627:25 632:16 637:2 645:22 659:21 666:24 675:8 679:7 681:4 685:18 692:5 693:9 695:21 698:25 699:14 700:13 705:3,4,6 707:19 709:11 710:11 712:18,20 714:3 715:23 720:4 721:5,12 723:21 thanks 559:14 686:5 710:19	712:12 thing 566:18 577:10 580:18 591:11 603:3,6 609:10 615:24 622:7 629:17 631:4,21 659:1 668:8 671:16 715:9,25 things 563:4 567:24 580:8 587:12 588:16 589:25 633:23 636:15 657:12 658:3 664:3,20 668:12,25 674:15 691:22 709:15,19 think 546:20 549:2 558:11 565:4,18 566:17 567:20 578:24 579:1,3,4 580:12 586:11,16 586:17 590:13,23 591:23 593:18 594:24 595:10 602:17,25 605:21 606:17 608:14 614:15,17 615:2,5 615:7,24 617:18 624:1 625:3 626:4 626:17 627:10,20 628:8 629:10,10 629:14,19,24 630:9,10,24 631:8 631:13,23,25 634:1 635:13,19 637:14 643:2 644:10 646:4,13 646:16,18,19,25 650:9 651:25 652:13,14,17,18 652:20 653:15,24 654:1,15 657:10 657:10 659:1 660:18 662:16,19 665:19 667:5,6
---	---	---	---	---

<p>670:25 672:14,22 675:6 677:4,18,22 678:3,6,22 679:1 679:8,10 681:15 697:3,5,11,11 698:1,5 699:18 713:4 716:11 718:4 719:5,9 720:14 722:5 723:9 thinking 631:6 652:23 657:12 thinks 618:17 thoroughly 694:4 722:17 thought 557:18 562:18 614:25 624:6,7 654:12 656:5 657:16 thoughts 632:19 thousands 649:2 650:13 threat 574:7 581:25 threatening 545:15 three 571:22 575:4 596:11 599:17 603:23,25 604:22 606:10 608:3 614:16 626:13 646:23 659:20 662:20 667:15 668:4,7 670:6,7 670:15,25 675:3 675:11 677:1 679:13 703:2 threshold 559:8 594:8 thrown 576:17 tight 590:5 tighten 602:23 Tillamook 576:7 timber 702:2 703:20 707:11 time 543:6 554:12 554:18 565:1</p>	<p>566:15 569:14 573:21 578:1 584:9 586:2,5 593:13 605:9 615:4 616:8 627:15 628:1 636:15 648:1,2 659:2 668:16 670:19 674:3,3,7 674:8,18,25 677:4 693:25 697:18,20 707:17 718:9 719:9 723:13,17 725:7 timelines 662:25 timely 691:6 716:12 times 545:13 556:13 560:14,19 567:25 573:23 599:21 671:6 timing 556:10 717:24 tiny 586:18 626:15 title 581:14 636:11 today 544:3,6 545:20 546:23 600:13 699:4,7 712:14 715:17 717:18 Todd 541:7 570:25 596:19 620:24 621:4 636:5 639:13 642:4 644:9 679:15 710:9 718:2 719:13 720:11 721:12 722:12 Todd's 645:13,15 toggle 622:18 told 585:13 628:1 ton 639:16 tool 545:9 590:8,9 tools 590:8,8 top 669:13 684:4 total 586:17 599:9</p>	<p>totally 661:25 667:1 721:13 touch 584:9 touched 692:11 tower 669:11 track 668:25 tracks 612:13 train 546:14 599:9 602:5 trains 602:6 transcript 726:10 transformers 553:1 translate 632:13 transmission 540:6 545:23 548:22 549:14,15,20 550:13 553:25 573:24 598:17 671:5,9,24 673:8 674:1,2,13 684:9 684:17,19,22 686:9,11 687:17 688:21 689:25 690:7,9 691:22 694:9 704:18 Transportation 710:22 treats 586:12 tree 694:25 trees 590:6 606:15 684:15 tried 589:1 613:17 692:17 tries 612:14 trigger 714:24 trimming 671:18 trouble 605:15 truck 583:18,21 true 566:16 614:24 652:12 726:12 Truitt 541:5 543:15,16 571:12 571:13 598:4,5 658:5,5 681:2,3 700:7,8 708:24,25 713:5,5,20,21</p>	<p>724:8,19,20 try 563:17 584:8 585:12 590:17 611:18 613:24 628:6 631:12 642:20 646:7 649:16 659:4 677:12 693:13 718:9 trying 583:12 601:19 619:4 621:1 627:23 631:11 632:13,18 633:13 640:3 643:25 647:23 650:16 653:8 659:12 669:12 676:6 722:2 Tuesday 718:6 turn 546:5 679:10 710:8 720:21 721:1 turning 588:15 607:21 677:11 turns 614:15 tutorial 658:11 twists 614:15 two 550:9 551:1 554:24 583:20 604:15 605:19 607:7 608:12,15 608:18 620:23 626:19,20 628:11 628:24 629:1,20 633:15,20 634:6,9 634:10 635:2 643:11,20,23 644:3,10 645:3,10 645:12,17,19,24 653:25 656:12 659:13 667:18 668:1 677:1 680:2 696:7 709:20,21 718:9 type 591:10 656:23 657:16 669:9,10</p>	<p>671:11 672:2 682:15 687:15 706:6 707:3,6 types 552:22 607:7 639:17 657:12 674:15 707:11 typical 683:23</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">U</p> <hr/> <p>ultimate 561:23 660:16 ultimately 566:22 566:24 567:5 579:3 601:18 613:15 616:4 625:21 638:2,10 640:14 652:4 653:21 660:14 661:5,13,18 670:3 715:6 Umatilla 683:2 684:3,6 685:2,10 694:2 unacceptable 545:18 unavoidable 695:11 uncomfortable 640:10,11 642:12 underestimate 649:4 underneath 548:4 550:8 558:22 understand 567:10 592:25 614:18 616:2 617:19 635:25 636:24 640:7 650:25 656:22 661:3 699:1 712:16 understanding 570:12,20 596:9 607:6,15 612:21 693:22 694:1 695:9,14 understood 640:9</p>
---	---	---	--	---

<p>662:17 undertake 615:20 undeserved 663:23 undeveloped 549:4 unexpected 591:18 Unfortunately 619:7 Union 577:20 579:20 598:23 599:2,15 602:5,11 603:2,7 683:1 684:3,6 685:2,7 685:10 701:10,11 701:14,16,19,23 701:25 702:3 703:22 705:13,14 705:15,23,25 706:5,7,12,22 707:8,25 708:2,4 708:7 unique 690:19 unnecessary 570:18 615:6 unpermissible 586:23 unreasonable 581:24 663:25 664:3 unrebutted 706:9 unresolved 574:23 untimely 612:20,24 unused 548:18,19 548:22 549:4,5 unusual 555:21 573:20 577:11 585:22 up-front 614:2 up-to-date 676:10 update 567:6 592:16,18 642:11 703:17 updated 614:7 628:18 636:14 655:7 upgrade 669:2 upgraded 669:9,14</p>	<p>upgrades 672:3 673:16,20 675:21 676:11 upgrading 672:25 urge 602:9 603:7 612:10 613:15 use 544:24 545:2 548:24 556:10,10 590:7 603:13 681:7 682:3,12,19 682:20,21 683:5,6 683:16,19,21,25 686:12 696:14,24 699:16 700:18,18 700:23 701:12,19 701:21 702:1,25 703:1,3,5,16,17 705:17 706:3,4,6 706:24,25 708:14 708:17,20,20 716:22 uses 684:10 usually 552:25 554:15 628:2 640:25 usurp 578:22 utility 650:10 668:18 672:22 675:18,22 686:2 693:20</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">V</p> <hr/> <p>v 576:7 valid 574:20 Valley 599:20 value 695:20 variance 555:8 556:22 557:5 572:22 573:10,17 575:19 576:19 578:15 579:8 584:20 585:4,15 586:20 587:14 588:6 593:13 594:16 595:1 600:19 678:11,14</p>	<p>678:16,18,22,24 variance/exception 571:25 572:2 600:12 variances 556:23 581:11,13 582:6 582:21 584:24 593:7 594:21 595:6 vast 549:19 vegetation 671:19 688:5 vegetative 684:15 686:1 verbally 669:23 verifiable 604:25 verify 613:10 652:12 vernacular 558:18 version 620:14 623:6 626:24 643:14 720:1 versions 623:19 versus 653:22 vetted 600:10 Vice 541:4 543:5 543:12,24,25 544:2,15 546:7 564:20 567:14 569:9 570:22 571:5,7 578:8 580:21 583:24 584:2 588:11 593:4 595:12 596:10,18 597:6 597:12,18 598:3 603:8 605:10 606:22 607:1 608:23 609:2 610:8 611:21 614:8 616:7 619:6 620:13,18,21 622:16 625:10 626:1,17 627:13 631:20 634:1,3 635:13 636:3,7</p>	<p>637:4,9,15 638:18 640:22 641:8 642:20,25 643:2 643:10 644:8 645:2,18,22 647:13 650:18 651:8,16,23 652:6 653:24 654:22 655:3,10 659:12 659:16 660:17 661:10 662:3,9,13 662:16 663:14 665:5 667:2,8,10 667:13 668:3 670:21 671:2 673:1,22 675:2,8 676:13,23 677:8 677:11,14,16,22 678:5,9 679:1,10 679:19 680:16,22 680:25 681:6,12 681:24 685:16 691:11 692:5 693:9 695:21 699:15,24 700:1 700:15 704:22 705:4 707:19 708:11 709:4,13 709:24 710:6,11 712:9,19 713:10 713:15,19 717:16 717:22 719:3 720:5 722:22 723:2,4,23 724:5 724:7,10,14,25 725:2,6 view 627:16 648:10 676:5 views 579:4 violation 600:21 663:9,19 664:24 665:4 666:11 667:7 virtually 603:18 663:22 vis-à-vis 692:14</p>	<p>visiting 545:9 voice 641:16 voltage 549:20,22 671:24 694:22 volume 677:11 voluminous 614:14 vote 661:21 715:7 Voters 576:15 vulnerable 704:25</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">W</p> <hr/> <p>wait 596:24 639:11 waive 561:6 565:21 walk 548:11 549:11 want 546:18 552:12 563:11 566:11,18 569:11 582:25 583:1,13 589:23 589:24 591:6 593:8 594:10 602:24 603:1 607:6,14,17 609:6 618:5,8 620:6,12 620:13,13 621:25 622:6 623:22 624:14,20,23,24 627:14 631:4,21 634:17 635:10,14 635:21 636:11,23 638:16 639:11,14 642:13,14 655:15 656:13 657:13 660:10 669:20 671:16 676:17 679:7 693:4,15 694:2 699:3,9 709:16,22,22 710:3 715:9,13 718:24 720:25 721:6,9 723:16,20 wanted 552:15 576:22 582:9,11 637:25 639:7 646:10 652:12 654:10,11 660:13 660:14 662:1</p>
---	--	---	--	---

695:7 715:25 717:5 720:8 wanting 625:5 632:21 720:15 wants 563:15 565:6 611:15 624:13 661:18 670:11 warning 686:10,16 686:17 687:7 689:11,12 warnings 686:21 687:1 689:7 690:2 warranting 585:22 washed 641:15 Washington 726:5 726:9 wasn't 564:13 580:15 590:17 646:18 653:13 662:12 681:20 682:23 705:20 waste 716:22 watch 686:22 water 576:21 waters 582:2 way 546:21 565:10 577:23 583:19,23 597:4 601:17,22 603:2 612:16 615:21 619:11 628:4,22 631:8 634:7,9,12 638:14 638:18 639:3 641:18 653:14 655:8 672:20 691:21 699:8 718:18 719:15,21 ways 549:1 630:14 649:22 691:14 we'll 562:7 579:3 588:7 592:24 609:6 652:21 659:17 662:19 710:1,4 711:17 714:14 718:6,9 we're 545:20	546:14,15,17 547:6,14 548:13 548:16,17 549:9 549:10,14 552:18 553:6,13,14 554:14 555:10,24 557:5 558:14 559:1,1,11,18 561:13 562:13 570:23 578:20,23 583:8,11 586:16 590:12,15 592:16 592:17,19 596:16 607:11,14 610:8 611:12 619:15 621:1,7,16,16 622:20 623:18 625:5,12 631:5,18 632:4,22 638:16 640:9 641:22 642:1 645:15 650:1 652:22 653:7 656:1 659:13 669:21 672:23 675:2 677:11 679:2,5,12 679:19 681:6 684:11 689:4,5 692:3 698:1,2 699:18 708:15 710:7 717:20 718:3,5,10 723:24 we've 547:2 560:13 589:1 597:4 603:5 607:5 611:25 613:9,12,16 621:18 634:1 637:4 651:10 653:24 662:16 667:13 673:11 681:7 692:1 weather 550:1 573:21,22 577:21 578:1 585:21 587:16,21 655:23 656:2 686:10,18	686:22,22,24,25 687:8 689:12,16 689:19,19 web 545:7 webcam 544:22 Webex 545:2 webinar 544:18,21 website 545:9 658:10 Webster 691:5 week 715:17 week's 583:9 weeks 599:17 603:25 608:3 718:9 weigh 638:24 639:14 welcome 543:6 545:8 welfare 556:7 557:2 574:2 575:1 580:17 581:4,9,17 581:19 582:1 587:11 589:1 610:15 611:10 676:7 well-documented 690:24 went 587:9 601:21 704:12 716:7 723:21 weren't 607:21 WHEREOF 726:14 White 583:4 whoa 679:3 wider 684:18 685:22 695:1 width 684:12 wildfire 668:18 687:7,9,21 689:11 692:12 693:16 694:3,5 696:10,10 697:13,25 698:7 698:16 699:6 wildfires 686:8	689:6 690:6 wildland 686:20 will/shall 721:16 will/would 720:9 Willful 545:14 willing 612:14 wind 551:5,5 599:22 606:14 655:24 656:11 658:2,23 688:8 window 589:21 windows 589:15,16 589:24 winds 690:6 windy 606:14,16 withdrew 547:23 witness 599:5 690:17 694:21 726:14 Women 576:15 wonder 630:14 wondered 547:3 wondering 623:12 623:17,22 656:8 658:7 712:21 713:1 word 624:23,23 638:7 639:7 640:15 660:16 661:23 680:13 721:18,18 wording 631:6 words 609:18 623:17 624:8 wordsmith 632:11 work 574:14 580:11 589:11 611:18 618:22 621:21 625:10 626:8 631:17 632:22 663:10,13 664:20,25 688:15 709:25 711:7 714:10 722:3 723:8 worked 701:25	706:11 working 544:13 663:1 664:1,10,17 664:18 670:22 671:20 706:7 710:1 works 645:1,2 worst 553:10 worst-case 552:20 553:6,9,25 598:19 worth 657:23 723:9 wouldn't 579:23 580:5 587:4 590:3 617:11 626:10 639:10 642:1 647:8 wrap 691:12 704:23 wrestle 603:1 write 655:5 writing 620:1 written 555:14 561:5,9 625:19 633:6 641:18 690:21 wrong 583:11 592:9 594:10 603:20 615:14 623:21 631:24 672:13 681:9 707:7
<hr/> X <hr/>				
X 553:8 559:23 565:8 X-4 636:17 X-5 628:18 647:4 X-7 592:16 626:24 636:11,12 655:6				
<hr/> Y <hr/>				
yard 590:6 yeah 569:15 578:20 583:25 592:1 611:23 620:19 624:18 625:2				

628:16 631:21 635:11,13,14 636:25 637:2,17 641:24 645:1,21 646:4 647:4 652:9 653:1,7 657:15 658:24 659:12 671:2,3 674:22 675:1,6 677:16 678:9 681:15 710:25 713:9 717:22 719:12 721:11 722:24 723:3 year 577:21 578:3 586:9 606:4 690:23 701:15,20 703:18 704:20 722:22 years 573:4 603:23 614:4 628:1 692:22 yep 588:25 yesterday 582:23 yielded 603:17	637:11 644:23 647:1 1(b) 637:17 10 550:14,20 554:22 555:4 558:4 572:24 582:10,13 598:21 607:13 653:16 710:3 10-minute 662:19 100 604:21 684:9 704:20 101 599:16 102 599:16 103 599:16 11 601:10,19 602:5 11:05 662:20,23 11:08 662:23 1162 541:17,22 118 622:25 623:1 12 640:2,5 686:23 12:30 710:3 12:35 710:3,4 12:57 725:7,11 1250 712:3 13 586:9 132 623:1,2 14 696:15 711:24 15 583:15 710:2 722:20 15-minute 710:2 18 622:25 1st 541:13 542:12	2011 703:15 2013 682:20 2021 599:18 2022 540:8 543:1,8 687:8 689:13 693:20 725:8 726:11,15 205 616:22 617:16 618:1 21 560:1 565:22 568:22 2121 540:24 726:19 215.275 688:20 22 724:1 22-0002 540:24 726:20 23rd/24th 723:25 24 602:2,12 24-hour 577:17 578:5 658:11 25 602:2,6,13,18 689:24 274 570:16 27th 718:5 722:11 29th 543:7 725:8 2A 628:16	599:24 601:21 602:20 604:12 726:11 31st 725:8 31th 543:8 32 599:4,24 601:21 33 704:12 340-035-0010 581:2 340-035-0035 572:1 340-035-0100 581:11 340-035-0110 595:3 340-35-0010(2) 574:10 340-35-0035 598:12 340-35-0035(3)(a) 600:6 345-21-0004 565:20 345-21-0010(1) 565:25 345.011.0080 545:18 35 552:7 602:6 3500 704:19 36 599:24 365 577:20 365-day 578:3 38 612:8	469.370 572:6 469.401 572:15 47 558:22 559:10 48 579:19 586:9 612:8 <hr/> 5 5 551:15 599:22 610:24 636:17 659:15,22,23,25 681:8,9,11,23,25 688:20 50 558:22 559:7 500 672:18 690:9 694:18,22 695:4 503.595.3925 542:7 503.827.0320 542:13 503.947.4520 541:23 503.947.4549 541:18 550 541:13 <hr/> 6 60 692:22 61 702:2 641 693:24 694:1 660-006-0025 684:20 660-006-0025(4)(q) 684:8 67 703:11,11 <hr/> 7 7 572:6 681:8,9,13 681:16 72 686:23 735 542:12 <hr/> 8 8 558:23 681:8,9,13 681:16 8:00 540:10 543:2 80 692:22 <hr/> 9
<hr/> Z Zhaolin 691:7 zone 689:14,16,17 689:17,21,22,22 689:23,24 690:1,1 691:13 693:24 694:1 697:7,7,19 698:2,3 702:2 zones 684:5 686:25 687:2,11 690:3,4 705:24 706:2 zoning 701:11 706:5 707:25,25	<hr/> 2 2 546:4 573:21 610:24 612:8 628:21 647:2 655:15 2(a) 644:22 645:21 646:14 654:4 680:3,8 20 582:10,13 583:15 692:13 701:20 707:12 2008 703:15	<hr/> 3 3 540:9,9 545:3 546:4 597:10 612:8 646:19 647:2 652:1 666:14,16 667:19 722:19 3-minute 596:15 3,500 704:20 3.3.2 711:13 30 573:4 587:10 599:1 692:13 300 579:15 684:13 300-mile 598:17 615:18 648:20 671:5,9 672:18 674:15 30th 543:8 725:8 31 540:8 543:1	<hr/> 4 4 546:5 597:10 610:24 612:8 684:20 400 542:6 41 594:2,5 619:22 625:17 675:14 676:18 419 542:5 43 599:25 467.010 572:3 573:25 581:22	<hr/> 9

<p>9 681:8,9,11,23,25 681:25 97.3 586:5 97204 542:12 97205 542:6 97301 541:14,17,22 98.7 586:1 9th 726:15</p>				
--	--	--	--	--