1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
б	BEFORE THE UTAH UTILITY FACILITY REVIEW BOARD
7	
8	
9	In Re: Rocky Mountain Power's) Docket 16-035-09
10	Petition for Review to the Utah)
11	Utility Facility Review Board) HEARING
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	March 28, 2016
18	9:04 a.m 10:25 a.m.
19	
20	Location: Utah Public Service Commission
21	160 East 300 South, Fourth Floor
22	Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
23	
24 Job 1	IO: 299628
25 Repoi	rter: Angela L. Kirk, RPR, CCR

Page 2 1 A P P E A R A N C E S 2 Board Members: 3 Chair Thad LeVar Beth Holbrook 4 David Clark (via telephone) Jordan White (via telephone) 5 For Rocky Mountain Power: 6 Jeff Richards 7 Heidi Gordon Matt Moscon (via telephone) 8 For Wasatch County: 9 Tyler Berg (via telephone) 10 For Intervenors: 11 Jeremy Reutzel 12 Ryan Merriman 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1	Page 3 Monday, March 28, 2016; 9:04 a.m.
2	PROCEEDINGS
3	CHAIR: Okay. Good morning. We're here with
4	the Utah Utility Facility Review Board in the matter of
5	Docket 16-035-09, which is I'll just state the name
6	of the docket. I should have had this in front of me.
7	It's the petition of Rocky Mountain Power for Review
8	with the Utah Utility Facility Review Board, and we're
9	here to consider the intervention motion of Mark 25,
10	LLC, Black Rock Ridge Master Homeowners Association,
11	Incorporated, Black Rock Ridge Townhome Owners
12	Association, Incorporated, and Black Rock Ridge
13	Condominium Association, Incorporated.
14	Let's just identify who we have in the room
15	and who we have on the phone. In terms of board
16	members who are physically present, I'm Thad LeVar, and
17	I'm present, and we have Beth Holbrook, who is a board
18	member, who is present.
19	I'm aware that board member David Wilson was
20	not able to participate, either in person or
21	telephonically today.
22	So let's go to the phone first. What board
23	members do we have on the phone?
24	BOARD MEMBER CLARK: This is David Clark.
25	I'm on the phone. I apologize that a little family

Page 4 1 emergency has prevented me from being physically 2 present there today, but I'm here. BOARD MEMBER WHITE: And this is Jordan 3 4 White. I'm also on the phone. 5 CHAIR: Okay. And then let's continue with 6 appearances, then. So we have four board members 7 present, either physically or on the phone. 8 For the petitioner, the inter -- who are 9 petitioning for intervention, we'll take an appearance 10 there. MR. REUTZEL: Jeremy Reutzel on behalf of the 11 12 intervenors. 13 MR. MERRIMAN: Ryan Merriman on behalf of the 14 intervenors. 15 CHAIR: And then for Rocky Mountain Power? MR. RICHARDS: Jeff Richards on behalf of 16 17 Rocky Mountain Power. MS. GORDON: Heidi Gordon on behalf of Rocky 18 Mountain Power. 19 20 MR. RICHARDS: And on the phone with us we have Matt Moscon. 21 2.2 CHAIR: Okay. And is there anyone else on 23 the phone? 24 MR. BERG: Yes, Tyler Berg is here from 25 Wasatch County.

Page 5 CHAIR: Okay. Well, I think we'll just go 1 2 into our business, then. We've received the briefings, 3 both the petition for intervention, the response by Rocky Mountain Power, and the reply by the intervenors, 4 5 which came in Friday about noon. I think before we move into just questions 6 7 from the board members, I'll ask, first, the petitioner 8 if you have any highlights that you want to make 9 verbally to us before we move into questions? 10 MR. REUTZEL: I think that our position is fairly well stated in the briefs, and we'll let it sit 11 with that, but I'm happy to answer any questions. 12 Okay. Do either Mr. Moscon or Mr. 13 CHATR: 14 Richards or -- I'm sorry, what... 15 MS. GORDON: Gordon, Heidi Gordon. CHAIR: Heidi Gordon, okay. Anything you 16 17 wanted to highlight verbally before we move into 18 questions? 19 MR. RICHARDS: Nothing here on behalf of 20 Rocky Mountain Power. 21 CHAIR: Well, I'm going to turn --2.2 BOARD MEMBER CLARK: I'm sorry, Chair LeVar? 23 CHAIR: Yes. BOARD MEMBER CLARK: This is Dave Clark. 24 25 I -- something's happening to the phone. I'm hearing

Page 6 1 like a clicking noise that -- that is obscuring any 2 voice. It's like a loud clock ticking or something. 3 BOARD MEMBER WHITE: Yeah, this is Jordan White, Chair. If folks there would just do what they 4 5 can to speak directly into the microphone. I'm having a real -- real trouble hearing folks who aren't up at 6 7 the -- the microphone. 8 CHAIR: Okay. We're not -- we're not hearing 9 that clicking sound. I guess I would encourage 10 everyone who is on the phone, when you're not speaking, to put your phone on mute, and then to unmute your 11 12 phone when you have something to say. And also remind -- remind those on the phone, 13 14 for the -- for the benefit of the court reporter, to 15 identify yourself if you start to speak on the phone, that would help. Hopefully, that improves things. 16 17 I'll just restate for the -- for those who are listening that both the petitioner and Rocky 18 Mountain Power indicated they did not have anything to 19 20 clarify verbally before we move into questions from board members, so -- are you hearing -- are you hearing 21 22 us better? 23 BOARD MEMBER CLARK: This is Dave Clark. 24 Yes, it's better for me. 25 BOARD MEMBER WHITE: Yeah, I could hear fine,

Page 7 thanks. This is Jordan White. 1 2 CHAIR: Okay. Well, I think we'll move into 3 questions, then. I have a few, and I'll go ahead and start, if there's no objection to that, and then open 4 5 it up to any questions from any of the board members. It wasn't clear to me -- this is for the 6 7 petitioner. It wasn't clear to me if the various home 8 owner and condo associations that you're representing 9 in this petition represent most or all of the homes 10 that are in the -- the homes for which the proposed corridor will be in the viewshed of those homes. Do 11 12 you have a sense of is this most or all or is this a portion? 13 14 MR. REUTZEL: This is most or all, and I 15 think it's all. 16 CHAIR: Okay. Any other -- any comments from 17 Rocky Mountain Power on that issue? MS. GORDON: I don't know whether he 18 represents them all or most of them. I don't -- I 19 20 don't know what the ownership of the condo association looks like. 21 2.2 CHAIR: Okay. The other question, I was just 23 wondering if you wouldn't mind addressing briefly how you see your clients' interests as either aligned or 24 25 divergent with the interests of Wasatch County.

1	Page 8 MR. REUTZEL: Well, Wasatch County doesn't
2	have unlike the Questar case, Wasatch County has no
3	statutory obligation to protect my clients' interests,
4	and in fact, their obligations are just as much to
5	Promontory as they are to to my client.
6	And so, you know, Wasatch County has an
7	interest in seeing that its ordinances are enforced.
8	My client, obviously, has an interest in protecting its
9	property values and its legal rights to those
10	properties. I don't think that's the same interest
11	that Wasatch County has.
12	And I think I haven't talked to Tyler
13	about this, but I expect that's what he would tell you
14	as well.
15	CHAIR: Okay. I'll go I'll go next to Mr.
16	Berg. You had indicated in our last hearing that you
17	weren't going to take a position on this intervention.
18	If you want to comment on this issue, feel free to do
19	so. If you don't have anything else to add, that's
20	your prerogative also.
21	MR. BERG: Okay. At this point, do you want
22	any comments from Wasatch County, or do you just want
23	to wait until we get further along?
24	CHAIR: Well, do you have any comments or
25	thoughts on the intervention that's in front of us

Page 9 right now? 1 2 MR. BERG: We don't have any objection to the intervention at all. We feel that it would be a 3 benefit to the Utility Review Board to be able to have 4 5 additional points of view, so we don't have an objection to it. We definitely feel like it would just 6 7 be more of the public being able to weigh in. 8 CHAIR: Okay. 9 MR. MOSCON: Chairman LeVar, you're ready for 10 us now? Tyler's comment again, that same question, I can save it until the end or have a point by point, 11 12 whichever you prefer. CHAIR: I think it would be good to have 13 14 someone from Rocky Mountain Power respond to that issue 15 of where you see the interests of the intervenors as either aligned or divergent with the county, since I 16 17 think we're at a point now where we're just taking questions from the board members, so that was a 18 19 question I had. 20 MR. MOSCON: Sure. 21 CHAIR: And after that question, we'll move 2.2 to -- we'll move to other board member questions. 23 MR. MOSCON: And if I might -- I appreciate 24 it -- I think that the response that the board heard 25 from Black Rock which is the way that they're divergent

Page 10 1 from Wasatch County is that they, meaning Black Rock 2 and their constituents, are concerned about their 3 property values really kind of cuts down to why Rocky 4 Mountain Power overall has concern with the proposed 5 intervention.

As far as this board is concerned and the 6 7 issue about whether the permit for this proposed 8 alignment goes forward, Wasatch County and the proposed 9 intervenor's position are the same. They have both 10 stated a position that they do not want the alignment where it's been proposed, where the permit application 11 placed it, and so as far as this proceeding goes and 12 what's before the board, their interests are aligned. 13

14 And as put forth in Rocky Mountain Power's 15 paper, that's one of the things that the board needs to consider in adjudicating whether to grant an 16 intervention, because the question is, is there going 17 to be a voice missing or are we going to have 18 duplication of efforts. And I think here clearly we're 19 20 going to be having a duplication of efforts that say we don't want or we don't think it's necessary to have 21 22 aligned here.

What our concern is, though, to respond to the points made by Mr. -- or by Black Rock, are that we do not think that this is the forum to address concerns

Page 11 about property value. That is not what the enabling 1 2 act of the Facility Review Board Act contemplates. That is a civil matter and not before this board. 3 So we think that not only are those issues 4 5 that are proper before this board aligned between Wasatch County and the proposed intervenors, to the 6 7 extent there is any divergence of interest, those 8 differences are not something that are at issue before 9 the board today, and that would be a separate forum, a 10 separate matter. And if you have additional questions, I'm 11 12 happy to go on to how or why that is. I don't want to steal the mic, but I just want to make that point in 13 14 responding. 15 CHAIR: Well, if you wanted to elaborate for a moment on where you see the distinction between the 16 17 issues that this board in your -- in your opinion should be considering and the issues that involve the 18 intervenors, I think a little more elaboration on that 19 20 might help. 21 MR. MOSCON: Sure. In the act that now -- in 22 the enabling act, it indicates that this board has been 23 convened to settle disputes between a utility and a local government about whether a proposed facility 24 should or should not be constructed or whether any 25

Page 12 mitigating factors should be put into place, and 1 2 whether the extra costs for the mitigation should be 3 born by the local government that is acquiring them or the utility. 4 And so before the board -- this board is not 5 itself a deciding board. It's not expected that its 6 7 board members have utility engineering to decide 8 whether a certain tower should be built here or here, 9 or now is needed or not needed. As -- there's a large 10 body of jurisprudence from the Utah Supreme Court and the Public Service Commission saying we don't make 11 12 decisions for the utility about where to put things. However, what the utility chooses to do may have an 13 14 application in terms of costs that it's required to 15 pay. In front of the board, the question is should 16 17 the permit be issued, kind of a yes or no question, and/or should there be a requirement that mitigating 18 factors be put in place where the facility has been put 19 20 forward by a utility? And if so, who should bear the costs of those mitigating factors? 21 22 The interests for those questions between 23 Wasatch and Black Rock are aligned, because both are telling the board the answer should be no, it should 24 25 not be permitted. We don't want it here. We want it

1	Page 13 somewhere else in Summit County. And so there is no
2	divergence of interest as to that particular issue.
3	To the extent that Wasatch County put forward
4	in its papers, which haven't been filed yet, any
5	mitigation that it wants to have undertaken, then the
6	question would be between the county and the utility as
7	to who has to pay for those mitigation factors. Again,
8	there's no one saying that Black Rock would be paying
9	for it, or they're not, you know, a party of interest
10	in that discussion.
11	But as far as Black Rock saying we're fearful
12	for our property values, that's not one of the things
13	that the enabling act really talks about, is whether or
14	not neighboring property owners are fearful of losing
15	interest in their property. That's not one of the
16	indicia set forth in the enabling act.
17	BOARD MEMBER WHITE: This is Jordan White.
18	Can I ask a clarifying question?
19	MR. MOSCON: Yes.
20	BOARD MEMBER WHITE: With respect to what's
21	actually before the board in terms of the application
22	or, I guess, request submitted by Rocky Mountain Power,
23	is there even at this point a question of alternate
24	alignments or additional cost, et cetera?
25	My understanding from the from the current

1	Page 14 case is it's simply just a question of a denial of the
2	actual permit by the Board of Adjustment. Is there
3	even an issue at this juncture of additional costs, et
4	cetera, or is it just I guess what I'm trying to say
5	here is, my view is that it's a very narrow focus of
6	the board at this point, which is, at this point, our
7	question was submitted under 54-14-303(d), which is,
8	you know, a review if a local government has prohibited
9	construction of a facility which is needed to provide
10	safe, reliable, adequate, efficient service to the
11	customers of a public utility.
12	So I guess I'm asking you, are we even
13	adjudicating or are there other options on the
14	table, or is it just a yes or no, like you said?
15	MR. MOSCON: I'll assume that I'm asked that
16	question directly. And I don't mean to go over Wasatch
17	County or Black Rock.
18	My understanding, Mr. White, is you're
19	correct. What happened in this particular matter, the
20	language I was describing is just what the board hears
21	as a whole. So typically in this case, Rocky Mountain
22	Power gave four options to Wasatch County prior to its
23	petition being filed with this board.
24	The county indicated to the applicant, or
25	Rocky Mountain Power, that a couple of those options,

Page 15 which we call three and four, were just nonstarters to 1 2 begin with. Options one and two follow the same 3 alignment. The permit application that ultimately went to the county was for this alignment. That's the only 4 5 alignment that's -- an application for a permit was ever sought or filed. 6 7 And you're correct, the county simply said 8 you can't mitigate it. We're just denying it. And so 9 they did not propose to put in place mitigation 10 factors, and so they just -- so the question, as it got 11 teed up, was just yes or no and there is nothing else. 12 I guess what I don't know, and I don't mean to punt on this, is could the county during this 13 14 proceeding before the board say well, now that we are 15 where we are, if you're going to put it there, we want you to do this. We want you to paint the towers green 16 to match the trees, or something like that, you know, 17 could they come up with something like that now? 18 I guess I don't know the answer to that 19 20 question. I think they probably could say that to the board at some point. But you're correct that the way 21 22 that this case has proceeded it's really just a yes or 23 a no, should it go in the alignment where the permit 24 was sought? 25 BOARD MEMBER WHITE: That's helpful. Thanks.

Page 16 1 CHAIR: Any other comment from other parties 2 on Mr. White's question? 3 MR. REUTZEL: I don't have any comments on Mr. White's question, but I do have some comments on 4 5 the divergent interests between the county and 6 intervenors, if that's something that I could address 7 now. 8 CHAIR: Yeah. Yeah, feel free to take 9 another moment or two. 10 MR. REUTZEL: Okay. So, I'd like to point 11 out that Wasatch County and the intervenors, in front 12 of the county proceedings, they took separate legal positions, interpreted the statutes differently, and 13 14 provided separate legal arguments. And I think that 15 will probably continue through this process as well. I'd also like to point out that the idea that 16 17 this board is only here to address issues between the county and the utility is incorrect. We have an 18 intervention statute that describes the factors that 19 20 you need to consider to determine whether or not someone should intervene. That intervention statute is 21 22 clearly applicable to this case. And so you can't just 23 cut that statute out and say no, we're only here to 24 decide issues between the county and utility. We have 25 an intervention statute that allows for intervention,

	- 17
1	Page 17 and so we ought to be talking about those factors.
2	And one of those factors is whether or not
3	there's divergent interests between separate parties.
4	But that's not the only factor. That's only one of a
5	number of factors.
6	And the only case where that was found
7	relevant is the Questar case. And in that case they
8	found that was important there because the intervenors
9	were represented by an agency that also had a statutory
10	obligation to represent their interest.
11	Wasatch County has no statutory obligation to
12	represent our interest, and certainly not our interest
13	over Promontory's interest.
14	And we're not just talking here about our
15	interest in property values, though that's that's an
16	important interest. We're also talking about the costs
17	that are going to be associated with us preparing
18	litigation, the changes to our development plans, our
19	interest in seeing that ordinances are enforced.
20	And they've said that they've limited their
21	application to only two of the options. I read their
22	application they've got more than two options, so I
23	wasn't maybe I wasn't a part to the proceedings
24	where the county said the other options are
25	nonstarters, but the application that's being appealed

Page 18 is one that has more than two options, and one of those 1 2 options runs right across our -- my clients' property. 3 And so they can say now that they're not pursuing that option, but that was in the application, 4 5 and that -- that's the application that's being 6 appealed. 7 MS. GORDON: If I could clarify on the 8 application itself. The way the application was filed was for the company's preferred alignment. Option two 9 10 was very similar in that it followed the same alignment but had different design and engineering. 11 12 Options three and four were presented very quickly in the application as options that the company 13 14 would explore if directed by the county. But we were 15 not directed by the county to explore those. We did not apply for a permit regarding either option three or 16 They were presented as part of our overall 17 four. packet for further exploration. 18 19 If the county is interested in those, we 20 would have further pursued them, but they would have required an amendment to the application, because they 21 22 were significantly different than the option that 23 was -- for which a permit was sought. 24 CHAIR: Okay, thank you. I'll ask if there 25 are further board member questions before we move into

Page 19 board deliberation, either Ms. Holbrook or to those --1 2 the other two on the phone, do you have further 3 questions for any of the parties? I guess, Mr. White, do you have any further 4 5 questions? 6 BOARD MEMBER WHITE: No, not at this time. 7 Thank you, Chair. 8 CHAIR: Mr. Clark, do you have any further 9 questions? 10 BOARD MEMBER CLARK: No, no further 11 questions. 12 CHAIR: Ms. Holbrook? 13 BOARD MEMBER HOLBROOK: No, I do not. 14 CHAIR: Okay. I think, then, we're ready to 15 move into board deliberations. Again, this is an open 16 meeting. 17 BOARD MEMBER CLARK: Chair LeVar, this is Dave Clark. 18 19 CHAIR: Yes. 20 BOARD MEMBER CLARK: Sorry. I -- again, I've got a lot of background noise and I'm having difficulty 21 22 hearing what you're saying. I could hear the speakers 23 just fine, but now something's changed. CHAIR: I'll try to move a little closer to 24 25 the microphone. Does that help?

Page 20 BOARD MEMBER CLARK: That helps a great deal. 1 2 Thank you. CHAIR: I don't like the sound of my voice 3 amplified, but I guess I'll live with that. 4 We'll move to board deliberations now. We'll 5 start discussing the application. This is a public 6 7 meeting. Everyone in the room is welcome to stay. 8 You're also not going to offend any of us if you decide not to, but I don't anticipate any of you will take us 9 10 up on that offer. So --MR. MOSCON: Chairman LeVar, and I apologize 11 12 if -- I probably was hearing the same static that Commissioner Clark referenced. I don't know if you've 13 14 already asked on our side if there's anything further. Can I respond to just one point that was made by Black 15 Rock before the deliberations? 16 17 CHAIR: Sure. Let me just ask, is that Mr. Moscon or Mr. Berg speaking now? 18 MR. MOSCON: This is Mr. Moscon. 19 20 CHAIR: Certainly. If you had -- if you want to add one or two more points before we move to 21 22 deliberations, go ahead. 23 MR. MOSCON: Just one thing. The thing that 24 highlights to me why this intervention is improper, or 25 really why this is not the forum for the concerns

Page 21 raised by Black Rock is, in the response that was just made, Black Rock said we take issue with Rocky Mountain Power's position that the only costs at play are whether it's Wasatch County or Rocky Mountain Power that has to pay for any mitigation or to do anything different.

7 But we also have our costs to consider and 8 what's it going to do to us. And that point highlights 9 to me, and I think should not be lost by the board, 10 that the type of arguments that Black Rock wants to 11 make about we as property owners, not on the property 12 where these facilities are going to go but nearby, that we think we're going to have some devaluation or we may 13 do things differently or we may have cost mitigation 14 15 and somebody should have to pay those costs.

But that is not the type of dispute that the Facility Review Board was created to review. Those are civil matters that if they believe that they're aggrieved, and that they believe they have a legal interest, that they should address elsewhere.

But that statement, I think, really kind of capsulates my concern, because if every property owner who thought that by being by a facility or being in the view of a facility, and if I devalue my property, therefore I have to have a say in where that facility

1	Page 22 is sited, then I believe the board is on a slippery
2	slope from which it can never recover and it converts
3	the Facility Review Board that had a very clear
4	statutory mandate into something that now becomes an
5	arbiter of every potential lost cost or increased cost
6	or devaluation from any kind of utility facility,
7	whether it's a power line or a water pump or a gas
8	compression station or anything else.
9	So I just wanted to respond to that point.
10	Thanks for giving me another 30 seconds.
11	CHAIR: Okay, thank you. And Mr. Reutzel was
12	also indicating he wants to make a few more comments.
13	And, you know, at some point we'll have to cut off the
14	back you know, back and forth, but I think a little
15	more response from you would still be appropriate.
16	MR. REUTZEL: Thank you. We're not
17	indicating that the board should somehow order Rocky
18	Mountain Power to pay our mitigation costs or some sort
19	of remedy to us. We simply have a legal interest in
20	this, and that interest makes us have an incentive to
21	make sure that the appropriate legal analysis and
22	appropriate laws are followed in this case.
23	And we're not like every other property
24	owner. We're the property owner that they want to
25	parallel this transmission line right across. And, you
23	pararrer ento cranomiosion rine right across. And, you

	Page 23
1	know, we're talking about hundreds of property owners
2	that we represent. This isn't, you know, someone miles
3	away that's got a problem with this transmission line.
4	This is someone that's going to be directly impacted by
5	this transmission line.
6	And, you know, much like the court supreme
7	court said in the Millard case, you know, we're an
8	association that represents a number of people, and by
9	doing that, we're relieving a lot of the burden of
10	having a lot of people involved, and we think it's an
11	appropriate thing.
12	And the intervention statute very clearly
13	says that if we have a legal interest and it won't harm
14	the proceedings and it's in the interest of justice, we
15	should be allowed to intervene, and that's what we're
16	asking for. And that's all I have.
17	CHAIR: Okay, thank you. I think we're ready
18	to move toward deliberation, then. Before we do that,
19	Mr. Berg, did you have anything else that you wanted to
20	add as a final thought from Wasatch County? You've
21	made the position
22	MR. BERG: No. This is Mr. Berg. I don't
23	have anything else on the issue at this point.
24	CHAIR: Okay. If all the people on the phone
25	can hear me, I'll ask if there are any board members

1	who want to lead off the deliberation discussion
2	process.
3	MR. BERG: I'm sorry, there's terrible
4	background noise. I can't hear anything.
5	CHAIR: Mr. Berg, I think your phone probably
6	got unmuted when you commented and we're having some
7	noise from it. If you could mute it back, I think that
8	would help.
9	MR. BERG: I muted it back and there was a
10	lot of background noise.
11	BOARD MEMBER CLARK: Yeah. This is Dave
12	Clark. I was having the same struggle and but was
13	talking into a mute phone, trying to describe it. So,
14	I think, Chair LeVar, if you just stay very close to
15	the mic, that really helps.
16	CHAIR: Okay. I'll do that now. I think
17	we're to the point of board deliberations, so I'll
18	invite any of the board members who feel inclined to
19	start off the discussion to do so.
20	BOARD MEMBER WHITE: This is Jordan White. I
21	guess maybe I'll start. And I apologize, it may be
22	easier to there is a little background noise, so let
23	me know if I you have difficulty hearing.
24	But I guess my initial thought is, I am
25	sympathetic to Black Rock's concerns. I mean,

1	Page 25 certainly, you know, having, you know, lines and signs,
2	et cetera, close to their property, you know,
3	potentially could implicate property values, et cetera.
4	I guess my concern, though, is that, again, I
5	see our the board's focus pretty narrow here. The
6	question being presented is pretty clear under the
7	statute.
8	And in terms of potential devaluation or
9	viewshed or implication of other property rights, I
10	guess I'm just concerned about opening the door to that
11	to go beyond the scope of what we've been asked to
12	consider, which is, again, you know, under that
13	54-14-303(d) is whether, you know, the government here
14	in Wasatch County prohibited construction of a facility
15	which is needed to provide safe, reliable, adequate,
16	efficient service, et cetera. So I guess that's my
17	concern.
18	So it's not that I don't recognize those
19	potential issues, but again, those, to me affected
20	property rights or potential litigation concerning
21	that, to me may be outside the scope of what our
22	statutory task is. That's those are my I guess
23	my initial thoughts. And I'll mute it now.
24	BOARD MEMBER HOLBROOK: Mr. Chair?
25	CHAIR: Yes.

1	Page 26 BOARD MEMBER HOLBROOK: I apologize. Mr.
2	Chair, that was my question too as to the scope. And
3	how I'm viewing the statute, I don't I don't know if
4	property rights could be something that could be
5	calculated in this at this stage in this process.
6	So I'd like further background on that, if there is
7	anything else. Thanks.
8	CHAIR: So you're asking a question from
9	BOARD MEMBER HOLBROOK: From you.
10	CHAIR: From me?
11	BOARD MEMBER HOLBROOK: Uh-huh.
12	CHAIR: Okay. Well, I mean, my thoughts are,
13	I don't know that we know yet how the testimony will
14	progress in terms of what remedies or options will
15	be will be available to this board. We've heard
16	some discussion about it could it's arguably simply
17	a yes or no from the board, but not having seen how the
18	testimony will progress, I don't know that from my
19	perspective, I don't know that we have enough in front
20	of us to really know how that will look by the time of
21	the hearing.
22	Do any of the other board members have
23	thoughts on that question from Ms. Holbrook? Mr. Clark
24	or Mr. White? Or other or other comments or
25	thoughts?
1	

	Page 27
1	BOARD MEMBER WHITE: Well, one question, I
2	guess oh, sorry. You go, Mr. Clark.
3	BOARD MEMBER CLARK: Oh, thank you. I didn't
4	have a direct response, but I do have maybe it's an
5	indirect response. My my reading of the statute
6	that governs the purpose and processes of the board is
7	what controls my thinking about this, and I am of the
8	view that we do have a set of issues in front of us
9	that is that is constrained by the language of the
10	statute, and it contains an intervention process, and I
11	really look to that process to guide my thinking about
12	whether to grant intervention or not.
13	And I think that, you know, the discussions
14	about 63G are interesting, but I read them in the
15	context of the specific intervention process that
16	that our governing statute describes.
17	And so that's just, I suppose, a long way of
18	saying that I feel like our our responsibility and
19	duty is to is to is to confine our deliberations
20	to the specific issues that the legislature in in
21	passing the statute presents to us, and that my
22	that reading leads me to conclude that that
23	intervention should not be granted in this instance
24	and to the requesting party. Although Black Rock
25	may have many other interests to pursue, I don't think

Page 28 that the issues that have been described are our issues 1 2 to adjudicate. CHAIR: This is -- this is Thad LeVar. 3 BOARD MEMBER WHITE: This is Jordan White. 4 5 Maybe if I could take you back to one point that Mr. Clark mentioned, which is I'd also take a look at the 6 7 two factors I think are at play here, which is a 8 specific one within, again, the board statute. And it 9 seems to me like when that was initially brought, the 10 right of the intervention argument by Black Rock, it was -- it seemed to me that, first of all, this was not 11 12 implicating a high-voltage line act. 13 And so, I quess, looking at that, where you 14 have a specific right of intervention which wasn't 15 applicable within our -- within the board's statute, to me, the substance of that -- of that intervention 16 statute seems to trump the more general intervention 17 rights under the 63G. 18 CHAIR: And this is --19 20 BOARD MEMBER WHITE: And it seems to me that 21 if the legislature had wanted to be that specific with 22 respect to, again, the high-voltage line and that 23 reference to that to the actual property owners, it seems to me that they would have done a further step to 24 25 address maybe potential particulates or adjacent land

1	Page 29 owners or viewshed implications, et cetera. But,
2	again, they didn't do that.
3	There's the county that denied the
4	application and the utility, which is the which is,
5	again, the entity that's trying to build the facility.
6	So, to me, the issues that are ancillary to that,
7	again, not that they're not important issues, but
8	they're beyond the scope of what this board is asked to
9	do.
10	So I guess I would you know, I guess I'm
11	open to other discussion from Ms. Holbrook and Chair
12	LeVar, but at this juncture I'm not seeing to me,
13	it's essentially duplicative and potentially a
14	potential to confuse the issues to to allow the
15	intervention of Black Rock.
16	With that being said, my understanding is
17	that there is they certainly have the opportunity
18	they have the opportunity to participate in public
19	witness hearings, et cetera, but it's, again, the
20	actual intervention of the parties I'm having, I guess,
21	a struggle with. I'll go ahead and mute now.
22	CHAIR: Okay. Well, this is Thad LeVar. I'd
23	like to just kind of lay out how I'm seeing the legal
24	issue. As I look at the Facility Review Board statute,
25	we have one issue that's specifically addressed with

	Page 30
1	respect to intervention and it's not applicable here,
2	so, to me, the statute says in this situation, a
3	potentially affected land owner has a right to
4	intervene, period. That's not the situation we have.
5	I'm having trouble seeing the facility board
6	statute silence as to any other intervention situation
7	as saying anything else except that we would fall back
8	to the general UAPA Administrative Procedures Act,
9	UAPA, provisions.
10	So, legally, I think that's we probably
11	have to get our arms around that legal question of what
12	statute applies. My instinct, at least, the way I'm
13	looking at the statute, because because I see the
14	facility board statute as silent to this situation, I
15	think our governing statute is the two-part test from
16	the Administrative Procedures Act for intervention.
17	But I've heard different positions from two of the
18	board members, so maybe we're just seeing it
19	differently, or maybe we need to discuss this a little
20	bit more.
21	Any other any other thoughts? Is my
22	are my comments coming across on the phone, to those
23	on to those on the phone?
24	MR. MOSCON: Yeah, they are, Chair LeVar.
25	Let me just explore something with the board for a

Page 31 You know, if -- again, if you were going to 1 moment. 2 take the fallback position of the more general intervention, my understanding -- and I don't have the 3 statute in front of me, but my understanding is that 4 5 the board does have the authority to limit intervention and to tailor that, I guess, to exclude what we would 6 7 perceive as potential extraneous issues beyond our 8 scope. So, for example, if we were to entertain 9 10 intervention under that, I quess I would propose that if we were to go that road, we would -- we would want 11 12 to limit, you know, discovery or testimony or issues that go, again, to potential devaluation or property 13 rights, or what have you, because, to me, again, 14 15 that's -- they're important issues, I recognize that, they're just not, in my view, important to the board's 16 17 tasks, I guess. 18 So I guess what I'm going to be proposing is a potential middle road. But I'll open it up to 19 20 discussion of the board. 21 This is Thad LeVar. I'll jump in a CHATR: 2.2 little bit too. I mean, as I look at the standard from 23 the Administrative Procedures Act, and then the Supreme Court case that interprets that, we have a standard of 24 25 whether a legal interest will be substantially

1	Page 32 affected, and then will anything materially impair the
2	proceeding?
3	I mean, I we have a schedule, we've set a
4	schedule for the docket. I think every everybody
5	who's participating knows that that schedule is not
6	movable, so there's not there's not much chance for
7	a motion or any kind of filing that can cause us to
8	move the hearing date, since since we're since
9	we're pretty strictly constrained by statute.
10	So the question is, is there any to me, is
11	there any other way that Black Rock's intervention
12	could materially impair the orderly and prompt conduct
13	of this of this case, considering that, you know, we
14	have a motion deadline, we have pretty much a general
15	understanding that any motions filed probably aren't
16	going to be able to be ruled on until the hearing date.
17	We have a hearing date that's pretty much set.
18	So that's how I'm seeing the global issue of
19	could there be any material impairment to the orderly
20	conduct of this proceeding. But if there's thoughts
21	that there need to be other if we're going to
22	consider granting intervention, if there's thoughts for
23	other limitations that would need to be in place, I
24	guess we could we could discuss that.
25	I guess that concludes my comments right now,

Page 33 1 if there's other -- other thoughts from Mr. Clark, Mr. 2 White, or Ms. Holbrook.

BOARD MEMBER CLARK: This is Dave Clark. 3 I am going to confess that my thoughts about this matter 4 5 have been -- have been at least partially influenced by where does this lead in other cases that the board 6 7 could have in the future? In other words, the slippery 8 slope reference that someone made earlier is what I've been thinking about and where -- where we would and how 9 10 we would draw a line if we -- if -- in some future case 11 if Black Rock participates as a party in this case. 12 And that's what -- that's what, you know, is sort of constraining my -- my thinking. Maybe I'm being too 13 14 influenced by that.

15

CHAIR: Ms. Holbrook?

16 BOARD MEMBER HOLBROOK: Mr. Chair, my -- one 17 of my concerns is that there -- again, it's possibly the slippery slope scenario, but I also do -- I am 18 concerned that if intervention were granted today that 19 20 there would be a possibility for maybe not direct values of the properties being affected either 21 22 adversely or otherwise, but also is this -- are we then 23 going to be pulling in a lot of extraneous intervention requests in the future? Again, very similar to 24 Commissioner Clark's response. 25

1	Page 34 CHAIR: This is Thad LeVar, and I and
2	maybe I'm becoming the outlier on this issue and it
3	you know, if we just get to a decision point, we'll be
4	there. As I thought about that specific issue before I
5	came in this morning, that led to one of the first
6	questions I asked of the of the petitioners.
7	Personally, I see a distinction or an ability
8	to draw a line between allowing individual home owners,
9	or even individual HOA's, if there were a situation
10	involving multiple HOA's, but I see that as different
11	from a situation where we have one petitioner who is
12	collectively representing what at least appears and
13	there doesn't seem to be any reason not to not to
14	think that they represent the lion's share of the
15	affected home owners as one as one petitioner.
16	So I I'm personally less concerned about
17	the slippery slope argument, because I see this as a
18	narrow fact situation. But perhaps I'm seeing this
19	differently from the other three board members.
20	So I don't know if we I don't know if
21	we're to a point of continuing discussion, or if any of
22	the board members intend to make a motion, the motion
23	would be appropriate at any at any point in the
24	discussion, but continued discussion would also
25	certainly be appropriate.
1	

	Page 35
1	BOARD MEMBER CLARK: So Chair LeVar, this
2	is Dave Clark. So you're thinking that the factual
3	the context of this case, where the property owners
4	are all of the affected ones are basically coming to
5	the board as one party with a unified position, is it
6	those kind of facts that are influencing you to feel
7	that we have a setting here that would be distinct from
8	other other cases going forward
9	CHAIR: If that's your question
10	BOARD MEMBER CLARK: where we might
11	where we might have a variety of property owners not
12	whose land is not directly it's not part of the
13	corridor, it's not it's not directly crossed by the
14	facility, but but they feel affected by it and want
15	relief from the board?
16	CHAIR: I think short answer to your question
17	to me is yes, that's influencing me also, as I look at
18	the standard from the Administrative Procedures Act and
19	the and the Supreme Court interpretation of that
20	standard, that, along with those facts, are leaning me
21	in that direction.
22	It looks like Ms. Holbrook was wanting to
23	interject.
24	BOARD MEMBER HOLBROOK: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
25	I did have a I do somewhat understand where I think

	Page 36
1	you your a little bit of your position was, and
2	I I do understand the fact that they are directly
3	theoretically directly impacted by this process, as
4	opposed to being simply somewhere along the sidelines
5	of and not directly or connected to it.
6	My question and I don't know if this is
7	the scope for which to put this in, but Rocky Mountain
8	Power indicated that options three and four were the
9	ones that actually directly connected Black Rock to
10	this intervention in the first place.
11	And would there be if the options that are
12	actually being discussed, if those options one and two
13	are the ones that are simply going to be considered,
14	and three and four are not, then if something happens
15	to impact Black Rock down the road, i.e. with a three
16	or four or some other modification or some other
17	application, I should say then that would I can
18	see where that could be applicable to what the
19	discussion is today. That's not a question.
20	CHAIR: Okay.
21	BOARD MEMBER HOLBROOK: That really wasn't a
22	question, just a statement of fact, and that's the way
23	that I'm looking at that.
24	BOARD MEMBER WHITE: This is Jordan White
25	again. Again, I guess, to me and maybe I haven't
Page 37 seen much through my office of a view of this, but I 1 2 just -- I'm not sure what the issue is whether --3 beyond -- is beyond whether it's necessary -- a 4 necessary facility. 5 So, to me -- and again, it's just a -- it's 6 kind of a yes or no question. So on all of the --7 again, these are important issues, and certainly to 8 Black Rock, but, you know, in terms of efficient 9 process and kind of the scope of our work here, I'm 10 just not sure if -- unless, you know -- and maybe --11 I'm not sure I heard this or not, whether or not that 12 would be testimony or evidence, et cetera, on actual necessity, because to me that's -- the way it was 13 brought to the board, it wasn't a condition, it wasn't 14 15 the county said well, yes, you can do it, but it has to be this or that, the extra costs, et cetera. 16 It was 17 just a no. 18 And so, to me, the way the petition was 19 postured was pretty narrow, in my mind. And so, you 20 know, if the board does want to go in that direction and kind of, I quess, take a more broad view of that 21 22 general intervention statute, again, my -- I guess my 23 caution is, if we do go that direction, that my 24 preference would be to -- again, to limit, you know, 25 exploring issues beyond what we've been tasked to do.

Page 38 So I -- Chair LeVar, so I don't know if -- at 1 2 this point if it's -- I mean, and I don't want to hold a discussion. I don't know if -- I don't -- if it's --3 I'll leave it to you to, I guess, entertain a motion to 4 5 that. BOARD MEMBER CLARK: Well, just before we get 6 7 to the motion state -- Dave Clark again -- from my 8 perspective, if we feel like we could write conditions related to the intervention that would confine -- and 9 10 I'm not really so concerned about Black Rock's 11 participation, I'm concerned about precedent -- but 12 that would confine Black Rock's participation in this case to the -- to the -- I'll use the word narrow or 13 limited set of issues that are presented to us in the 14 15 confines of our -- of our statutory responsibilities as 16 a board. 17 If we can -- we can -- we could craft the inter -- something granting intervention that way, then 18 I -- my concerns would be largely alleviated, certainly 19 20 ameliorated, so I want -- I wanted to make that known. 21 CHAIR: Well -- and this is -- this is Thad 22 LeVar -- to that comment too. I mean, I think that's 23 an important point. It's important to recognize that 24 this proceeding is not going to expand beyond the scope 25 of what the Facility Review Board statute allows us to

Page 39 1 do. 2 However, I'm having difficulty even looking 3 at the narrow options that we have in front of us in that statute getting to a conclusion that a decision, 4 even under that narrow scope, doesn't substantially 5 affect the legal interest of the -- of the petitioners. 6 7 I -- I'm still viewing there -- there's some 8 substantial effect on the petitioners based on what decisions we might or might not make out of this. And 9 10 I'm having trouble getting myself to see the -- to see 11 that legal issue any other way. 12 But I agree that if -- if we are going to consider granting intervention it needs to be clear 13 14 that that doesn't modify the scope of the proceeding or 15 the scope of the issues that we have in front of us. Ms. Holbrook? 16 17 BOARD MEMBER HOLBROOK: Mr. Chair, was that a motion or was that a statement? 18 19 CHAIR: It was not a -- no, we're still in 20 discussion stage. I haven't made a motion, although a 21 motion from any board member at any point would be 22 appropriate. Well --23 BOARD MEMBER WHITE: This is --24 CHAIR: Oh. BOARD MEMBER WHITE: This is Jordan White. 25 Ι

	Page 40
1	guess a follow-up to the legal interest or interest in
2	this proceeding. I just want to say that I'm not
3	from my point of view, it's not that Black Rock doesn't
4	have an interest. It's what we have jurisdiction over,
5	which interest. In other words, are we if we're
6	going to adjudicate this proceeding, they may have an
7	interest that's not that's not an interest that we
8	can adjudicate, so to me that's why, I guess, it falls
9	to that on that general UAPA factor.
10	It really with respect to their opening a
11	complaint, which is a potential devaluation or
12	diminishment of their property, that seems like it's
13	outside the scope of what we could adjudicate, or also,
14	again, that's a legal interest that they may be outside
15	of something that can be dealt with in this proceeding.
16	So, anyway, that's my final comment. And I
17	don't know if it's again, I'll leave it to you,
18	Chair LeVar, for your thoughts of whether it's time to
19	entertain a motion.
20	CHAIR: Any other board members want to
21	discuss anything further before we move into potential
22	motions? Am I speaking close enough to the microphone?
23	BOARD MEMBER CLARK: This is Dave Clark.
24	I've got a question, and it's for its for you, Chair
25	LeVar. So, would you again take us through your legal

Page 41 analysis of the relationship between the specific intervention criteria that are addressed in the statute and that petitioner addresses in its papers, and then the Administrative Procedures Act process and its applicability to us and sort of the relationships of those two statutory authorities?

7 CHAIR: Certainly. I'd be happy to walk 8 through my view of it. And, again, we may have -obviously, there's differing views in the room and on 9 10 the phone. But my view of our legal standard is, as I look -- as I look at the Facility Review Board statute 11 12 in 54-14-303-2(b), it has very specific language that says if a specific circumstance is met in an action 13 filed by a local government seeking a modification, the 14 15 local government shall do the following, and any potential affected land owner has a statutory right to 16 17 intervention.

So, as I'm seeing it, if we were in that 18 situation, under the Facility Review Board statute, the 19 20 intervention question would be decided. I don't see the Facility Review Board statute speaking to 21 22 intervention in any other way or any other situation. 23 And I don't think it's been -- anyone has 24 made the argument that there's other language under 25 this statute that would -- that would govern this

1	Page 42 situation. So my my personal thinking, legally, is
2	that that takes us to the Administrative Procedures
3	Act, which has a two-part standard that says the
4	petitioner's legal interest may be substantially
5	affected by the proceeding and the interest of justice
6	and orderly and prompt conduct of the proceeding will
7	not be materially impaired by allowing the
8	intervention.
9	And, of course, we have a Utah Supreme Court
10	case that establishes a five-part test to further
11	evaluate that two-part test, since, you know, two parts
12	are never good enough for a court. You have to add a
13	few more.
14	But that's my short answer to your question,
15	Mr. Clark. That's how I see the relationship between
16	the two.
17	BOARD MEMBER CLARK: Yes. Thank you. And so
18	the Millard case that was cited in papers, the Millard
19	County case, is that is that sort of what's guiding
20	your thinking about how we apply, then, the
21	Administrative Procedures Act criteria?
22	CHAIR: You're asking me, Mr. Clark?
23	BOARD MEMBER CLARK: Yeah. I apologize, I'm
24	putting you on the spot, but
25	CHAIR: No, that's fine. I

Page 43 1 BOARD MEMBER CLARK: And maybe -- pardon me 2 for one moment. Maybe there's a time when we need to look back to the counsel in front of us from --3 representing the various entities, but I would like to 4 5 hear your thoughts on that, if you don't mind sharing 6 them. 7 CHAIR: Well, my thoughts are that if -- if 8 my assumption is correct that the absence of any language in the Facility Review Board statute dealing 9 10 with this specific intervention situation bumps us back to the general Administrative Procedures Act standard, 11 12 then yes, that Millard County case is the Supreme Court's interpretation of that -- of that standard from 13 14 the Administrative Procedures Act. And it's a five-15 part test that if -- for reference, it's listed near the bottom of page 5 of the petitioner's final reply 16 17 that came in on Friday, the five --BOARD MEMBER CLARK: Right. 18 CHAIR: -- the five factors. And I --19 20 personally, I think those five factors govern our decision today. And to me, four, number four, is the 21 22 one that's most in dispute. 23 BOARD MEMBER CLARK: Well, this is -- this is Dave Clark. And to help us along, then, perhaps I'm 24 25 going to move that we grant intervention and -- as a

	Page 44
1	way to hear the other board members' views now.
2	Obviously, mine have changed a bit, given the dialogue,
3	but that's my motion, Mr. Chair.
4	CHAIR: Okay. Any discussion to the motion?
5	BOARD MEMBER WHITE: Was there was there
6	any further thoughts? Just to clarify, Chair LeVar,
7	were you thinking that it's too early in the proceeding
8	to you don't want to foreclose any potential issues,
9	but you don't want to limit the potential scope of
10	intervention? Is that I just want to make sure that
11	I was clear on your position on that.
12	CHAIR: Well, I guess one option could be if
13	we're going to consider this motion and I'm
14	personally inclined to favor the motion. I also would
15	support language in our order that says this
16	intervention does not expand the scope of the
17	proceeding or the scope of the issues under the
18	Facility Review Board Act that we're that we're
19	considering.
20	To me, that that kind of a general
21	statement would be appropriate at this point. I
22	don't I don't see how we could how we have enough
23	in front of us to go any more specific than that,
24	but but if someone else sees a path forward, I'm
25	happy to consider other options.

1	Page 45 BOARD MEMBER CLARK: I'm sorry, Chair LeVar,
2	I think I think I heard most of it. Did you
3	conclude what you were saying? I wasn't you kind of
4	trailed off a bit and I wasn't sure if you
5	CHAIR: I'm sorry, I backed away from the
6	microphone. I have an aversion to staying this close
7	to the microphone.
8	BOARD MEMBER CLARK: All right.
9	CHAIR: I'll summarize what I think I just
10	said. Personally, I think we're at a point now where
11	we could if we were if we were crafting an
12	intervention order, we could say this intervention does
13	not expand the scope of the proceeding or the scope of
14	the issues that we'll have in front of us.
15	I personally don't see a path forward to
16	being more specific than that, but if someone I'd be
17	happy to consider a path forward first, if you know,
18	assuming that we're considering acting on this motion,
19	if there's a way to be more specific than what I just
20	described, we ought to we ought to consider that.
21	BOARD MEMBER CLARK: Was it appropriate that
22	the term the term in question I know that we're
23	just in a board, but I would like to hear also from,
24	potentially, Black Rock's counsel to understand
25	specifically what issue that they would would
1	

Page 46 1 propose addressing in this. 2 In other words, if they were to discuss the 3 scope of their involvement in this proceeding, that would help me maybe to understand that, because, again, 4 5 I don't -- what I'm concerned about is getting into, 6 you know, extended arguments and extended testimony, et 7 cetera, on, again, issues of, you know, whether EMS or 8 devaluation, diminution, et cetera. 9 To me, again, it's about -- again, not that 10 those aren't important, but, to me, it's the limited scope of the necessity of this facility. 11 12 So I -- is it appropriate, Chair, to -- to turn that question over to -- back to counsel for Black 13 14 Rock before we make a final deliberation -- or final 15 vote, I guess? CHAIR: They're all still in the room. 16 Any 17 objection from any of the board members to inviting 18 comment? But I think -- I think we should also invite 19 20 comment from Rocky Mountain Power also. But let me ask, is there any objection to board -- from board 21 22 members to doing so at this process? 23 BOARD MEMBER HOLBROOK: No. 24 BOARD MEMBER CLARK: No objection. This is Dave Clark. 25

Page 47 1 BOARD MEMBER WHITE: I have no objection, 2 Jordan White. CHAIR: Okay. Well, I think we'll, then, ask 3 4 Mr. Reutzel if you wanted to comment on this, and then 5 we'll go to either Mr. Moscon, Mr. Richards, or Ms. Gordon, whichever one of you -- if you have a -- if you 6 want to comment on this again. You don't have to. 7 8 Mr. Reutzel. 9 MR. REUTZEL: Thank you. I think Mr. White's 10 point is a fair one, and I want to make it clear we're 11 not here asking this board to decide whether it impacts our property values or we're entitled to some remedy. 12 That certainly is not this board's role. 13 14 This board's role is to apply the statutes in front of it. And we're here because the application of 15 that statute may affect us and, you know, if it does 16 affect us, we may have some other remedy somewhere 17 18 else. 19 But all we're asking this board to do is 20 apply the law that's applicable to it, and we want to argue that and the facts. We're not here to present 21 22 all of our grievances. 23 CHAIR: Mr. Richard -- Mr. Richards? 24 MR. RICHARDS: Yeah, and I'm going to turn it over to Matt. I just wanted to make one thing clear, 25

Page 48 1 though. The biggest concern that I have here is if you 2 grant intervention to someone who has -- that may have an affected interest or they may believe they're being 3 affected by the power line. The distinction is a 4 5 legally affected interest. And keep in mind they don't own property 6 where the line crosses. They are adjacent to it. 7 But 8 if you open up intervention in this matter, it's 9 difficult for me to see how you could prevent anyone 10 anywhere who sees the line that may have an aversion to it or not want it to go there, that you would be able 11 12 to not grant them intervention status either. And I think it's really opaque. The slippery 13 14 slope, I think, is a real issue, and it does open it 15 up. So then I'd like Matt to -- Mr. Moscon to 16 17 comment. CHAIR: Was Ms. Gordon looking to make a 18 19 comment also? 20 MR. MOSCON: Sure. Thank you. For the board, just to be brief, I'm going to start with the 21 22 premise, Commissioner LeVar, that your interpretation 23 is correct that we go straight to the 63G analysis. I'm not sure of that, but I want to just assume for 24 this that it does. 25

	Page 49
1	The reason I think that there is still a
2	distinction that I haven't heard made in the
3	discussion actually, I heard, I think, Mr. White
4	making this. Maybe he was just saying it in a
5	different way is just because someone thinks that a
6	project or an action is going to do something to them,
7	may have an opinion about it, and they have beliefs and
8	they have desires, that does not give them a right
9	under general UAPA law to intervene.
10	To intervene under general UAPA standards,
11	you have to have a "legal interest" that is going to be
12	substantially affected. So that begs the question what
13	legal interest does Black Rock have? Do they have a
14	legal interest to never have a utility facility next
15	door to them, not on their property, but on property by
16	them? Is that a legal interest that they have that is
17	going to be taken away by this?
18	I apologize that we didn't put this in any of
19	our papers, but again, when we filed our opposition,
20	the proposed intervention was based on the Facility
21	Review Board statute saying that the corridor ran over
22	their land, and we addressed that, but they since
23	conceded it does not.
24	But the Utah Supreme Court, in various
25	condemnation cases, has been presented with a similar

Page 50 thing where people have said hey, wait a minute. 1 By 2 putting that highway, that, you know, whatever by my 3 property, it's going to impact my legal interest. 4 And the Utah Supreme Court has said you know 5 There's no way that you could then end that what? slippery slope, because, you know, where do you draw 6 7 the line and say well, you're an HOA versus an 8 individual, though you're right next door versus two 9 houses away? We don't have a legal mechanism to do 10 this, so we're going to limit our analysis to parcels 11 actually impaired or encumbered by the thing at 12 question. And so I think looking at that here, you say 13 14 what legal interest does Black Rock have, number one, 15 and then number two, is not already represented by another voice? 16 17 So if it is correct that the board is saying well, how can we limit them to keep them within the 18 If you -- if you do that, if the board is to 19 scope? 20 say well, you know, limit them to only this kind of yes or no thing they have, that the -- that he county is 21 22 then on the same pages that they are, then general UAPA 23 standard says you don't get to intervene, because 24 whatever interest you have is already represented by 25 another party. In this case, it's Wasatch County.

1	Page 51 So my concern is that the board opens up the
2	floodgates in future proceedings, because it won't be
3	able to draw a clear, distinct line, when the distinct
4	line that should be there for it is that Black Rock
5	does not have a legal interest that is going to be
6	taken away or divested by any order of this board, and
7	any legal interest that it believes it does have, it
8	could and should raise in a different forum.
9	And I don't think you could take an order and
10	carve to sufficiently say we're going to let them in,
11	but we're still only talking about yes or no, because
12	then you do kind of duplicate their efforts with the
13	county and you open the floodgates for other
14	proceedings or anybody else that says they have opinion
15	on it.
16	Anyway, I don't want to duplicate myself, but
17	that's just a distinction I think should be focused on.
18	It's a legal interest.
19	MS. GORDON: I'd like to add, just quickly,
20	that to the extent that Black Rock and the association
21	has something to say in this proceeding, we have
22	designated a public witness hearing. So the question
23	is whether they should be a party to the action with a
24	separate legal interest that they need to protect by
25	being a party to the action or whether they, as a
1	

Page 52 1 member of the public who's not directly touched by the 2 corridor, have something that they feel like they have 3 to add.

And there is a method for them to do that, and that's the public involvement, the hearing that's been set for the public to come and express ways that they may be affected by this power line, even though their interests may not rise to the level of a legal interest that requires them to be a party to the action.

CHAIR: This is Thad LeVar. I'd like to ask 11 12 one clarifying question of Mr. Moscon, if I could. And you may not have this in front of you, but you 13 14 referenced a line of condemnation cases that have 15 addressed intervention issues from home owners. And obviously we don't have those cases briefed. 16 We don't have them in front of us. 17

I assume those cases are under Rules of Civil 18 Procedure intervention standards rather than 19 20 Administrative Procedures Act intervention standards. Do you have the ability to comment on the difference 21 22 between those two standards at all, Mr. Moscon? 23 MR. MOSCON: Sure. And again, I apologize, 24 because the -- an argument changed, that the reply, we 25 hadn't supplied those.

Page 53 1 You are correct that those cases are not UAPA 2 cases. Those line of cases simply address what happens when we have people that are going to -- that live next 3 door to the highway transmission line, a reservoir, of 4 5 whatever, a public -- you know, a publicly needed thing, and they claim that they now have a legally --6 7 or that they have interest or are being affected. And 8 how and where would you cross and draw the line? And those lines of cases have said because we 9 10 never could draw a clear line, because we never could carve an order out that effectively allows you in but 11 to not argue something different than the land owner 12 itself and/or the condemning party, that what we're 13 14 going to say is, in these kinds of cases, we're going 15 to let the condemning authority and the directly impacted land owner themselves work it out, because 16 otherwise you don't have a legal interest that is 17 really being taken away. You didn't have a legal 18 19 interest to, you know, not have to see a power pole or 20 something. That's not a legal interest that you ever 21 had, so it's not being taken away. 22 It's true you were able to enjoy that view 23 without a power pole or a water pump for a while, but that wasn't a legal right that you had, you know, as a 24 25 vest -- something vested to you.

1	Page 54 And so I was using by analogy those cases to
2	simply say here, when you're looking at UAPA and you're
3	looking at the standards under that statute, you have
4	to make a distinction between an interest, meaning I
5	have an opinion, I sure hope this doesn't happen, and a
6	legal interest, meaning you have a vested right that
7	you could sell at a show in the action or you could,
8	you know, do something with that is being deprived or
9	taken away from you.
10	And we have not heard Black Rock ever explain
11	what that legal interest is that they're being deprived
12	of that is in the context of what the Facility Review
13	Board can address, because their perceived property
14	valuation claim is not something that this board under
15	its jurisdiction would address.
16	And so if it is limited to simply yes or no
17	should a facility be built, yes or no, they also don't
18	have a divergent view or opinion from the county or
19	have a legal standing, really, to make that argument.
20	So I don't know if that answers your question, but
21	that's the context in which I was using those
22	condemnation cases.
23	CHAIR: Thank you. So I think we're back to
24	board discussion on a pending motion.
25	BOARD MEMBER CLARK: This is Dave Clark. So,

1	Page 55 I wonder, in light of Mr. Moscon's comments, if we
2	ought to give Mr. Reutzel an opportunity to and
3	I'm I'd be interested in this as succinctly as
4	you can, to state what legal interest his client has in
5	the proceedings before us, or to state why we should
6	not confine our reasoning to the identification of a
7	legal interest.
8	CHAIR: I personally would appreciate that
9	additional clarification. Any board members that
10	oppose oppose that?
11	BOARD MEMBER WHITE: I'm also in favor. This
12	is Jordan White.
13	CHAIR: Okay. And
14	BOARD MEMBER HOLBROOK: I'm in favor of that
15	also. Thank you.
16	CHAIR: Okay, Mr. Reutzel.
17	MR. REUTZEL: My clients have a legal
18	interest, obviously, in their property, and they also
19	have a legal interest in protecting the value of their
20	property and seeing that the ordinances and the laws
21	that are applicable to their property are enforced,
22	namely my client buys a piece of property, expecting
23	that Wasatch County's ridge line ordinances will be
24	enforced, and expecting that Wasatch County's
25	conditional use permit ordinances will be enforced,

Page 56 expecting that the utility company will not be able to 1 2 just pick and choose winners and move utility lines 3 based off of agreement that they -- that are not disclosed. 4 5 My client has a legal interest in protecting its property. And I don't think -- the cases that Mr. 6 7 Moscon has talked about are under a different standard, 8 and I don't think we're talking about a legal interest in whether or not there's a property right that my 9 client can deed. 10 When we talk about administrative 11 12 proceedings, we're talking about a zone of interest, and here the zone of interest is the effect on the 13 value and the rights, my client's property rights, and 14 15 there is a legal interest. I'd also like to point out that, you know, 16 17 the Millard County case addresses this very clearly and says this slippery slope argument is not an argument 18 that is a -- should be considered by the board, and the 19 20 board actually has an obligation under statute to devise procedures to minimize burdens, without 21 22 undermining the intervention statute. 23 To rule as they're asking would totally nullify the intervention statute. Nobody other than 24 25 the county and the utility could participate in these

1	Page 57 proceedings, and that's not what the intervention
2	statute envisions or the Millard County case.
3	And we did, in our initial moving papers
4	although we did concede that it was not an appropriate
5	grounds for intervention under the Section 54, we also
6	mentioned the section we're talking about today, and so
7	that's been out there from the very beginning.
8	CHAIR: Okay, thank you. I think we're back
9	to board discussion of a pending motion.
10	Ms. Holbrook?
11	BOARD MEMBER HOLBROOK: Mr. Chair, thank you.
12	I I do understand kind of both sides where you're
13	presenting that scenario. And the challenge, I think,
14	is from the perspective of looking at long-term future
15	growth.
16	When you presented your argument, Mr.
17	Reutzel, about that they do have a legal interest based
18	on they had an expectation that, say, ridge line
19	ordinances, et cetera, would be applicable, there are
20	always changes that happen down the road, and they
21	having sat on several commissions in a similar nature,
22	it is we do set policy and procedures based on the
23	fact that there is that opportunity, here's the
24	guidelines and here's everything, but things do change.
25	Having said that, I do look at the the

1	Page 58 I do look at it as to how can we include some of what
2	you're saying and and using that as some value of
3	having an intervention at this stage so that it doesn't
4	come become costly down the road for either entity,
5	and that's kind of where I'm struggling with a little
6	bit, or that's where I'm trying to get that value add
7	to that, so
8	I do I do want to make sure that this
9	proceeds in a timely fashion. And my one comment would
10	be to that, if we did allow to do intervention, that we
11	stipulate something along the lines or we include in
12	this in some fashion that property values are not
13	are not included and incorporated in any way. Thank
14	you.
15	CHAIR: Well, this is Thad LeVar, and I
16	and I appreciate all the comments we've had from the
17	parties, and I to me, this is both a legal and a
18	factual difficult difficult issue.
19	I think I'm still inclined to support the
20	motion that's pending on the table, with with
21	clarifying language, simply from the fact that I I
22	see the UAPA language on intervention and the Supreme
23	Court's interpretation of it as intending a broader
24	intervention option than generally is available under
25	the Rules of Civil Procedure.

1	Page 59 And while it's a closed case and while I have
2	some concern about the slippery slope, I think the fact
3	that we have an association that's representing most,
4	if not all, of the of the property owners who are at
5	least alleging a legal interest and again, a
6	decision on intervention doesn't modify what we have in
7	front of us substantively in this case and what
8	decisions and what options we do and don't have, but
9	that's where that's where I'm leaning on this
10	motion.
11	If there's any desire for further further
12	discussion before we vote on the pending motion from
13	anyone else.
14	Okay. Someone just unmuted their phone and
15	we have some background noise. I don't know if that's
16	one of the two of you who need to be participating.
17	BOARD MEMBER WHITE: Sorry, that's me.
18	CHAIR: Okay.
19	BOARD MEMBER HOLBROOK: Mr. Chair, may I ask,
20	Commissioner Clark, could you please restate your
21	motion, for my benefit? Thank you.
22	BOARD MEMBER CLARK: Sure. I and if I
23	could just make a preliminary comment too. You know, I
24	think this is a closed question. It's a challenging
25	question, I think, legally and factually. And yet my

	Daga 60
1	Page 60 inclination is to err on the side of hearing more
2	rather than less, or having more participation rather
3	than less, that's a better way to say it.
4	So my motion is that we grant intervention.
5	And I'll amend it or amplify it by saying that I think
6	the order should, in a careful way, outline the limits
7	of the board's authority and express an intention to
8	constrain and confine the participation of parties to
9	the issues that are are within our statutory
10	responsibilities and authorities as they're presented
11	by the facts in this case.
12	CHAIR: Any more discussion to the motion?
13	BOARD MEMBER WHITE: I apologize, Chair
14	LeVar, but what were you saying?
15	CHAIR: Oh, I asked if there's any further
16	discussion to the motion.
17	BOARD MEMBER WHITE: My final comment, again,
18	is, I think it probably is is probably right for a
19	vote now. It's just that, again, I don't I have
20	full, you know, faith that Black Rock would abide by
21	the policy.
22	My my concern, again, is just based upon
23	precedent, I think that the the road that we may be
24	going down. But that's kind of, I mean, I guess my
25	final comment on that.
1	

Page 61 And I apologize, Chair LeVar, was there -- is 1 there -- did you submit it to a vote? I'm only hearing 2 3 about 50 percent there. Okay. I'll lean in closer to my 4 CHAIR: 5 microphone. I think it's appropriate to take it to a vote now. I think what I'll do is just go 6 7 alphabetically to each board member, in alphabetical order. 8 Mr. Clark? 9 BOARD MEMBER CLARK: Yes, I quess I --10 technically, does it need a second? 11 CHAIR: Oh, I suppose that wouldn't hurt. Ι 12 don't -- I don't know the answer to whether that's legally necessary, but I don't think it harms anything 13 if anyone wants to second the motion, if we have 14 15 anybody who -- who's willing to do that. And I don't know if as the chair -- I'm not 16 as familiar with Robert's Rules of Order as I could 17 be -- if a second -- if a second is required, whether 18 19 it's appropriate to come from the chair, I'm willing to 20 second it, unless any other board member is interested in doing so. 21 22 Okay. Well, I'll second the motion, and hope 23 I haven't violated any procedure by doing so. MR. MOSCON: I'm sorry, Chair LeVar, I missed 24 25 what you just said.

1	Page 62 CHAIR: I'll second the motion. And then I
2	think we'll go to a vote. And if you if you desire
3	to say anything with respect to your vote, feel free to
4	do so. Not not necessary. And I think I'll just go
5	in alphabetical order with the board members.
6	Mr. Clark?
7	BOARD MEMBER CLARK: I vote aye.
8	CHAIR: Ms. Holbrook?
9	BOARD MEMBER HOLBROOK: I vote I vote aye.
10	CHAIR: I vote aye.
11	Mr. White?
12	BOARD MEMBER WHITE: I vote nay.
13	CHAIR: Okay. The motion passes.
14	Intervention is granted, and there will be a written
15	order in due course that will be issued. I don't know
16	that I can commit to a time frame in which a written
17	intervention order will be issued, but but the
18	motion passes.
19	Is there any other business I'll go to the
20	board members. Any other business that we need to
21	address this morning before we adjourn, that any of you
22	are aware of?
23	I'm not hearing any, so we are adjourned.
24	Thank you.
25	(The hearing concluded at 10:25 a.m.)

Page 63 1 CERTIFICATE 2 STATE OF UTAH) :ss 3 COUNTY OF SALT LAKE) 4 I, Angela L. Kirk, a Registered Professional Reporter, Certified Court Reporter, and Notary Public in and for the State of Utah, do hereby certify: 5 That the foregoing hearing was taken on March б 28th, 2016. 7 That the proceedings were reported by me in stenotype, and thereafter transcribed by computer, and 8 that a full, true, and correct transcription of said 9 testimony so taken is set forth in the foregoing pages; I further certify that I am not of kin or 10 otherwise associated with any of the parties to said cause of action, and that I am not interested in the 11 event thereof. 12 WITNESS MY HAND and official seal at Salt Lake City, Utah, this 1st day of April, 2016. 13 Mare 14 Angie L. Kirk, RPR, CCR 15 License No. 108202-7801 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

HEARING PROCEEDINGS DOCKET NO. 16-035-09 - 03/28/2016 Index: 10:25..appearance

				25appearance
	across 18:2	adjudicating	alignment	always 57:20
1	22:25 30:22	10:16 14:13	10:8,10 15:3,4,	ameliorated
10:25 62:25	act 11:2,21,22	Adjustment	5,23 18:9,10	38:20
16-035-09 3:5	13:13,16 28:12	14:2	alignments	amend 60:5
10-033-09 3.5	30:8,16 31:23	administrative	13:24	amendment
	35:18 41:4	30:8,16 31:23	all 7:9,12,14,	18:21
2	42:3,21 43:11,	35:18 41:4	15,19 9:3	amplified 20:4
2016 3:1	14 44:18 52:20	42:2,21 43:11,	23:16,24 28:11	amplify 60:5
25 3:9	acting 45:18	14 52:20 56:11	35:4 37:6 45:8	analogy 54:1
28 3:1	action 41:13	adversely	46:16 47:19,22	analysis 22:21
	49:6 51:23,25	33:22	52:22 58:16	41:1 48:23
3	52:10 54:7	affect 39:6	59:4	50:10
	actual 14:2	47:16,17	alleging 59:5	ancillary 29:6
30 22:10	28:23 29:20	affected 25:19	alleviated	and/or 12:18
	37:12	30:3 32:1	38:19	53:13
5	actually 13:21	33:21 34:15	allow 29:14	another 16:9
5 43:16	36:9,12 49:3	35:4,14 41:16	58:10	22:10 50:16,25
50 61:3	50:11 56:20	42:5 48:3,4,5	allowed 23:15	answers 54:20
54 57:5	add 8:19 20:21	49:12 52:7	allowing 34:8	
54-14-303(d)	23:20 42:12	53:7	42:7	anticipate 20:9
14:7 25:13	51:19 52:3	after 9:21	allows 16:25	anybody 51:14
54-14-303-2(b)	58:6	again 9:10 13:7	38:25 53:11	61:15
41:12	additional 9:5	19:15,20 25:4,	along 8:23	anyone 4:22
41.12	11:11 13:24	12,19 28:8,22	35:20 36:4	41:23 48:9
	14:3 55:9	29:2,5,7,19	43:24 58:11	59:13 61:14
6	address 10:25	31:1,13,14	alphabetical	anything 5:16
63G 27:14	16:6,17 21:20	33:17,24 36:25	61:7 62:5	6:19 8:19
28:18 48:23	28:25 53:2	37:5,7,22,24	alphabetically	20:14 21:5
	54:13,15 62:21	38:7 40:14,17,	61:7	22:8 23:19,23
9	addressed	25 41:8 46:4,7,		24:4 26:7 30:7
9:04 3:1	29:25 41:2	9 47:7 49:19	already 20:14	32:1 40:21
9:04 3:1	49:22 52:15	52:23 59:5	50:15,24	61:13 62:3
	addresses	60:17,19,22	also 4:4 6:13	anyway 40:16
Α	41:3 56:17	agency 17:9	8:20 16:16	51:16
a.m. 3:1 62:25		aggrieved	17:9,16 20:8	anywhere
abide 60:20	addressing	21:19	21:7 22:12	48:10
ability 34:7	7:23 46:1		28:6 33:18,22	apologize 3:25
52:21	adequate	agree 39:12	34:24 35:17	20:11 24:21
able 3:20 9:4,7	14:10 25:15	agreement 56:3	40:13 44:14	26:1 42:23
32:16 48:11	adjacent 28:25		45:23 46:19,20	49:18 52:23
51:3 53:22	48:7	ahead 7:3	48:19 54:17	60:13 61:1
56:1	adjourn 62:21	20:22 29:21	55:11,15,18	appealed
absence 43:8	adjourned	aligned 7:24	56:16 57:5	17:25 18:6
acquiring 12:3	62:23	9:16 10:13,22	alternate 13:23	appearance
acquiring 12.3	adjudicate	11:5 12:23	although 27:24	4:9
	28:2 40:6,8,13		39:20 57:4	

111111(11()	F PROCEEDINGS	Docter no. 10		arancesbumps
	around 20:11	hasiaally 25:4		—
appearances	around 30:11	basically 35:4	52:22 54:4	16 34:19,22
4:6	associated	bear 12:20	beyond 25:11	35:1,5,10,15,
appears 34:12	17:17	become 58:4	29:8 31:7 37:3,	24 36:21,24
applicability	association	becomes 22:4	25 38:24	37:14,20 38:6,
41:5	3:10,12,13	becoming 34:2	biggest 48:1	16,25 39:17,
applicable	7:20 23:8	before 5:6,9,17	bit 30:20 31:22	21,23,25
16:22 28:15	51:20 59:3	6:20 10:13	36:1 44:2 45:4	40:20,23
30:1 36:18	associations	11:3,5,8 12:5	58:6	41:11,19,21
47:20 55:21	7:8	13:21 15:14	Black 3:10,11,	42:17,23 43:1,
57:19	assume 14:15	18:25 20:16,21	12 9:25 10:1,	9,18,23 44:1,5,
applicant	48:24 52:18	23:18 34:4	24 12:23 13:8,	18 45:1,8,21,
14:24	assuming	38:6 40:21	11 14:17 20:15	23 46:17,21,
application	45:18	46:14 55:5	21:1,2,10	23,24 47:1,11,
10:11 12:14	assumption	59:12 62:21	24:25 27:24	19 48:21 49:21
13:21 15:3,5	43:8	begin 15:2	28:10 29:15	50:17,19 51:1,
17:21,22,25	authorities	beginning 57:7	32:11 33:11	6 54:13,14,24,
18:4,5,8,13,21	41:6 60:10	begs 49:12	36:9,15 37:8	25 55:9,11,14
20:6 29:4	authority 31:5	behalf 4:11,13,	38:10,12 40:3	56:19,20 57:9,
36:17 47:15	53:15 60:7	16,18 5:19	45:24 46:13	11 59:17,19,22
applies 30:12	available 26:15	being 4:1 9:7	49:13 50:14	60:13,17 61:7,
apply 18:16	58:24	14:23 17:25	51:4,20 54:10	9,20 62:5,7,9,
42:20 47:14,20	aversion 45:6	18:5 21:23	60:20	12,20
appreciate	48:10	25:6 29:16	board 3:4,8,15,	board's 25:5
9:23 55:8	aware 3:19	33:13,21 36:4,	17,19,22,24	28:15 31:16
58:16	62:22	12 45:16 48:3	4:3,6 5:7,22,24	47:13,14 60:7
appropriate	away 23:3 45:5	51:25 53:7,18,	6:3,21,23,25	body 12:10
22:15,21,22	49:17 50:9	21 54:8,11	7:5 9:4,18,22,	born 12:3
23:11 34:23,25	51:6 53:18,21	beliefs 49:7	24 10:6,13,15	both 5:3 6:18
39:22 44:21	54:9	believe 21:18,	11:2,3,5,9,17,	10:9 12:23
45:21 46:12	aye 62:7,9,10	19 22:1 48:3	22 12:5,6,7,16,	57:12 58:17
57:4 61:5,19		believes 51:7	24 13:17,20,21	bottom 43:16
arbiter 22:5	B	benefit 6:14	14:2,6,20,23	brief 48:21
arguably 26:16		9:4 59:21	15:14,21,25	briefed 52:16
argue 47:21	back 22:14	Berg 4:24 8:16,	16:17 18:25	briefings 5:2
53:12	24:7,9 28:5	21 9:2 20:18	19:1,6,10,13,	briefly 7:23
argument	30:7 43:3,10	23:19,22 24:3,	15,17,20 20:1,	briefs 5:11
28:10 34:17	46:13 54:23	5,9	5 21:9,17 22:1,	broad 37:21
41:24 52:24	57:8	Beth 3:17	3,17 23:25	broader 58:23
54:19 56:18	backed 45:5	better 6:22,24	24:11,17,18,20	brought 28:9
57:16	background	60:3	25:24 26:1,9,	37:14
arguments	19:21 24:4,10,	between 11:5,	11,15,17,22	build 29:5
16:14 21:10	22 26:6 59:15	16,23 12:22	27:1,3,6 28:4,	built 12:8
46:6	based 39:8	13:6 16:5,17,	8,20 29:8,24	54:17
arms 30:11	49:20 56:3	24 17:3 34:8	30:5,14,18,25	bumps 43:10
	57:17,22 60:22	41:1 42:15	31:5,20 33:3,6,	-
	1	1	1	1

HEARING PROCEEDINGS DOCKET NO. 16-035-09 - 03/28/2016 Index: burden conduct

			Index: bu	urdenconduct
burden 23:9	29:1,19 37:12,	changes 17:18	client's 56:14	complaint
burdens 56:21	16 46:7,8	57:20	clients 55:17	40:11
business 5:2	57:19	choose 56:2	clients' 7:24	compression
62:19,20	chair 3:3 4:5,	chooses 12:13	8:3 18:2	22:8
buys 55:22	15,22 5:1,13,	circumstance	clock 6:2	concede 57:4
-	16,21,22,23	41:13	close 24:14	conceded
C	6:4,8 7:2,16,22	cited 42:18	25:2 40:22	49:23
	8:15,24 9:8,13,	civil 11:3 21:18	45:6	concern 10:4,
calculated	21 11:15 16:1,	52:18 58:25	closed 59:1,24	23 21:22 25:4,
26:5	8 18:24 19:7,8,	claim 53:6	closer 19:24	17 48:1 51:1
call 15:1	12,14,17,19,24	54:14	61:4	59:2 60:22
came 5:5 34:5	20:3,17,20	clarification	collectively	concerned
43:17	22:11 23:17,24	55:9	34:12	10:2,6 25:10
can't 15:8	24:5,14,16	clarify 6:20	come 15:18	33:19 34:16
16:22 24:4	25:24,25 26:2,	18:7 44:6	52:6 58:4	38:10,11 46:5
capsulates	8,10,12 28:3,	clarifying	61:19	concerning
21:22	19 29:11,22	13:18 52:12	coming 30:22	25:20
careful 60:6	30:24 31:21	58:21	35:4	concerns
carve 51:10	33:15,16 34:1	Clark 3:24	comment 8:18	10:25 20:25
53:11	35:1,9,16,24	5:22,24 6:23	9:10 16:1	24:25 33:17
case 8:2 14:1,	36:20 38:1,21	19:8,10,17,18,	38:22 40:16	38:19
21 15:22 16:22	39:17,19,24	20 20:1,13	46:18,20 47:4,	conclude
17:6,7 22:22	40:18,20,24	24:11,12 26:23	7 48:17,19	27:22 45:3
23:7 31:24	41:7 42:22,25	27:2,3 28:6	52:21 58:9	concluded
32:13 33:10,11	43:7,19 44:3,4,	33:1,3 35:1,2,	59:23 60:17,25	62:25
35:3 38:13	6,12 45:1,5,9	10 38:6,7	commented	concludes
42:10,18,19	46:12,16 47:3,	40:23 42:15,	24:6	32:25
43:12 50:25	23 48:18 52:11 54:23 55:8,13,	17,22,23 43:1,	comments	conclusion
56:17 57:2	16 57:8,11	18,23,24 45:1,	7:16 8:22,24	39:4
59:1,7 60:11 cases 33:6	58:15 59:18,19	8,21 46:24,25	16:3,4 22:12	condemnation
	60:12,13,15	54:25 59:20,22	26:24 30:22	49:25 52:14
35:8 49:25	61:1,4,11,16,	61:8,9 62:6,7	32:25 55:1	54:22
52:14,16,18 53:1,2,9,14	19,24 62:1,8,	Clark's 33:25	58:16	condemning
54:1,22 56:6	10,13	clear 7:6,7 22:3	Commission	53:13,15
cause 32:7	Chairman 9:9	25:6 39:13	12:11	condition
caution 37:23	20:11	44:11 47:10,25	Commissioner	37:14
certain 12:8	challenge	51:3 53:10	20:13 33:25	conditional
	57:13	clearly 10:19	48:22 59:20	55:25
certainly 17:12 20:20 25:1	challenging	16:22 23:12	commissions	conditions
29:17 34:25	59:24	56:17	57:21	38:8
37:7 38:19	chance 32:6	clicking 6:1,9	commit 62:16	condo 7:8,20
41:7 47:13	change 57:24	client 8:5,8	company	Condominium
cetera 13:24	changed 19:23	55:4,22 56:5,	18:13 56:1	3:13
14:4 25:2,3,16	44:2 52:24	10	company's	conduct 32:12,
L 17.7 20.2,0,10			18:9	20 42:6

HEARING PROCEEDINGS	DOCKET NO.	16-035-09 -	03/28/2016
		Index:	confess distinct

			Index: conf	essdistinct
confess 33:4	converts 22:2	craft 38:17	22 24:17 27:19	58:18
confine 27:19	correct 14:19	crafting 45:11	denial 14:1	difficulty 19:21
38:9,12 55:6	15:7,21 43:8	created 21:17	denied 29:3	24:23 39:2
60:8	48:23 50:17	criteria 41:2	denying 15:8	diminishment
confines 38:15	53:1	42:21	deprived 54:8,	40:12
confuse 29:14	corridor 7:11	cross 53:8	11	diminution
connected	35:13 49:21	crossed 35:13	describe 24:13	46:8
36:5,9	52:2	crosses 48:7	described 28:1	direct 27:4
consider 3:9	cost 13:24	current 13:25	45:20	33:20
10:16 16:20	21:14 22:5	customers	describes	directed 18:14,
21:7 25:12	costly 58:4	14:11	16:19 27:16	15
32:22 39:13	costs 12:2,14,	cut 16:23 22:13	describing	direction 35:21
44:13,25	21 14:3 17:16	cuts 10:3	14:20	37:20,23
45:17,20	21:3,7,15		design 18:11	directly 6:5
considered	22:18 37:16	D	designated	14:16 23:4
36:13 56:19	counsel 43:3		51:22	35:12,13 36:2,
considering	45:24 46:13	date 32:8,16,17	desire 59:11	3,5,9 52:1
11:18 32:13	county 4:25	Dave 5:24 6:23	62:2	53:15
44:19 45:18	7:25 8:1,2,6,	19:18 24:11	desires 49:8	disclosed 56:4
constituents	11,22 9:16	33:3 35:2 38:7	determine	discovery
10:2	10:1,8 11:6	40:23 43:24	16:20	31:12
constrain 60:8	13:1,3,6 14:17,	46:25 54:25	devaluation	discuss 30:19
constrained	22,24 15:4,7,	David 3:19,24	21:13 22:6	32:24 40:21
27:9 32:9	13 16:5,11,12,	deadline 32:14	25:8 31:13	46:2
constraining	18,24 17:11,24	deal 20:1	40:11 46:8	discussed
33:13	18:14,15,19	dealing 43:9	devalue 21:24	36:12
constructed	21:4 23:20	dealt 40:15	development	discussing
11:25	25:14 29:3	decide 12:7	17:18	20:6
construction	37:15 42:19	16:24 20:8	devise 56:21	discussion
14:9 25:14	43:12 50:21,25	47:11	dialogue 44:2	13:10 24:1,19
contains 27:10	51:13 54:18	decided 41:20	difference	26:16 29:11
contemplates	56:17,25 57:2	deciding 12:6	52:21	31:20 34:21,24
11:2	County's	decision 34:3	differences	36:19 38:3
context 27:15	55:23,24	39:4 43:21	11:8	39:20 44:4
35:3 54:12,21	couple 14:25	59:6	different 18:11,	49:3 54:24
continue 4:5	course 42:9 62:15	decisions	22 21:6 30:17	57:9 59:12
16:15		12:12 39:9	34:10 49:5	60:12,16
continued	court 6:14	59:8	51:8 53:12	discussions
34:24	12:10 23:6,7	deed 56:10	56:7	27:13
continuing	31:24 35:19 42:9,12 49:24	definitely 9:6	differently	dispute 21:16
34:21	42.9,12 49.24 50:4	deliberation	16:13 21:14	43:22
controls 27:7	Court's 43:13	19:1 23:18	30:19 34:19	disputes 11:23
convened	58:23	24:1 46:14	differing 41:9	distinct 35:7
11:23	00.20	deliberations	difficult 48:9	51:3
		19:15 20:5,16,		

HEARING PROCEEDINGS DOCKET NO. 16-035-09 - 03/28/2016 Index: distinction..free

			Index: dist	inction.free
distinction	efforts 10:19,	14:3,12 34:9	24,25 22:3,6	filed 13:4 14:23
11:16 34:7	20 51:12	39:2,5 52:7	25:14 29:5,24	15:6 18:8
48:4 49:2	either 3:20 4:7	every 21:22	30:5,14 35:14	32:15 41:14
51:17 54:4	5:13 7:24 9:16	22:5,23 32:4	37:4 38:25	49:19
divergence	18:16 19:1	everybody	41:11,19,21	filing 32:7
11:7 13:2	33:21 47:5	32:4	43:9 44:18	final 23:20
divergent 7:25	48:12 58:4	everyone 6:10	46:11 49:14,20	40:16 43:16
9:16,25 16:5	elaborate	20:7	54:12,17	46:14 60:17,25
17:3 54:18	11:15	everything	fact 8:4 34:18	fine 6:25 19:23
divested 51:6	elaboration	57:24	36:2,22 57:23	42:25
docket 3:5,6	11:19	evidence 37:12	58:21 59:2	first 3:22 5:7
32:4	elsewhere	example 31:9	factor 17:4	28:11 34:5
done 28:24	21:20	except 30:7	40:9	36:10 45:17
door 25:10	emergency 4:1	exclude 31:6	factors 12:1,	five 43:17,19,
49:15 50:8	EMS 46:7	expand 38:24	19,21 13:7	20
53:4	enabling 11:1,	44:16 45:13	15:10 16:19	five- 43:14
down 10:3	22 13:13,16	expect 8:13	17:1,2,5 28:7	five-part 42:10
36:15 57:20	encourage 6:9	expectation	43:19,20	floodgates
58:4 60:24	encumbered	57:18	facts 35:6,20	51:2,13
draw 33:10	50:11	expected 12:6	47:21 60:11	focus 14:5
34:8 50:6 51:3	end 9:11 50:5	expecting	factual 35:2	25:5
53:8,10	enforced 8:7	55:22,24 56:1	58:18	focused 51:17
due 62:15	17:19 55:21,	explain 54:10	factually 59:25	folks 6:4,6
duplicate	24,25	exploration	fair 47:10	follow 15:2
51:12,16	engineering	18:18	fairly 5:11	follow-up 40:1
duplication	12:7 18:11	explore 18:14,	faith 60:20	followed 18:10
10:19,20	enjoy 53:22	15 30:25	fall 30:7	22:22
duplicative	enough 26:19	exploring	fallback 31:2	following
29:13	40:22 42:12	37:25	falls 40:8	41:15
during 15:13	44:22	express 52:6	familiar 61:17	foreclose 44:8
duty 27:19	entertain 31:9	60:7	family 3:25	forum 10:25
	38:4 40:19	extended 46:6	far 10:6,12	11:9 20:25
E	entities 43:4	extent 11:7	13:11	51:8
	entitled 47:12	13:3 51:20	fashion 58:9,	forward 10:8
each 61:7	entity 29:5	extra 12:2	12	12:20 13:3
earlier 33:8	58:4	37:16	favor 44:14	35:8 44:24
early 44:7	envisions 57:2	extraneous	55:11,14	45:15,17
easier 24:22	err 60:1	31:7 33:23	fearful 13:11,	found 17:6,8
effect 39:8	essentially	01.7 00.20	14	four 4:6 14:22
56:13	29:13	F	feel 8:18 9:3,6	15:1 18:12,17
effectively	establishes		16:8 24:18	36:8,14,16
53:11	42:10	facilities 21:12	27:18 35:6,14	43:21
efficient 14:10	evaluate 42:11	facility 3:4,8	38:8 52:2 62:3	frame 62:16
25:16 37:8	even 13:23	11:2,24 12:19	few 7:3 22:12	free 8:18 16:8
		14:9 21:17,23,	42:13	62:3
L				

		DOCKET NO. 16	Index: Friday.	
Friday 5:5	govern 41:25	14:19	22 12:8,25	
43:17	43:20	happening	14:5 16:17,23	I
front 3:6 8:25	governing	5:25	17:14 25:5,13	
12:16 16:11	27:16 30:15	happens 36:14	28:7 30:1 35:7	i.e. 36:15
26:19 27:8	government	53:2	37:9 47:11,15,	idea 16:16
31:4 39:3,15	11:24 12:3	happy 5:12	21 48:1 50:13	identification
43:3 44:23	14:8 25:13	11:12 41:7	54:2 56:13	55:6
45:14 47:15	41:14,15	44:25 45:17	here's 57:23,	identify 3:14
52:13,17 59:7	governs 27:6	harm 23:13	24	6:15
full 60:20	grant 10:16	harms 61:13	hey 50:1	impact 36:15
further 8:23	27:12 43:25	having 6:5	high-voltage	50:3
18:18,20,25	48:2,12 60:4	10:20 19:21	28:12,22	impacted 23:4
19:2,4,8,10	granted 27:23	23:10 24:6,12	highlight 5:17	36:3 53:16
20:14 26:6	33:19 62:14	25:1 26:17	highlights 5:8	impacts 47:11
28:24 40:21	granting 32:22	29:20 30:5	20:24 21:8	impair 32:1,12
42:10 44:6	38:18 39:13	39:2,10 57:21,	highway 50:2	impaired 42:7
59:11 60:15	great 20:1	25 58:3 60:2	53:4	50:11
future 33:7,10,	green 15:16	hear 6:25	HOA 50:7	impairment
24 51:2 57:14	•	19:22 23:25	HOA'S 34:9,10	32:19
	grievances 47:22	24:4 43:5 44:1	Holbrook 3:17	implicate 25:3
G		45:23		implicating
	grounds 57:5	heard 9:24	19:1,12,13 25:24 26:1,9,	28:12
gas 22:7	growth 57:15	26:15 30:17	11,23 29:11	implication
gave 14:22	guess 6:9	37:11 45:2	33:2,15,16	25:9
general 28:17	13:22 14:4,12	49:2,3 54:10	35:22,24 36:21	implications
30:8 31:2	15:12,19 19:4	hearing 5:25	39:16,17 46:23	29:1
32:14 37:22	20:4 24:21,24	6:6,8,21 8:16	55:14 57:10,11	important
40:9 43:11	25:4,10,16,22	19:22 20:12	59:19 62:8,9	17:8,16 29:7
44:20 49:9,10	27:2 28:13	24:23 26:21	hold 38:2	31:15,16 37:7
50:22	29:10,20 31:6,	32:8,16,17		38:23 46:10
generally	10,17,18	51:22 52:5	home 7:7 34:8,	improper
58:24	32:24,25 36:25	60:1 61:2	15 52:15	20:24
getting 39:4,10	37:21,22 38:4	62:23,25	Homeowners	improves 6:16
46:5	40:1,8 44:12		3:10	incentive
give 49:8 55:2	46:15 60:24	hearings 29:19	homes 7:9,10,	22:20
given 44:2	61:9	hears 14:20	11	inclination
giving 22:10	guide 27:11	Heidi 4:18	hope 54:5	60:1
global 32:18	guidelines	5:15,16	61:22	
goes 10:8,12	57:24	help 6:16 11:20	Hopefully 6:16	inclined 24:18 44:14 58:19
good 3:3 9:13	guiding 42:19	19:25 24:8	houses 50:9	
42:12		43:24 46:4	However 12:13	include 58:1,
Gordon 4:18	н	helpful 15:25	39:2	11 included 50:10
5:15,16 7:18	happen 54:5	helps 20:1	hundreds 23:1	included 58:13
18:7 47:6	57:20	24:15	hurt 61:11	incorporated
48:18 51:19	happened	here 3:3,9 4:2,		3:11,12,13
TU. IU UI. IU	Inappened	24 5:19 10:19,		58:13

	TROCEEDINGD	DUCKET NO. 16		correctLevar
incorrect 16:18	interested	48:2,8,12	24:20 28:4	lead 24:1 33:6
increased 22:5	18:19 55:3	49:20 52:15,	36:24 39:25	leads 27:22
	61:20	49.20 52.15, 19,20 56:22,24	47:2 55:12	
indicated 6:19		, , ,		lean 61:4
8:16 14:24	interesting	57:1,5 58:3,10,	jump 31:21	leaning 35:20
36:8	27:14	22,24 59:6	juncture 14:3	59:9
indicates	interests 7:24,	60:4 62:14,17	29:12	least 30:12
11:22	25 8:3 9:15	into 5:2,6,9,17	jurisdiction	33:5 34:12
indicating	10:13 12:22	6:5,20 7:2 12:1	40:4 54:15	59:5
22:12,17	16:5 17:3	18:25 19:15	jurisprudence	leave 38:4
indicia 13:16	27:25 52:8	22:4 24:13	12:10	40:17
indirect 27:5	interject 35:23	40:21 46:5	justice 23:14	led 34:5
individual	interpretation	invite 24:18	42:5	legal 8:9 16:12,
34:8,9 50:8	35:19 43:13	46:19		14 21:19
influenced	48:22 58:23	inviting 46:17	K	22:19,21 23:13
33:5,14	interpreted	involve 11:18	keep 48:6	29:23 30:11
influencing	16:13	involved 23:10	50:18	31:25 39:6,11
35:6,17	interprets	involvement	kind 10:3 12:17	40:1,14,25
initial 24:24	31:24	46:3 52:5	21:21 22:6	41:10 42:4
25:23 57:3	intervene	involving		49:11,13,14,16
initially 28:9	16:21 23:15	34:10	29:23 32:7	50:3,9,14 51:5,
instance 27:23	30:4 49:9,10	issue 7:17 8:18	35:6 37:6,9,21	7,18,24 52:8
instinct 30:12	50:23	9:14 10:7 11:8	44:20 45:3	53:17,18,20,24
intend 34:22	intervenor's	13:2 14:3 21:2	50:20 51:12	54:6,11,19
intending	10:9	23:23 29:24,25	57:12 58:5	55:4,7,17,19
58:23	intervenors	32:18 34:2,4	60:24	56:5,8,15
intention 60:7	4:12,14 5:4	37:2 39:11	kinds 53:14	57:17 58:17
	9:15 11:6,19	45:25 48:14	known 38:20	59:5
inter 4:8 38:18	16:6,11 17:8	58:18	knows 32:5	legally 30:10
interest 8:7,8,	intervention	issued 12:17		42:1 48:5 53:6
10 11:7 13:2,9,	3:9 4:9 5:3	62:15,17	L	59:25 61:13
15 17:10,12,	8:17,25 9:3	issues 11:4,17,	land 28:25 30:3	legislature
13,15,16,19	10:5,17 16:19,	18 16:17,24	35:12 41:16	27:20 28:21
21:20 22:19,20	21,25 20:24	25:19 27:8,20	49:22 53:12,16	less 34:16
23:13,14 31:25	23:12 27:10,	28:1 29:6,7,14	language	60:2,3
39:6 40:1,4,5,	12,15,23	31:7,12,15	14:20 27:9	let 5:11 20:17
7,14 42:4,5	28:10,14,16,17	37:7,25 38:14	41:12,24 43:9	24:22 30:25
48:3,5 49:11,	29:15,20 30:1,	39:15 44:8,17	44:15 58:21,22	46:20 51:10
13,14,16 50:3,	6,16 31:3,5,10	45:14 46:7	large 12:9	53:15
14,24 51:5,7,	32:11,22	52:15 60:9	largely 38:19	Levar 3:16
18,24 52:9	33:19,23 36:10		last 8:16	5:22 9:9 19:17
53:7,17,19,20	37:22 38:9,18	J	law 47:20 49:9	20:11 24:14
54:4,6,11 55:4,	39:13 41:2,17,			28:3 29:12,22
7,18,19 56:5,8,	20,22 42:8	Jeff 4:16	laws 22:22	30:24 31:21
12,13,15 57:17	43:10,25	Jeremy 4:11	55:20	34:1 35:1 38:1,
59:5	44:10,16 45:12	Jordan 4:3 6:3	lay 29:23	22 40:18,25
		7:1 13:17		

HEARING PROCEEDINGS DOCKET NO. 16-035-09 - 03/28/2016 Index: level..motion

			Index:	levelmotion
44:6 45:1	58:5	match 15:17	28:4,20 33:3,	mine 44:2
48:22 52:11	live 20:4 53:3	material 32:19	16 35:1,10,24	minimize 56:21
58:15 60:14	LLC 3:10	materially	36:21,24 38:6	minute 50:1
61:1,24	local 11:24	32:1,12 42:7	39:17,21,23,25	missed 61:24
level 52:8	12:3 14:8	Matt 4:21 47:25	40:23 42:17,23	missing 10:18
light 55:1	41:14,15	48:16	43:1,18,23	mitigate 15:8
like 6:1,2 7:21	long 27:17	matter 3:4	44:5 45:1,8,21	mitigating
9:6 14:14	long-term	11:3,10 14:19	46:23,24 47:1	12:1,18,21
15:17,18	57:14	33:4 48:8	52:1 54:25	mitigation 12:2
16:10,16 20:3	looking 28:13	matters 21:18	55:11,14 57:11	13:5,7 15:9
22:23 23:6	30:13 36:23	may 12:13	59:17,19,22	21:5,14 22:18
26:6 27:18	39:2 48:18	21:13,14 24:21	60:13,17 61:7,	modification
28:9 29:23	50:13 54:2,3	25:21 27:25	9,20 62:7,9,12	36:16 41:14
35:22 38:8	57:14	40:6,14 41:8	members 3:16,	
40:12 43:4		42:4 47:16,17	23 4:6 5:7 6:21	modify 39:14
45:23 48:16	looks 7:21	48:2,3,10 49:7	7:5 9:18 12:7	59:6
51:19 52:2,11	35:22	48.2,3,10 49.7 52:7,8,13	23:25 24:18	moment 11:16
56:16	losing 13:14	59:19 60:23	26:22 30:18	16:9 31:1 43:2
limit 31:5,12	lost 21:9 22:5		34:19,22 40:20	Monday 3:1
37:24 44:9	lot 19:21 23:9,	maybe 17:23	46:17,22 55:9	more 9:7 11:19
50:10,18,20	10 24:10 33:23	24:21 27:4	62:5,20	17:22 18:1
limitations	loud 6:2	28:5,25 30:18,	members' 44:1	20:21 22:12,15
32:23		19 33:13,20	mentioned	28:17 30:20
	M	34:2 36:25	28:6 57:6	31:2 37:21
limited 17:20	made 10:24	37:10 43:1,2	Merriman 4:13	42:13 44:23
38:14 46:10	20:15 21:2	46:4 49:4	met 41:13	45:16,19 60:1,
54:16	23:21 33:8	mean 14:16		2,12
limits 60:6	39:20 41:24	15:12 24:25	method 52:4	morning 3:3
line 22:7,25	49:2	26:12 31:22	mic 11:13	34:5 62:21
23:3,5 28:12,	make 5:8 11:13	32:3 38:2,22	24:15	Moscon 4:21
22 33:10 34:8	12:11 21:11	60:24	microphone	5:13 9:9,20,23
48:4,7,10 50:7	22:12,21 34:22	meaning 10:1	6:5,7 19:25	11:21 13:19
51:3,4 52:7,14	38:20 39:9	54:4,6	40:22 45:6,7	14:15 20:11,
53:2,4,8,10	44:10 46:14	mechanism	61:5	18,19,23 30:24
55:23 57:18		50:9	middle 31:19	47:5 48:16,20
lines 25:1 53:9	47:10,25 48:18	meeting 19:16	might 9:23	52:12,22,23
56:2 58:11	54:4,19 58:8	20:7	11:20 35:10,11	56:7 61:24
lion's 34:14	59:23	member 3:18,	39:9	Moscon's 55:1
listed 43:15	makes 22:20	19,24 4:3 5:22,	miles 23:2	most 7:9,12,
listening 6:18	making 49:4	24 6:3,23,25	Millard 23:7	14,19 43:22
litigation 17:18	mandate 22:4	9:22 13:17,20	42:18 43:12	45:2 59:3
25:20	many 27:25	15:25 18:25	56:17 57:2	motion 3:9
little 3:25 11:19	March 3:1	19:6,10,13,17,	mind 7:23	32:7,14 34:22
19:24 22:14	Mark 3:9	20 20:1 24:11,	37:19 43:5	38:4,7 39:18,
24:22 30:19	Master 3:10	20 25:24 26:1,	48:6	20,21 40:19
31:22 36:1		9,11 27:1,3		44:3,4,13,14
	I	I	l	I

Index: motions..passing

45:18 54:24	necessary	obscuring 6:1	option 18:4,9,	lonspassing
57:9 58:20	10:21 37:3,4	obviously 8:8	16,22 44:12	P
59:10,12,21	61:13 62:4	41:9 44:2	58:24	F
60:4,12,16	necessity	52:16 55:18		packet 18:18
61:14,22 62:1,	37:13 46:11		options 14:13,	pages 50:22
		off 22:13 24:1,	22,25 15:2	paint 15:16
13,18	need 16:20	19 45:4 56:3	17:21,22,24	paper 10:15
motions 32:15	30:19 32:21,23	offend 20:8	18:1,2,12,13	papers 13:4
40:22	43:2 51:24	offer 20:10	26:14 36:8,11,	41:3 42:18
Mountain 3:7	59:16 61:10	office 37:1	12 39:3 44:25	49:19 57:3
4:15,17,19 5:4,	62:20	one 10:15 13:8,	59:8	parallel 22:25
20 6:19 7:17	needed 12:9	12,15 15:2	order 22:17	parcels 50:10
9:14 10:4,14	14:9 25:15	17:2,4 18:1	44:15 45:12	pardon 43:1
13:22 14:21,25	53:5	20:15,21,23	51:6,9 53:11	part 17:23
21:2,4 22:18	needs 10:15	27:1 28:5,8	60:6 61:7,17	18:17 35:12
36:7 46:20	39:13	29:25 33:16	62:5,15,17	43:15
movable 32:6	neighboring	34:5,11,15	orderly 32:12,	
move 5:6,9,17	13:14	35:5 36:12	19 42:6	partially 33:5
6:20 7:2 9:21,	never 22:2	43:2,22 44:12	ordinances 8:7	participate
22 18:25	42:12 49:14	47:6,10,25	17:19 55:20,	3:20 29:18
19:15,24 20:5,	53:10	50:14 52:12	23,25 57:19	56:25
21 23:18 32:8	next 8:15 49:14	58:9 59:16	otherwise	participates
40:21 43:25	50:8 53:3	ones 35:4 36:9,	33:22 53:17	33:11
56:2	Nobody 56:24	13	outlier 34:2	participating
moving 57:3	noise 6:1 19:21	only 11:4 15:4	outline 60:6	32:5 59:16
much 8:4 23:6	24:4,7,10,22	16:17,23 17:4,	outside 25:21	participation
32:6,14,17	59:15	6,21 21:3	40:13,14	38:11,12 60:2,
37:1	nonstarters	50:20 51:11	over 14:16	8
multiple 34:10	15:1 17:25	61:2	17:13 40:4	particular 13:2
mute 6:11	noon 5:5	opaque 48:13	46:13 47:25	14:19
24:7,13 25:23	nothing 5:19	open 7:4 19:15	49:21	particulates
29:21	15:11	29:11 31:19	overall 10:4	28:25
muted 24:9	nullify 56:24	48:8,14 51:13	18:17	parties 16:1
	number 17:5	opening 25:10	own 48:6	17:3 19:3
N	23:8 43:21	40:10	owner 7:8	29:20 58:17
	50:14,15	opens 51:1	21:22 22:24	60:8
name 3:5		opinion 11:17	30:3 41:16	parts 42:11
namely 55:22	0	49:7 51:14	53:12,16	party 13:9
narrow 14:5		54:5,18	owners 3:11	27:24 33:11
25:5 34:18	objection 7:4	opportunity	13:14 21:11	35:5 50:25
37:19 38:13	9:2,6 46:17,21,	29:17,18 55:2	23:1 28:23	51:23,25 52:9
39:3,5	24 47:1	57:23	29:1 34:8,15	53:13
nature 57:21	obligation 8:3	oppose 55:10	35:3,11 52:15	passes 62:13,
nay 62:12	17:10,11 56:20	opposed 36:4	59:4	18
near 43:15	obligations 8:4	opposition	ownership	passing 27:21
nearby 21:12		49:19	7:20	_

HEARING PROCEEDINGS DOCKET NO. 16-035-09 - 03/28/2016 Index: path..public

			Index:	pathpublic
path 44:24	phone 3:15,22,	possibly 33:17	presents 27:21	prohibited
45:15,17	23,25 4:4,7,20,	postured 37:19	pretty 25:5,6	14:8 25:14
pay 12:15 13:7	23 5:25 6:10,	potential 22:5	32:9,14,17	project 49:6
21:5,15 22:18	11,12,13,15	25:8,19,20	37:19	Promontory
paying 13:8	19:2 23:24	28:25 29:14	prevent 48:9	8:5
pending 54:24	24:5,13 30:22,	31:7,13,19	prevented 4:1	Promontory's
57:9 58:20	23 41:10 59:14	40:11,21 41:16	prior 14:22	17:13
59:12	physically 3:16	44:8,9	probably 15:20	prompt 32:12
people 23:8,	4:1,7	potentially	16:15 20:12	42:6
10,24 50:1	pick 56:2	25:3 29:13	24:5 30:10	proper 11:5
53:3	piece 55:22	30:3 45:24	32:15 60:18	properties
perceive 31:7	place 12:1,19	power 3:7	problem 23:3	8:10 33:21
perceived	15:9 32:23	4:15,17,19 5:4,	procedure	property 8:9
54:13	36:10	20 6:19 7:17	52:19 58:25	10:3 11:1
percent 61:3	placed 10:12	9:14 10:4	61:23	13:12,14,15
perhaps 34:18	plans 17:18	13:22 14:22,25	procedures	17:15 18:2
43:24	play 21:3 28:7	21:4 22:7,18	30:8,16 31:23	21:11,22,24
period 30:4	point 8:21	36:8 46:20	35:18 41:4	22:23,24 23:1
permit 10:7,11	9:11,17 11:13	48:4 52:7	42:2,21 43:11,	25:2,3,9,20
12:17 14:2	13:23 14:6	53:19,23	14 52:20 56:21	26:4 28:23
15:3,5,23	15:21 16:10,16	Power's 10:14	57:22	31:13 35:3,11
18:16,23 55:25	20:15 21:8	21:3	proceeded	40:12 47:12
permitted	22:9,13 23:23	precedent	15:22	48:6 49:15
12:25	24:17 28:5	38:11 60:23	proceeding	50:3 54:13
person 3:20	34:3,21,23	prefer 9:12	10:12 15:14	55:18,20,21,22
personal 42:1	38:2,23 39:21	preference	32:2,20 38:24	56:6,9,14
, personally	40:3 44:21	37:24	39:14 40:2,6,	58:12 59:4
34:7,16 43:20	45:10 47:10	preferred 18:9	15 42:5,6 44:7,	propose 15:9
44:14 45:10,15	56:16	preliminary	17 45:13 46:3	31:10 46:1
55:8	points 9:5	59:23	51:21	proposed 7:10
perspective	10:24 20:21	premise 48:22	proceedings	10:4,7,8,11
26:19 38:8	pole 53:19,23	preparing	16:12 17:23	11:6,24 49:20
57:14	policy 57:22	17:17	23:14 51:2,14	proposing
petition 3:7 5:3	60:21	prerogative	55:5 56:12	31:18
7:9 14:23	portion 7:13	8:20	57:1	protect 8:3
37:18	position 5:10	present 3:16,	proceeds 58:9	51:24
petitioner 4:8	8:17 10:9,10	17,18 4:2,7	process 16:15	protecting 8:8
5:7 6:18 7:7	21:3 23:21	47:21	24:2 26:5	55:19 56:5
34:11,15 41:3	31:2 35:5 36:1	presented	27:10,11,15	provide 14:9
petitioner's	44:11	18:12,17 25:6	36:3 37:9 41:4	25:15
42:4 43:16	positions	38:14 49:25	46:22	provided 16:14
petitioners	16:13 30:17	57:16 60:10	processes	provisions
34:6 39:6,8	possibility	presenting	27:6	30:9
petitioning 4:9	33:20	57:13	progress	public 9:7
			26:14,18	12:11 14:11

HEARING PROCEEDINGS DOCKET NO. 16-035-09 - 03/28/2016 Index: publicly say

			Index:	publiclysay
20:6 29:18	quickly 18:13	relevant 17:7	responsibilities	Rock's 24:25
51:22 52:1,5,6	51:19	reliable 14:10	38:15 60:10	32:11 38:10,12
53:5		25:15	responsibility	45:24
publicly 53:5	R	relief 35:15	27:18	Rocky 3:7
pulling 33:23	raise 51:8	relieving 23:9	restate 6:17	4:15,17,18 5:4,
pump 22:7		remedies	59:20	20 6:18 7:17
53:23	raised 21:1	26:14	Reutzel 4:11	9:14 10:3,14
punt 15:13	ran 49:21	remedy 22:19	5:10 7:14 8:1	13:22 14:21,25
purpose 27:6	rather 52:19	47:12,17	16:3,10 22:11,	21:2,4 22:17
pursue 27:25	60:2	remind 6:13	16 47:4,8,9	36:7 46:20
pursued 18:20	read 17:21	reply 5:4 43:16	55:2,16,17	role 47:13,14
pursuing 18:4	27:14	52:24	57:17	room 3:14 20:7
put 6:11 10:14	reading 27:5,	reporter 6:14	review 3:4,7,8	41:9 46:16
12:1,12,19	22	represent 7:9	9:4 11:2 14:8	rule 56:23
13:3 15:9,15	ready 9:9	17:10,12 23:2	21:17 22:3	ruled 32:16
36:7 49:18	19:14 23:17	34:14	29:24 38:25	Rules 52:18
putting 42:24	real 6:6 48:14	represented	41:11,19,21	58:25 61:17
50:2	really 10:3	17:9 50:15,24	43:9 44:18	runs 18:2
50.2	13:13 15:22	representing	49:21 54:12	Ryan 4:13
Q	20:25 21:21	7:8 34:12 43:4	Richard 47:23	rtyun nito
	24:15 26:20	59:3	Richards 4:16,	S
Questar 8:2	27:11 36:21		20 5:14,19	
17:7	38:10 40:10	represents 7:19 23:8	47:5,23,24	safe 14:10
question 7:22	48:13 53:18		ridge 3:10,11,	25:15
9:10,19,21	54:19	request 13:22	12 55:23 57:18	said 14:14 15:7
10:17 12:16,17	reason 34:13	requesting 27:24	rights 8:9 25:9,	17:20,24 21:2
13:6,18,23	49:1		20 26:4 28:18	23:7 29:16
14:1,7,16	reasoning 55:6	requests 33:24	31:14 56:14	37:15 45:10
15:10,20 16:2,	received 5:2	required 12:14	rise 52:8	50:1,4 53:9
4 25:6 26:2,8,	recognize	18:21 61:18	road 31:11,19	57:25 61:25
23 27:1 30:11	25:18 31:15	requirement	36:15 57:20	same 8:10 9:10
32:10 35:9,16	38:23	12:18	58:4 60:23	10:9 15:2
36:6,19,22	recover 22:2	requires 52:9	Robert's 61:17	18:10 20:12
37:6 40:24	reference	reservoir 53:4	Rock 3:10,11,	24:12 50:22
41:20 42:14	28:23 33:8	respect 13:20	12 9:25 10:1,	sat 57:21
45:22 46:13	43:15	28:22 30:1	24 12:23 13:8,	save 9:11
49:12 50:12	referenced	40:10 62:3	11 14:17 20:16	say 6:12 10:20
51:22 52:12	20:13 52:14	respond 9:14	21:1,2,10	14:4 15:14,20
54:20 59:24,25	regarding	10:23 20:15	27:24 28:10	16:23 18:3
questions 5:6,	18:16	22:9	29:15 33:11	21:25 36:17
9,12,18 6:20	related 38:9	responding	36:9,15 37:8	40:2 45:12
7:3,5 9:18,22	relationship	11:14	40:3 46:14	50:7,13,20
11:11 12:22	41:1 42:15	response 5:3	49:13 50:14	51:10,21 53:14
18:25 19:3,5,9,	relationships	9:24 21:1	51:4,20 54:10	54:2 57:18
11 34:6	41:5	22:15 27:4,5	60:20	60:3 62:3
		33:25		

HEARING PROCEEDINGS DOCKET NO. 16-035-09 - 03/28/2016 Index: saving..summarize

			Index: sayi	ngsummarize
saying 12:11	52:6 57:22	slippery 22:1	speakers	38:25 39:4
13:8,11 19:22	setting 35:7	33:7,18 34:17	19:22	41:2,11,19,21,
27:18 30:7	settle 11:23	48:13 50:6	speaking 6:10	25 43:9 47:16
45:3 49:4,21	several 57:21	56:18 59:2	20:18 40:22	49:21 54:3
50:17 58:2	share 34:14	slope 22:2	41:21	56:20,22,24
60:5,14	sharing 43:5	33:8,18 34:17	specific 27:15,	57:2
says 23:13	short 35:16	48:14 50:6	20 28:8,14,21	statutes 16:13
30:2 41:13	42:14	56:18 59:2	34:4 41:1,12,	47:14
42:3 44:15	should 3:6	somebody	13 43:10 44:23	statutory 8:3
50:23 51:14	11:18,25 12:1,	21:15	45:16,19	17:9,11 22:4
56:18	2,8,16,18,20,	somehow	specifically	25:22 38:15
scenario 33:18	24 15:23 16:21	22:17	29:25 45:25	41:6,16 60:9
57:13	21:9,15,20	someone 9:14	spot 42:24	stay 20:7 24:14
schedule 32:3,	22:17 23:15	16:21 23:2,4	stage 26:5	staying 45:6
4,5	27:23 36:17	33:8 44:24	39:20 58:3	steal 11:13
scope 25:11,21	46:19 51:4,8,	45:16 48:2	standard	step 28:24
26:2 29:8 31:8	17,23 54:17	49:5 59:14	31:22,24	still 22:15 39:7,
36:7 37:9	55:5 56:19	something 6:2,	35:18,20 41:10	19 46:16 49:1
38:24 39:5,14,	60:6	12 11:8 15:17,	42:3 43:11,13	51:11 58:19
15 40:13 44:9,	show 54:7	18 16:6 22:4	50:23 56:7	stipulate 58:11
16,17 45:13	side 20:14 60:1	26:4 30:25	standards	straight 48:23
46:3,11 50:19	sidelines 36:4	36:14 38:18	49:10 52:19,	strictly 32:9
second 61:10,	sides 57:12	40:15 49:6	20,22 54:3	-
14,18,20,22		51:21 52:2	standing 54:19	struggle 24:12 29:21
62:1	significantly	53:12,20,25	start 6:15 7:4	
seconds 22:10	18:22	54:8,14 58:11	20:6 24:19,21	struggling
section 57:5,6	signs 25:1	something's	48:21	58:5
seeking 41:14	silence 30:6	5:25 19:23	state 3:5 38:7	submit 61:2
seem 34:13	silent 30:14	somewhat	55:4,5	submitted
seemed 28:11	similar 18:10	35:25	stated 5:11	13:22 14:7
seems 28:9,17,	33:24 49:25	somewhere	10:10	substance
20,24 40:12	57:21	13:1 36:4	statement	28:16
seen 26:17	simply 14:1	47:17	21:21 36:22	substantial
37:1	15:7 22:19	sorry 5:14,22	39:18 44:21	39:8
sees 44:24	26:16 36:4,13	19:20 24:3	static 20:12	substantially
48:10	53:2 54:2,16	27:2 45:1,5	station 22:8	31:25 39:5
sell 54:7	58:21	59:17 61:24		42:4 49:12
	since 9:16 32:8	sort 22:18	status 48:12	substantively
sense 7:12	42:11 49:22	33:12 41:5	statute 16:19,	59:7
separate 11:9,	sit 5:11	42:19	21,23,25 23:12	succinctly
10 16:12,14	sited 22:1	sought 15:6,24	25:7 26:3 27:5,	55:3
17:3 51:24	situation 30:2,	18:23	10,16,21 28:8,	sufficiently
service 12:11	4,6,14 34:9,11,	sound 6:9 20:3	15,17 29:24	51:10
14:10 25:16	18 41:19,22	speak 6:5,15	30:2,6,12,13,	summarize
set 13:16 27:8	42:1 43:10	Spear 0.0, 10	14,15 31:4	45:9
32:3,17 38:14			32:9 37:22	

			Index:	Summitvest
Summit 13:1	telling 12:24	35:2 42:1,20	try 19:24	undertaken
supplied 52:25	term 45:22	44:7	trying 14:4	13:5
support 44:15	terms 3:15	thinks 49:5	24:13 29:5	unified 35:5
58:19	12:14 13:21	thought 21:23	58:6	unless 37:10
suppose 27:17	25:8 26:14	23:20 24:24	turn 5:21 46:13	61:20
61:11	37:8	34:4	47:24	unlike 8:2
supreme 12:10	terrible 24:3	thoughts 8:25	two 15:2 16:9	unmute 6:11
23:6 31:23	test 30:15	25:23 26:12,	17:21,22 18:1,	unmuted 24:6
35:19 42:9	42:10,11 43:15	23,25 30:21	9 19:2 20:21	59:14
43:12 49:24	testimony	32:20,22 33:1,	28:7 30:17	until 8:23 9:11
50:4 58:22	26:13,18 31:12	4 40:18 43:5,7	36:12 41:6	32:16
sympathetic	37:12 46:6	44:6	42:11,16 50:8,	use 38:13
24:25	Thad 3:16 28:3	three 15:1	15 52:22 59:16	55:25
	29:22 31:21	18:12,16 34:19	two-part 30:15	using 54:1,21
Т	34:1 38:21	36:8,14,15	42:3,11	58:2
table 14:14	52:11 58:15	through 16:15	Tyler 4:24 8:12	Utah 3:4,8
58:20	than 17:22	37:1 40:25	Tyler's 9:10	12:10 42:9
tailor 31:6	18:1,22 44:23	41:8	type 21:10,16	49:24 50:4
take 4:9 8:17	45:16,19 52:19	ticking 6:2	typically 14:21	utility 3:4,8 9:4
16:8 20:9 21:2	53:12 56:24	time 19:6 26:20		11:23 12:4,7,
28:5,6 31:2	58:24 60:2,3	40:18 43:2	U	12,13,20 13:6
37:21 40:25	their 8:4 10:2,	62:16	UAPA 30:8,9	14:11 16:18,24
51:9 61:5	13 13:15	timely 58:9	40:9 49:9,10	22:6 29:4
taken 49:17	17:10,20,21	today 3:21 4:2	50:22 53:1	49:14 56:1,2,
51:6 53:18,21	25:2 40:10,12	11:9 33:19	54:2 58:22	25
54:9	46:3 49:15,22	36:19 43:21	Uh-huh 26:11	
takes 42:2	51:12 52:8	57:6	ultimately 15:3	V
taking 9:17	54:13 55:18,	took 16:12	under 14:7	valuation
talk 56:11	19,21 59:14	totally 56:23	25:6,12 28:18	54:14
talked 8:12	themselves	touched 52:1	31:10 39:5	value 11:1
56:7	53:16	toward 23:18	41:19,24 44:17	55:19 56:14
talking 17:1,	theoretically	tower 12:8	49:9,10 52:18	58:2,6
14,16 23:1	36:3	towers 15:16	54:3,14 56:7,	values 8:9 10:3
24:13 51:11	therefore	Townhome	20 57:5 58:24	13:12 17:15
56:8,12 57:6	21:25	3:11	undermining	25:3 33:21
talks 13:13	thing 20:23	trailed 45:4	56:22	47:12 58:12
task 25:22	23:11 47:25	transmission	understand	variety 35:11
tasked 37:25	50:1,11,21	22:25 23:3,5	35:25 36:2	various 7:7
tasks 31:17	53:6	53:4	45:24 46:4	43:4 49:24
technically	things 6:16	trees 15:17	57:12	verbally 5:9,17
61:10	10:15 12:12	trouble 6:6	understanding	6:20
teed 15:11	13:12 21:14	30:5 39:10	13:25 14:18	versus 50:7,8
telephonically	57:24	true 53:22	29:16 31:3,4	vest 53:25
3:21	thinking 27:7,	trump 28:17	32:15	
0.21	11 33:9,13			

Index: vested..zone

			Index:	vestedzone
vested 53:25	7:25 8:1,2,6,	33:2 36:24		
54:6	11,22 10:1,8	39:23,25 44:5	Z	
view 9:5 14:5	11:6 12:23	47:1,2 49:3	zone 56:12,13	
21:24 27:8	13:3 14:16,22	55:11,12 59:17	20110 00.12,10	
31:16 37:1,21	16:11 17:11	60:13,17		
40:3 41:8,10	21:4 23:20	62:11,12		
53:22 54:18	25:14 50:25	White's 16:2,4		
viewing 26:3	55:23,24	47:9		
39:7	water 22:7	whole 14:21		
views 41:9	53:23	will 7:11 16:15		
44:1	way 9:25 15:21	20:9 26:13,14,		
viewshed 7:11	18:8 27:17	15,18,20 31:25		
25:9 29:1	30:12 32:11	32:1 42:6		
violated 61:23	36:22 37:13,18	55:23,25 56:1		
voice 6:2 10:18	38:18 39:11	62:14,15,17		
20:3 50:16	41:22 44:1	willing 61:15,		
vote 46:15	45:19 49:5	19		
59:12 60:19	50:5 58:13	Wilson 3:19		
61:2,6 62:2,3,	60:3,6	winners 56:2		
7,9,10,12	ways 52:6	within 28:8,15		
	weigh 9:7	50:18 60:9		
W	welcome 20:7	without 53:23		
wait 8:23 50:1	went 15:3	56:21		
	whatever 50:2,	witness 29:19		
walk 41:7	24 53:5	51:22		
want 5:8 8:18,	whether 7:18	wonder 55:1		
21,22 10:10,21	10:7,16 11:24,	wondering		
11:12,13 12:25 15:15,16 20:20	25 12:2,8	7:23		
22:24 24:1	13:13 16:20	word 38:13		
31:11 35:14	17:2 21:4 22:7	words 33:7		
37:20 38:2,20	25:13 27:12	40:5 46:2		
40:2,20 44:8,9,	31:25 37:2,3,	work 37:9		
10 47:7,10,20	11 40:18 46:7	53:16		
48:11,24 51:16	47:11 51:23,25	write 38:8		
58:8	56:9 61:12,18	written 62:14,		
wanted 5:17	whichever	16		
11:15 22:9	9:12 47:6			
23:19 28:21	while 53:23	Y		
38:20 47:4,25	59:1			
wanting 35:22	White 4:3,4	yet 13:4 26:13		
wants 13:5	6:3,4,25 7:1	59:25		
21:10 22:12	13:17,20 14:18	yourself 6:15		
61:14	15:25 19:4,6			
Wasatch 4:25	24:20 26:24			
	27:1 28:4,20			
1				