BEFORE THE UTAH UTILITY	FACILITY REVIEW	BOARD
ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER, Petitioner,)) DOCKET NO.)	16-035-09
vs.)	
WASATCH COUNTY,)	
Respondent.))	

IN THE MATTER OF ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER'S PETITION FOR REVIEW TO THE UTAH UTILITY FACILITY REVIEW BOARD

Utah Public Service Commission 160 East 300 South, Fourth Floor Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

Thursday, April 14, 2016 * 9:00-10:14 a.m.

Reported by: Jennifer E. Garner, RPR
Notary Public in and for the State of Utah
Job No.: 300883

		Page	2
1	BOARD APPEARANCES	_	
2	Thad LeVar (Chair)		
3	David R. Clark Beth Holbrook		
	Jordan White		
4	David Wilson (via telephone)		
5	ADDEADANGED OF COUNTRY		
6	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL		
7	For the Petitioner Rocky Mountain Power:		
	D. Matthew Moscon, Esq.		
8	STOEL RIVES 201 Main Street, Suite 1100		
9	Salt Lake City, Utah 84111		
10	Phone: 801-578-6985 Fax: 801-578-6999		
1 10	E-mail: matt.moscon@stoel.com		
11	Hoidi K. Gordon Egg		
12	Heidi K. Gordon, Esq. ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER		
	1407 West North Temple, Suite 320		
13	Salt Lake City, Utah 84116 Phone: 801-220-4545		
14	Fax: 801-220-3299		
15	E-mail: heidi.gordon@pacificorp.com		
	For the Respondent Wasatch County:		
16	Tyler J. Berg, Esq. (Via telephone)		
17	WASATCH COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE		
1.0	805 West 100 South		
18	Heber City, Utah 84032 Phone: 435-654-2909		
19	Fax: 435-654-2947		
20	E-mail: tberg@wasatch.utah.gov		
	On behalf of Black Rock Intervention Group:		
21	Jeremy C. Reutzel, Esq.		
22	Ryan M. Merriman, Esq.		
23	BENNETT TUELLER JOHNSON & DEER 3165 East Millrock Drive, Suite 500		
	Salt Lake City, Utah 84121-5027		
24	Phone: 801-438-2000 Fax: 801-438-2050		
25	E-mail: jreutzel@btjd.com		

1	On behalf of Promontory Intervention Group:	Page 3
2	Wade R. Budge, Esq.	
3	Jordan Lee, Esq. SNELL & WILMER	
4	15 West South Temple, Suite 1200 Salt Lake City, Utah 84101	
5	Phone: 801-257-1906 Fax: 801-257-1800	
6	E-mail: wbudge@swlaw.com	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24 25		

HEARING PROCEEDINGS DOCKET NO. 16-035-09 - 04/14/2016

2	STATEMENTS	PAGE
3	By Mr. Moscon	7
4	By Mr. Budge	36
5	By Mr. Reutzel	40
6 7	DISCUSSION BY THE BOARD	50
8	MOTION	
9	Made by Mr. Clark	58
10	Discussion on the Motion	58
11	Seconded by Mr. Wilson	60
12	Vote on the Motion	61
13	Motion Passes	62
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	Page 5 PROCEEDINGS
2	
3	MR. LEVAR: Okay. Good morning. It looks
4	like we're ready to begin.
5	This is the time and place for the hearing
6	of the Utah Utility Facility Review Board, Docket
7	16-035-09, and this is a hearing to address several
8	motions.
9	We have four of the Board members present
10	here physically in the room today: Ms. Beth
11	Holbrook, Mr. Jordan White, myself, and David Clark.
12	I believe we have one Board member on the telephone,
13	Mr. Wilson; is that correct?
14	MR. WILSON: That is correct, sir.
15	MR. LEVAR: Okay. And since we have him
16	and one other party participating by phone, I'll just
17	note, those of you on the phone, when you speak, for
18	the purposes of the court reporter, please state your
19	name before you start speaking. And for those of us
20	in the room, as we discovered last time, the people
21	on the phone can hear better if you almost swallow
22	the microphone when you talk. And so that's not very
23	comfortable to do, but we'll all try to do that today
24	so those of you on the phone can hear. If you cannot
25	hear on the phone, please let us know.

1	Page 6 So I think we'll move to appearances now.
2	For Rocky Mountain Power?
3	MR. MOSCON: Matt Moscon and Heidi Gordon
4	for Rocky Mountain Power.
5	MR. LEVAR: Okay. Thank you.
6	For Wasatch County?
7	MR. BERG: Tyler Berg from Wasatch County.
8	MR. LEVAR: Okay. Thank you.
9	From the Black Rock Intervention Group?
10	MR. REUTZEL: Jeremy Reutzel and Ryan
11	Merriman.
12	MR. LEVAR: Okay. Thank you.
13	Do we have anyone here from the Promontory
14	Intervention Group?
15	MR. BUDGE: Yes. Wade Budge and Jordan
16	Lee are both here on behalf of Promontory.
17	MR. LEVAR: Okay. Thank you. Wait. I'm
18	sorry. What was the first name you said?
19	MR. BUDGE: Wade. Wade Budge.
20	MR. LEVAR: Okay. Any other appearances?
21	I know that the Division of Public
22	Utilities and the Office of Consumer Services are
23	sitting comfortably in the audience observing today.
24	So I hope you find your observations valuable.
25	Is that all for appearances?
1	

	Domo 7
1	Page 7 Okay. We have several motions to consider
2	today; obviously, the first of which is Rocky
3	Mountain Power's Motion for Reconsideration on the
4	Intervention of the I'll just refer to it as the
5	Black Rock Intervention Group. I think that's the
6	easiest way to refer to it today.
7	Probably what makes sense in terms of
8	procedure, unless anyone feels differently, is to go
9	to you first, Mr. Moscon, since it's your motion.
10	You can take a few minutes to highlight any points.
11	Obviously, we've had all the briefings on all sides
12	of it. But if you want to make a few highlights, and
13	then I think we might just do Board questions for you
14	before we move on from that point.
15	MR. MOSCON: Sure.
16	Mr. Chairman, is it preferable that I stay
17	seated while I address the Board? Is that okay?
18	MR. LEVAR: Yes, that is fine with me.
19	
20	STATEMENT
21	BY MR. MOSCON:
22	First, I'd like to express on behalf of my
23	client gratitude and appreciation for the Board
24	taking this time. We recognize that the Board
25	members all have day jobs in addition to this. And

```
Page 8
     it certainly is not our intent to make this Facility
 1
 2
     Review Board proceeding overly contentious, but we --
     and we are mindful of the time that it is consuming.
 3
                 We -- there is a good note to report.
 4
 5
    Mr. Berg is on the line. We have been able to work
 6
     with the county, Wasatch County, to go through two
 7
     rounds of discovery without any concerns that has not
 8
     had to take up time of the Board. I say that only
     because I don't want the Board to believe that it's
 9
10
     the intention of Rocky Mountain Power to necessarily
     blockade all efforts of all parties to ask questions
11
     or to get any clarification of materials that have
12
    been filed.
13
14
                 I also want to note that it's not our
15
    position that the Black Rock Intervention Group, that
16
     they are bad people that are conspiring to create
    problems. That is not our belief or certainly is not
17
     an argument that we want to make. But what I think
18
     happens is this comes down simply to a difference of
19
20
     opinion as to what the purpose of this Board is, what
21
     the role of this proceeding is, and that -- and what
2.2
     the role of a partied opponent is. And that also
23
     ties into the discovery disputes that we have.
24
                 So, Chairman LeVar, to your point about
25
     just highlighting points, if I might approach, I have
```

Page 9 a little handout, which, by the way, is already -- it 1 2 is in information that was already filed in the 3 record. This is nothing new. But I think rather 4 than making people flip to 20 different pages, if I 5 could just hand this to you, if I might. 6 MR. LEVAR: Sure. Any objection? MR. REUTZEL: We don't know what it is. 7 8 MR. LEVAR: Okay. Why don't you give him 9 a copy. 10 MR. MOSCON: Absolutely. MR. LEVAR: Yes. I believe this is 11 12 something we already have several copies of, for the 13 record. 14 MR. MOSCON: Yes. I think I said I don't 15 intend to make this a new part of the record or an 16 exhibit. This is actually several pages from the record that has already been filed that I thought 17 might be easier to highlight the points that I'll 18 19 make. 20 The front page, as you will see, is from 21 the Board's previous order. This is not an entire 2.2 copy of the order. I only wanted to highlight a 23 couple of things. 24 The first page into the handout that I've 25 given where it's highlighted in green and entitled

Page 10 "Scope of Board Review," this, coming from this 1 2 Board's most recent ruling, identifies the very situation we're in. In that dispute that involves 3 Tooele County and the Company, the Board noted that 4 because this involved a denial of a CUP rather than 5 CUP conditions and associated costs, that the Board 6 7 turns to 303(d), and it lays out what the statute 8 says. And the point I want to make is at the very end, "Accordingly, the scope of the Board's inquiry 9 10 is to find whether there is substantial, credible, competent evidence the Transmission Project is needed 11 to provide safe, reliable, adequate, and efficient 12 utility service." 13 14 My point is, that is the position of the 15 Power Company and I believe of the Board of -- in this type of a dispute where the county has 16 prohibited a CUP, that is what is relevant. 17 18 If you turn a page in to my handout, this is part of the same order, you will see we have 19 20 skipped some pages. On pages 10 and 11 in that 21 previous order, the Board indicated, well, let's talk 22 about what that means, and they highlighted things 23 that they would not consider. And as I've highlighted, as the Board indicated, "Therefore, the 24 25 following objections used as a basis by the County to

```
Page 11
     deny the CUP are not properly considered here."
 1
                                                       One
 2
     of those is viewsheds and another is loss in property
 3
     value.
                 So this Board has previously in its
 4
 5
     opinions taken the position that it is not relevant
     to the Board, and the Board will not take up and
 6
     consider such things as complaints about views or
 8
     what is going to happen to neighboring property
     values by virtue of the facility that is subject to
 9
10
     the dispute.
                 If you turn in my handout, the next thing
11
12
     that we see is the Petition to Intervene by the Black
     Rock Group. And one page in, which begins on page
13
     three of their filing, here is where Black Rock
14
15
     addresses what they think this dispute is. There
     they say, "Rocky Mountain Power's petition fails to
16
     clearly address the issue before this Board.
17
     proceeding is not about Rocky Mountain Power's
18
     ability to construct facilities needed to provide
19
20
     safe, reliable, adequate and efficient electric
21
     service to its customers. Rather, the issue here is
22
     whether Rocky Mountain Power should be allowed to
23
     move a transmission line from a route that has
     existed for nearly a century into Wasatch County."
24
25
                 So here the Intervention Group is actually
```

```
Page 12
     saying, hey, it's not that question that 303(d) says.
 1
 2
     We want to talk about something else. We want to
 3
     talk about whether you can move a line from somewhere
     it already is, not what 303(d) says. And this is one
 4
 5
     of the fundamental problems that we're having in
     terms of the intervention and the role of Black Rock
 6
 7
     as a party.
 8
                 If you continue in the handout that I have
     where we get to the reply of Black Rock when Rocky
 9
10
    Mountain Power has filed their papers to say, hey,
     you really don't have a legal interest; you don't
11
12
     have a standing argument under the UAPA guidelines,
     on page four, here is how they respond. So here this
13
     is in the reply. We've already made our argument
14
15
     about you don't have a legal interest. And the
     response is that there is no dispute that they will
16
     be substantially affected. Rocky Mountain Power is
17
     seeking to construct a massive transmission line
18
19
     parallel to their property over the mountaintop.
20
     This will create noise and safety and impact economic
21
     interests that will require Black Rock to spend
22
     substantial sums and importantly it will harm their
23
     property values and their ability to market their
     respective properties.
24
25
                 So, again, the Board has already indicated
```

Page 13 1 in its order, we're not looking at arguments about 2 whether this impacts your view, and we are not going 3 to consider arguments that this has had an impact on your property value. 4 5 When we turn to what Black Rock intends to do as a party, they have made clear, we're not here 6 to talk about the safe, reliable, dependable, 8 adequate delivery of power to Rocky Mountain Power's 9 We want to talk about the economic impact customers. 10 to our property values and the fact that the ridge-11 line ordinance that protects our view is going to be violated -- things that the Board has already said 12 that they are not going to consider. 13 14 That fundamental dispute about what the 15 role of the Board proceeding is, is what is precipitating the friction between the parties that 16 then extends into discovery. Because, as we have 17 seen, immediately following the intervention, Black 18 Rock issued subpoenas, requests for admissions, 19 20 interrogatories, deposition notices on a host of 21 topics that, if their interpretation is correct, that 22 what is at issue is the impact to their value --23 can't we put this line in Summit County; won't that 24 line in Summit County be just as safe, just as 25 reliable, just as efficient? If that was a relevant

Page 14 issue for the Board to consider, then that --1 2 those -- it makes sense that they would think that those are relevant areas of inquiry for discovery. 3 On the other hand, if the issue is limited 4 5 to what we believe the Board has identified, simply whether this facility is needed, then all of those 6 7 issues about, well, couldn't you build it somewhere 8 else and wouldn't it be just as efficient over there, 9 those are not applicable. 10 So I guess I -- maybe I'll just keep this brief and let the Board indicate what questions it 11 12 has of me. I would point out -- and I'll address the specifics and which deposition topic is proper or 13 not, I guess, when asked for it by the Board. 14 15 simply want to indicate to the Board that Utah law is clear that private parties are not allowed to dictate 16 17 where utility facilities are constructed. In some of our previous hearings, and I 18 know in the one where the Board was courteous enough 19 20 to allow me to appear by telephone, one of the 21 arguments that I alluded to that the Board had a 2.2 question about was that I indicated that there were 23 cases in the condemnation context in which the law of Utah had been established that it's the utility, not 24 25 the Public Service Commission, it's not the property

Page 15 owners, but the utility that picks the location for 1 2 its facilities, and then the chips fall where they 3 There may be costs, there may be impacts, but the utility is able to do that and there was some 4 5 question about it. So I cite the Board to the case of 6 7 Williams and Hyrum Gibbons vs. Northern Utah TV. 8 I concede this is not a power line case; it was a 9 telegraph line question. But the Utah Supreme Court 10 expressly stated: "It is not a question whether 11 there is other land to be had that is equally 12 available. But the question is whether the land sought is needed for the construction of the public 13 14 The necessity is shown to exist simply when it 15 appears that it is necessary to take the land by condemnation in order to effectuate the purposes of 16 17 the corporation." And here is the important part: 18 Respondent has the right to determine when and where 19 20 its telegraph line shall be built. It may be said to 21 be the general rule that unless the corporation 2.2 exercises the power of imminent domain in bad faith or is guilty of oppression, its discretion in the 23 selection of land will not be interfered with." 24 25 So the law of Utah, certainly in that

```
Page 16
 1
     condemnation context, is we're not going to be in the
 2
     business of dictating where utilities should put
     their facilities unless there is some demonstration
 3
     of bad faith that this is done for an improper
 4
 5
     purpose or for oppression.
 6
                 Here, I recognize there is not a
 7
     condemnation and the reason is because the property
     owner acquiesced.
 8
                        It would be very unusual if the
 9
     rule of law was if Promontory had not agreed to give
10
     Rocky Mountain Power the easement and Rocky Mountain
     Power had to condemn it, that then there could not be
11
     a dispute about the location, but since the parties
12
     were able to mutually, cooperatively work out an
13
     alignment, that now all of the sudden Utah law
14
15
     changes and other parties get to appear and make
     arguments about where the line should or should not
16
17
     be.
                 I know that the Board has reviewed our
18
19
     materials that we've supplied about why we think that
20
     this Board proceeding is really a dispute between the
     county and the utility. And I'm happy to answer any
21
22
     other questions or move into the specifics of
23
     discovery at the Board's discretion.
24
                 MR. LEVAR: I think it probably makes
     sense to have Board questions of you at this point on
25
```

```
Page 17
 1
     the --
 2
                 MR. MOSCON: Sure.
 3
                 MR. LEVAR: -- solely on the intervention
 4
     issue.
                 MR. MOSCON: Okay.
 5
 6
                 MR. LEVAR: And if there's no objection, I
 7
     have a couple of questions I'd like to jump into
8
     first just to get your viewpoint on this legal issue.
                 It seems to me there is at least an
 9
10
     argument that the intervention statutory standard is
11
     a different standard than what would apply to either
     relevance at the hearing or relevance with respect to
12
     discovery. You know, we have the legal interest that
13
     could be substantially affected by the proceeding.
14
15
     The legislature could have used language raised to
     either relevance or jurisdiction in that phrase, but
16
17
     they used the phrase, "a legal interest that could be
     substantially affected by the result."
18
19
                 So isn't it possible that a party could
20
     have no -- hypothetically, no input that would be
21
     relevant in either discovery or the hearing but still
22
     have a right to intervene because their interest
23
     might be affected by the outcome?
24
                 MR. MOSCON:
                              I do not agree with that
25
     proposition for the following reasons: The statute
```

Page 18 1 that you talked about didn't simply say that you have 2 an interest. It said two things: You have to have a 3 legal interest that will be substantially affected. And one of the arguments that we've made is that 4 5 every citizen in the county may have an interest. They may all say, hey, I care about the views and I 6 care about what's going on here, and I'm interested 8 in what happens, and I'd like to speak up. But that 9 is not a legal interest. To have a legal interest, 10 you have to have a vested right; a vested right that 11 is now subject to being taken away. 12 One of the things that we put in our petition for reconsideration is noting that one 13 14 landowner does not have a vested right in what their 15 neighbor does or doesn't do on their neighbors' 16 property. Now, the local government might -- the city, the county, the state -- they can get involved 17 with that and say -- you know, talk about what is or 18 is not available. But Black Rock does not have a 19 20 vested legal right to never have views of 21 transmission lines. That is not a legal interest 2.2 that they have. Therefore, just because they have an 23 interest, I would say that they still do not have automatically a legal interest that could be 24 25 substantially impacted by the decision. So I would

Page 19 still dispute that they have intervention rights 1 2 under the statute. 3 MR. LEVAR: Would you mind then comparing the alleged legal interest that the Black Rock Group 4 5 They're claiming a legal interest and potential impact on their property values, depending on the 6 7 outcome of this. How would that compare against the 8 legal interests in Rocky Mountain Power general rate 9 cases of parties like Utah Clean Energy, Sierra Club, 10 Western Resources Advocates, who regularly intervene 11 unopposed in those cases? 12 MR. MOSCON: Sure. The difference there is -- this is my understanding. The reason virtually 13 anyone is allowed to intervene in a rate case 14 15 proceeding is anyone is a rate payer or is a direct customer. And so they would say if you grant their 16 petition to raise rates, personally, my rates go up, 17 and I am a customer and they are asking you 18 19 permission to charge me more money. Whether that's 20 an individual or a group of industrial customers or what have you, they have direct interest in that 21 22 proceeding. 23 Here, we are not -- if we were on the land 24 of Black Rock where they said, hey, this is my land 25 that you are -- that you are literally putting it on

Page 20 1 my land, that would perhaps be a different 2 argument -- I'm not even sure if necessarily in this forum is proper. And, again, it might be like a 3 civil matter, in a condemnation, or an inverse 4 5 condemnation situation. But at least they would have that kind of a legal interest. 6 7 So I think that the analogy is not 8 complete, the one that you posed about a rate payer, because they do have that direct interest. 9 10 The Millard case that the parties cited I think extends from that point. This is what they had 11 12 cited for grounds. In that case, it was over an argument about who can have a seat at the table about 13 taxes and what happens to tax funds. And there the 14 15 court ruled, well, certainly the county, Millard County, you have -- you get to spend some of those; 16 you get some of those taxes. So you have a right to 17 be here because you have a claim to that tax money. 18 But here we don't have a legal claim, a 19 20 legal right, by Black Rock. And that's highlighted 21 by the fact that this comes up from a permit 22 application at which they were not a party. And I 23 think it's belied by the Board's own ruling that says, look, we are not here to consider property 24 25 values or views or anything else.

```
Page 21
 1
                 If it really was a proper party and that
 2
     was a legal interest, then I think the Board would be
 3
     considering those things because the Board would say
     that's a legal interest; we need to consider it. But
 4
 5
     if -- they are not and the Board doesn't consider
 6
     them.
 7
                 MR. LEVAR: Okay. Thank you.
                                                If the
8
     Board would indulge me one more question then.
 9
                 This is an issue that in your brief you
10
     raised on the second part of the test, which is the
     four-part -- the four factors that would affect
11
12
     whether it would substantially impair the conduct of
     the proceeding -- I'm not sure if I have the words
13
     right -- but the problem that relates to
14
15
    participation below. And you mentioned that the
     Black Rock Group had participated as -- in providing
16
    public comment. In their response, they point out
17
     that that was the only option available to them in
18
19
     that proceeding; there was no intervention option
20
     there. Do you have any verbal response to the
21
     position they took on that issue?
2.2
                 MR. MOSCON: Yes. It -- as it should be
23
    below, it should be here. That is the point.
24
     Whether an entity -- whether it's a person, a
25
     homeowner, a corporation, a utility -- can do
```

Page 22 something -- in a city, a county, a subdivision of 1 2 the state -- is between the government and the 3 applicant. They're happy to take input or hear the voices of the citizens, but the only parties 4 5 necessary are the governing authority and the applicant. So they don't need to be a party below 6 because it's really -- they don't have legal 8 standing. And so the county did not let them 9 10 participate as a party in the CUP application for the 11 same reason that this Board shouldn't. We're happy to hear what you have to say. We're going to provide 12 you a forum to get your thoughts, and we'll take 13 those into consideration, but you are not a party to 14 15 the proceeding. This is really an applicant asking Those are the only two parties. us for permission. 16 17 Just like in this Board proceeding, the statute is clear, this Board was organized by the 18 legislature to govern disputes between two parties: 19 20 Utilities and local governments. 21 As you pointed out, wouldn't the 2.2 legislature have clarified this in the UAPA 23 intervention rules? Clearly, if the legislature had 24 intended private parties to be parties in the 25 Facility Review Board proceedings, in the Enabling

Page 23

- 1 Act, it would have said this Board is to resolve
- 2 disputes between utilities, local governments, and
- 3 impacted parties. But they did not. They limited it
- 4 to utilities and local governments.
- 5 MR. LEVAR: Thank you. That's all the
- 6 questions I have. I'll go to the rest of the Board.
- 7 Mr. Clark, do you have questions for Mr. Moscon at
- 8 this point?
- 9 MR. CLARK: I do have a question. Let me
- 10 get to where I can swallow the mic. I'll follow your
- 11 instructions.
- 12 Mr. Moscon, I wonder if you would please
- 13 address the Sevier Citizens vs. DEO case and, in
- 14 particular, the language that the associations cite
- in their opposition to your Motion for
- 16 Reconsideration, citing the reasons that
- 17 intervention -- the denial of intervention in that
- 18 case was sustained by the court because the Sevier
- 19 Citizens failed to identify a specific impact that,
- 20 in this case, the power plant's operation is likely
- 21 to have on any member's recognized legal interests
- 22 such as a negative impact on livelihood or property
- values or diminution in a particular member's health
- 24 or recreational enjoyment.
- 25 MR. MOSCON: Just to make sure I get the

```
Page 24
 1
     right one, can you tell me what page of that?
                                                     I'm on
 2
     the right brief.
 3
                             I'm on page seven --
                 MR. CLARK:
 4
                 MR. MOSCON: Okay. Thank you.
 5
                 MR. CLARK: And I -- let me give you a
 6
     minute to get there. I want to understand the
 7
     Company's views on the extent to which and how this
8
     language should influence our thinking about the
 9
     intervention petition before us.
10
                 MR. MOSCON: Absolutely. And, by the way,
11
     I obviously turned to the wrong brief. I was on page
12
     seven of their Opposition for Protective Order.
     take it it's --
13
14
                             Opposition to Petitioner's
                 MR. CLARK:
15
    Motion for Reconsideration.
                 MR. MOSCON: Sorry for the -- okay.
16
17
                 MR. CLARK: So it's there in the upper...
                 MR. MOSCON: Yeah, okay. Yes.
18
19
                 MR. CLARK: You want to just take a moment
20
     and...
                 MR. MOSCON: This -- I apologize.
21
22
     going through so many briefs here to find the right
23
     one.
24
                 I think I'm going to have to just answer
     based on what I understood you to say because, I
25
```

Page 25 apologize, I'm not finding the right page in the 1 2 right brief. But what I understand the question to be is: If there is a case that indicates that one of 3 the things that would give parties an interest is 4 5 diminution in property value, impact on value, et 6 cetera. If that -- whether or not that gives someone 7 a legal interest that would quality under UAPA; is 8 that fair? 9 Right. Right. In the Sevier MR. CLARK: 10 case, at least as represented by the associations, intervention was denied but the interests that were 11 12 not established included the list of things that I mentioned, which are a negative impact on livelihood 13 or property values or diminution in a particular 14 15 member's health or recreational enjoyment. MR. MOSCON: Sure. And I guess the way I 16 17 would respond -- and this came up at our previous hearing -- and I'll again draw an analogy from the 18 condemnation rule where utilities are putting 19 20 facilities where property owners don't like them. The Admiral Beverage case stands for, 21 22 among other things, a proposition that if a condemnor 23 builds a facility somewhere, a property owner whose 24 property is impacted gets the damage and the rest of 25 their property, even if it's not condemned, they can

Page 26

get severance damage on the basis that that remaining 1 property has had some diminution in value or has an 2 3 impact. Even though he didn't put a power pole on it or he didn't put a substation or a water pump there, 4 5 that the rest of your property is impacted along the lines you described. 6 7 But the case clarifies and says but if you 8 are the next-door neighbor, you don't get those 9 These damages and the parties that can seek 10 those kinds of compensations are limited to the 11 owners of the property that has the direct impact on 12 it. And the reason, the rationale that that court says is otherwise we would not be able to draw the 13 line. Because if you put a transmission pole on this 14 15 lot, the next-door neighbor can see it and they could argue an impact. And the person next to them could 16 see it and argue an impact. And down the road and 17 down the road. And it may gradually diminish but how 18 19 and where do we stop it? 20 And so to have orderly rule of law, under 21 Utah law, the only parties that can claim an impact 2.2 for diminution to the value of their property or to 23 have some kind of severance damage is the owner of 24 the specific lot on which the road, the power line, 25 or whatever was built. And neighbors do not get that

Page 27 1 value; they do not get that claim. 2 I would say that that is the answer to the 3 question that the Board has raised. That, in the case that is cited, we would agree that if they had 4 5 the -- if they had a direct -- their -- literally, 6 there was a pole on their property, that would be a 7 legal interest; they have a vested right in what 8 happens to their property. But they do not have a 9 vested right in what happens next door. 10 If -- and I'll put it another way. Let's 11 say that the county granted the CUP application that 12 Rocky Mountain Power requested. Under that analogy, they would say we've had an impact to our property, 13 14 and we had no forum, we had no voice. And they would 15 have, therefore, been required to have been a party at the CUP application. And, in fact, every CUP 16 application process would necessarily have to allow 17 all of the neighboring parties to be involved. 18 Because, again, if Wasatch County granted us the 19 20 application, we would not be here and the 21 intervention group would not be able to initiate this 22 process and say, hey, wait a minute; they granted the 23 application and they're moving forward, but we think 24 it impacts our property. They would not be able to 25 start this proceeding. And I think that that is the

Page 28 1 answer. 2 It applies when you actually have your 3 vested property right, not because you are a neighbor, even if you can articulate that. That 4 5 would throw on its head the ruling of the -- that I quoted at the beginning of this where the Board 6 already said in the Tooele case, this Board does not 8 consider view; this board does not consider property 9 value. So what would be the point of allowing a 10 party to intervene to argue that they have an impact 11 in their property value if the Board is already 12 taking the position, we don't consider property value? 13 14 MR. CLARK: Thank you. That is my only 15 question. 16 Okay. Ms. Holbrook, do you MR. LEVAR: 17 have any questions? MS. HOLBROOK: Not at this time. 18 19 MR. LEVAR: Mr. White, do you have any 20 questions? 21 MR. WHITE: Let me ask you a question. 2.2 mean, the Sevier case, I'll go back to that, was of 23 interest to me. It sets a pretty low bar. You know, 24 frankly, a little bit -- it raised my eyebrows, I 25 guess, in terms of the potential low bar for

Page 29 1 intervening at least in an administrative proceeding 2 under UAPA. You said something interesting or you 3 noted something interesting in one of your motion papers that -- you said something, assuming for 4 5 argument's sake that UAPA applies. Is that -- is it the Company's position that UAPA may or may not apply 6 7 to this proceeding? 8 MR. MOSCON: What was referenced there was 9 the following point: The statute, the Facility 10 Review Board Act, I believe does two things: 11 says, number one, we are here to have disputes between utilities and local governments. There is 12 another provision where they say an impacted property 13 owner can be a participant in this circumstance. 14 15 it describes a circumstance where the governing authority is going to do something, and they direct 16 the utility to study and, you know, basically say to 17 the utility, hey, we think we want to make -- zone 18 19 this area our -- you know, where we are going to put 20 utilities and a property owner is in that area. 21 And so because the Facility Review Board 2.2 Act I believe directly indicates here is when it's 23 between a utility and a local government, and here is 24 when another party can intervene, I don't think you 25 necessarily go to the default UAPA rules. Those are

Page 30 referred to if and only if the more specific act 1 2 doesn't answer the question. It's kind of like the 3 catchall thing. And I would take the position that the Facility Review Board Act on its face already 4 5 answers the question at hand. 6 So, number one, to answer your question, I 7 think that the controlling act is this Board's own 8 governing act and it identifies when private parties are allowed. And so I don't think you have to go to 9 10 UAPA's general catchall. To the extent the Board disagrees with 11 12 that and goes to UAPA's general catchall, I still take the position that it, and all of the cases that 13 have interpreted that, still state you have to have a 14 15 legal interest, not just you are going to have an impact or you have an opinion or anything else. You 16 have to have a legal interest which is a vested right 17 at stake, and I still think that is not satisfied in 18 19 this case. 20 So, under that theory, is it MR. WHITE: 21 the Company's position that the only parties --22 potential parties that would have some type of right 23 to intervention, whether under UAPA or some other civil case law theory, would be the Company, the 24 County, and then the property owner on which the 25

Page 31 1 facility is proposed? Are there any other parties 2 that could potentially... MR. MOSCON: As I sit here, I can't think 3 Is there some -- I mean, you are right; I 4 5 think that is what was intended by the legislature. If there is some very unusual circumstance I'm not 6 7 thinking of, I'd hate to speak in definitive terms. 8 But I believe that that is what was intended by the 9 legislature. That is my understanding of Utah law, 10 that you have to have a vested legal right in order to have any tribunals offer you protection. 11 don't get a tribunal to offer you protection under 12 two categories: Number one, if you don't have a 13 vested right and, number two, if it would be a 14 15 nullity. If the Board's ruling is that we don't 16 17 consider property value and we don't consider views, then allowing them to intervene certainly would go 18 19 back and violate the UAPA rule that says, well, it 20 would frustrate the process and be a waste of time. Because if their interest is just property value and 21 2.2 views, and if this Board is taking the position we 23 don't consider property values and views, then having them intervene would necessarily and by definition be 24 25 a distraction to the core purpose of the Board and a

```
Page 32
    waste of time.
 1
                             Thank you. That's all I've
 2
                 MR. WHITE:
 3
     got, Mr. Chair.
 4
                 MR. LEVAR: Okay. Mr. Wilson, can you
 5
    hear on the phone?
 6
                 MR. WILSON: Yes.
                                    I can hear.
 7
                 MR. LEVAR: Do you have any questions for
8
    Mr. Moscon?
 9
                 MR. WILSON: I guess just a follow-up
10
     question. So is it his position that a private party
     would never have rights of intervention; it would
11
     just be between a local government entity and the
12
     utility? Am I understanding that correctly?
13
14
                 MR. MOSCON: My interpretation is -- and
15
     this is not just what I'm suggesting is a good
     philosophy or idea -- the Facility Review Board
16
17
     Enabling Act -- and I can grab it and cite the
     statutes if that makes it easier. It calls out two
18
19
     scenarios for which this Board was created and given
20
     legislative authority. And I'm looking at 54-14-301
21
     first and that is the one that says, "The Board has
2.2
     jurisdiction to resolve disputes between local
     governments and public utilities."
23
24
                 And so, for that, I would say those are
25
     the only two parties. There is another section of
```

Page 33 the Board -- or excuse me -- of the act that allows 1 2 impacted landowners to intervene, and it provides you 3 a definition and it refers you to a different statute to say what we mean by "impacted landowner." And 4 5 when you go back to that statute -- and we'll keep flipping the pages -- it is identified specifically 6 7 as someone owning the land. 8 And so, for the record, I'm looking at 54-14-303 and Sub (2) Sub (a), and that says if an 9 10 action is filed by a local government seeking 11 modification to a target study area, then an affected landowner, as defined in this other statute, can be a 12 13 party. 14 So, yes, there are some instances when an 15 affected landowner can be a party, but those 16 instances are governed by statute and it is only in an instance when the local government is seeking to 17 18 modify a target study area. 19 MR. WILSON: Okay. Thank you. 20 MR. LEVAR: Are those all your questions, 2.1 Mr. Wilson? 2.2 MR. WILSON: Yes, sir. 23 MR. LEVAR: I'd like to ask one follow-up 24 question following up to Mr. Clark's question and 25 some of the comments you made. And I guess this

Page 34 1 question assumes that the intervention right and the 2 Facility Review Board Statute is not exclusionary. 3 And you're taking the position that it is exclusionary. Assuming it's not and we are back to 4 5 UAPA, it seems to me you are making the argument that "legal interest" is synonymous with "vested right." 6 7 And as I look at -- I think Mr. Clark already asked 8 this, but as I look at the Sevier Citizens case and 9 it says, "A legal interest involves more than a mere 10 expression of concern and must amount to a 11 sufficiently particularized injury to livelihood, 12 health, and property values," that language doesn't seem to me to be synonymous with "vested right." 13 "Vested right" seems to me to be a higher standard, 14 15 but tell me if I am -- if you have a different 16 perspective on that. I do because, again, it's the 17 MR. MOSCON: impact to livelihood or property of what? Again, if 18 it was anything other than your actual property that 19 20 is being taken or that is the subject of the lawsuit, 21 then, literally, all the citizens of an entire 22 subdivision of a community would have intervention 23 rights and would be able to intervene. And, in condemnation proceedings, entire subdivisions would 24

be able to get severance damages and these parties

25

Page 35 1 would say, hey, my property value has gone down; I have been impacted. But Utah law has clarified and 2 3 said there is no way to draw that line. So in the language in Sevier, when they 4 5 say we are not talking about just your -- you have an opinion, but you have to have livelihood or property 6 7 at stake, I believe that is not inconsistent with 8 what I'm talking about. 9 You have to -- it has to be, we're putting 10 the power pole in the middle of your plant, your farm, your business, your property. That's how you 11 have the livelihood or the property interest at 12 stake. It does not apply to private parties down the 13 road, across the street, somewhere else that say, you 14 15 know what? I know you are not taking my property, I know you are putting this here, but I think I'm going 16 to have a harder time marketing. I think I'm going 17 to have a harder time selling. That is not what I 18 believe Sevier stands for. Those are not vested 19 20 property rights. That is not the damage that is at 21 issue in that case. 2.2 Okay. Thank you. That's all MR. LEVAR: 23 the follow-up questions I have. Does any other Board member have additional follow-up questions? 24

Mr. Clark?

25

	Page 36
1	MR. CLARK: No questions.
2	MR. LEVAR: Ms. Holbrook?
3	MS. HOLBROOK: No questions.
4	MR. LEVAR: Mr. White?
5	MR. WHITE: No questions.
6	MR. LEVAR: Mr. Wilson?
7	MR. WILSON: No. Thank you.
8	MR. LEVAR: Okay. Thank you.
9	I think I want to go next to the
10	Promontory Group. You've made a motion to intervene
11	that is contingent on what we decide with respect to
12	the Motion for Reconsideration. You've also weighed
13	in, to some extent, on Black Rock Group's
14	Intervention Motion. So I think I'll go to you next,
15	if you want to comment any further verbally on the
16	Black Rock Intervention Motion.
17	
18	STATEMENT
19	BY MR. BUDGE:
20	Thank you, Chair. And thank you, Board.
21	We echo what has been said by Mr. Moscon.
22	We agree with his point that in this case we are
23	dealing with an act that describes both a remedy and
24	a process, and neither the remedy nor the process
25	accommodates the type of arguments and the type of

Page 37 discovery and the type of positions that are being 1 2 advanced by Black Rock. In the statute, the statute that 3 Mr. Moscon just referenced, it's very clear that 4 5 Promontory itself is an identified party. It states that an affected landowner, as defined in 54-18-102, 6 may intervene. 8 The reason we've done a conditional intervention is we don't believe we need to be a 9 10 party if Black Rock is not a party. And that's because we believe that the statute, as Mr. Moscon 11 indicated, is really described and defined and set up 12 to handle a dispute between the county -- in this 13 case it's the land use authority -- and the regulated 14 15 utility. But if Black Rock is going to be allowed 16 to intervene, then we would want to be allowed to 17 intervene as well because our substantial interest in 18 this could be affected by their arguments. 19 20 We don't believe the statute is going to allow the kind of relief that Black Rock is wanting 21 2.2 to seek. Because, as Mr. Moscon indicated, the 23 statute always speaks in terms of analyzing whether 24 the proposed route is going to lead to a safe, reliable, and efficient way to provide power. 25

Page 38 1 believe that those standards will be clearly met by 2 the Utility. And -- but we are concerned by some of 3 the arguments and some of the requests that have been made by Black Rock, which have gone into areas which 4 5 are very broad and well outside of the scope contemplated by this act. 6 7 We also wanted to add that with respect to 8 the issue about vested rights, I think in the case of 9 Sevier County and these other cases, LUDMA cases, 10 where I often run into them, you're dealing with a 11 situation where the regulated authority has power to 12 grant relief. In the case of the DEQ, the DEQ has authority to grant relief that might impact or result 13 in a remedy to the parties seeking intervention in 14 15 that case. In this case, what Black Rock is seeking 16 17 is to create a right out of thin air. They do not 18 have a viewshed easement over Promontory's property. 19 They do not have a solar easement over our property. 20 They do not have any other property interests in our 21 property. And we are the ones that have negotiated a 2.2 right of way with Rocky Mountain Power that is 23 contained completely on our property. It does not 24 touch in any way the Black Rock properties. 25 And so what they are trying to obtain is

Page 39 1 an interest that they have not obtained at law, and 2 they are trying to create a remedy that is not 3 provided for them by the statute. And given all that backdrop and given the fact that this statute has 4 5 already identified the narrow circumstances in which 6 it would be appropriate for someone to intervene, I think that it is proper to reconsider the prior order 8 and to reject the effort by Black Rock to be an 9 intervener. 10 I'll just add to that this fact and that 11 is, this is intended to be a very expedited proceeding. And, as we know from the statute, it 12 talks about a 50-day time line and a 60-day and then 13 a 75-day. We're talking about a procedure here which 14 15 is very expedited. It doesn't simply allow for the kind of multiparty discovery into facts and 16 circumstances dating ten years or even farther back 17 than that that are -- that Black Rock is seeking to 18 introduce into this matter. 19 20 And, for all those reasons, we would suggest that it would be proper in this circumstance 21 2.2 to conclude that while UAPA may, in other statutes 23 and in other acts, grant broad intervention rights, 24 in this case, when we are dealing with this act and 25 having this Board administer this act, it's

```
Page 40
 1
     appropriate to read the provision down in (2)(b) as
 2
     identifying those that can properly intervene. And
 3
     we're happy to not be a party to this proceeding if
     Black Rock is not allowed to be a party. Thank you.
 4
 5
                 MR. LEVAR: Okay. Thank you.
 6
                 Mr. Clark, do you have any questions for
 7
     Promontory?
 8
                 MR. CLARK: No questions.
 9
                 MR. LEVAR: Ms. Holbrook?
10
                 MS. HOLBROOK: No questions.
11
                 MR. LEVAR: Mr. White?
12
                 MR. WHITE: No questions.
13
                 MR. LEVAR: Mr. Wilson?
14
                 MR. WILSON: No questions.
15
                 MR. LEVAR: And I don't at this point.
16
     Thank you.
17
                 MR. BUDGE:
                             Thank you.
                 MR. LEVAR: So we'll go to Mr. Reutzel.
18
     If you want to hit a few high points, we've all
19
20
     obviously had a chance to read your briefing.
21
2.2
                           STATEMENT
23
    BY MR. REUTZEL:
24
                 Thank you. I'll try to just address the
25
     arguments that were made today and not reiterate my
```

Page 41 brief. 1 2 As a preliminary matter, a Motion to 3 Reconsider is really only proper when there has been some new evidence or some new case or some new law 4 5 that's come out. And here there has not been. don't think a Motion to Reconsider is even proper to 6 be considered at this point. 8 And then as another preliminary matter, 9 this is now the second time that we have shown up to 10 a hearing to hear new arguments from Rocky Mountain Power that have not been put in their briefs. 11 for example, today they talked about a case, Williams 12 vs. Hyrum Gibbons, and suggest that that case is 13 somehow applicable. And this is in the imminent 14 15 domain context. At the last hearing they said there's some 16 17 imminent domain cases that will shed light on this, and they didn't put that in their brief. So we show 18 19 up here today, they cite this case. And we pulled 20 this case up quickly and what it says is the Supreme 21 Court rejected the argument that the availability of 2.2 an alternate route is relevant to determining whether 23 condemning authority is using imminent domain for a public use. 24 25 That has nothing to do with the

Page 42 1 intervention statute or the legal interest analysis 2 that we are talking about today. 3 Then they pull a snippet out of our petition where we say the issue here is not the 4 5 necessity of this line. That was a rhetorical device to say there really is no issue that this is not 6 7 necessary. They have an alternate route. It was not 8 meant to say that is not the issue. 9 And then they conflate the two arguments. 10 Yes, the reason we're allowed to intervene is because 11 it affects our property interests. That is the 12 reason we're allowed to intervene. That's not the issue before this Board. I've said that before and 13 I'll say it again. We are not arguing that this 14 15 Board has any right to adjudicate our property rights or to give us some sort of remedy. But because this 16 proceeding affects our property rights, we have a 17 right to intervene under UAPA. We have a right to 18 advocate the standard, which is whether or not this 19 20 Wasatch County segment is necessary, and it's our 21 position it's not. 2.2 Now, if you look at our discovery -- and I 23 hope you've actually read our discovery, including the definitions in there -- we're not conducting 24 25 discovery on property values. We're not conducting

Page 43

- 1 discovery on any of these issues related to our
- 2 affected interests. We are conducting discovery on
- 3 whether or not the Wasatch County segment is
- 4 necessary. That is what we are conducting discovery
- 5 on, and it's limited for the most part to the
- 6 Promontory land. And I hope you will read -- and we
- 7 talked about discovery motions. I hope you will read
- 8 our definitions. They are not nearly as broad as
- 9 what has been represented.
- 10 I want to move on to the argument that
- 11 UAPA does not apply. 64G-4-102 says UAPA applies to
- 12 every agency of the state. UAPA then lists the
- 13 number of proceedings exempted from UAPA but this is
- 14 not one of them.
- 15 While the Utah Facilities -- while the
- 16 Board's act here provides an automatic intervention
- 17 right for landowners, it only provides that automatic
- 18 intervention right in proceedings instigated by the
- 19 county. This is not a proceeding instigated by the
- 20 county. That automatic intervention right does not
- 21 apply despite what Promontory's just said. It's the
- 22 plain language. So the fact that there may be some
- 23 automatic intervention right in some other proceeding
- 24 does not negate UAPA's applicability in this
- 25 proceeding.

```
Page 44
                 Now, in fact, the legislature has actually
 1
 2
     gone to great effort in some proceedings to point out
 3
     where certain administrative proceedings are not
     subject to certain UAPA provisions. Again, it has
 4
 5
     not done that here. UAPA is applicable to all
     agencies of the state, and there is nothing that says
 6
     it doesn't apply here.
 8
                 If UAPA applies, then we look at whether
 9
     or not we have a legal interest, and there has been a
10
     lot of discussion about a vested legal right.
11
     not seen vested legal right in any of the statutes or
     any of the cases. That is a standard that does not
12
     exist.
13
14
                 If the Board allows Promontory and Rocky
15
     Mountain Power to move this transmission line, it
     will undoubtedly affect my client's property.
16
     submitted letters from bankers saying that. We've
17
     submitted all sorts of evidence demonstrating that.
18
     I don't think it's really even disputed. The Board
19
20
     does not have to have the right to adjudicate the
21
     value of that or to even discuss the value of those
22
    property values for us to have a legal interest in
     the outcome of these proceedings. And there's not
23
24
     been a single legal argument that -- or legal
25
     authority that has been set forth to support that
```

Page 45 1 proposition. 2 I want to talk about the Millard County Rocky Mountain Power said, well, the Millard 3 case. County case is different because in Millard County, 4 5 if -- you know, if they are not allowed to participate, it will affect the taxes that they are 6 allowed to recover, and that is partially true. But 8 the reality of what happened there is the taxes that 9 were going to be assessed or settled as a result of 10 that proceedings were state taxes, not taxes that 11 were going to Millard County. Now, Millard County is 12 entitled to impose a local tax depending on how much of the state tax is collected. 13 14 So there was not a direct right into the 15 proceedings. There was not -- the tax commission there was not awarding Millard County any money. 16 17 was just an indirect effect that it may have on their ability to collect money; just like it's an indirect 18 effect on my client's property values. 19 20 And then I want to talk about the Sevier 21 County case. As we've talked about that already, it 2.2 says if it affects your property that you are -- that 23 you have a legal interest. It doesn't say if it 24 affects the property by constructing an improvement 25 directly on your property. And, in fact, the parties

Page 46

- 1 there were people that were all over the community.
- 2 And the court said, hey, if they would have actually
- 3 identified a specific harm to one of these people,
- 4 they would have been allowed to intervene, but they
- 5 didn't. We have. We've identified the harm to our
- 6 property.
- 7 Now, I understand the slippery slope
- 8 argument. I get it and I understand that this Board
- 9 would be very concerned about having a whole bunch of
- 10 people come in here. But you have to understand that
- 11 the court in the Millard County case said agencies
- 12 have an obligation to not nullify intervention rights
- 13 because of administrative burdens, but rather they
- 14 should create procedures that allow the agencies to
- 15 have those intervention rights and make it
- 16 manageable. And that's what we've done here. We
- 17 have several associations with hundreds of members
- 18 represented by one firm and making the same arguments
- 19 with the same interests. We don't have hundreds of
- 20 people here. We have two attorneys.
- 21 And then we have Promontory that may or
- 22 may not intervene. The deadline to intervene has
- 23 passed. This is the parties that we are dealing
- 24 with. So factually, that's not a real issue.
- 25 I also want to address quickly our

Page 47

- 1 participation below in Wasatch County. They
- 2 indicated that we didn't participate as interveners.
- 3 That's because there are no parties in those
- 4 proceedings. There is no intervention -- there is no
- 5 intervention provision there. We were allowed to
- 6 participate in every hearing that happened, just like
- 7 we're asking to participate in every hearing that
- 8 happens here.
- 9 It's also important to note that the
- 10 standards are different in Wasatch County, and so the
- 11 procedures were different. It was talking about a
- 12 conditional use standard. Here we're talking about
- 13 the necessity of constructing the Wasatch line.
- 14 That's what we want to talk about. And I just want
- 15 to be clear. That is the issue I intend to litigate,
- 16 and that is the issue that we've conducted discovery
- on. And I think if you'll read our discovery
- 18 requests, you'll see that that's really the issue
- 19 that we're after here.
- I think that's all I have. I'd be happy
- 21 to answer any questions.
- MR. LEVAR: Thank you. I just have one
- 23 quick question. It's about paragraph 10 of the
- 24 Sevier Citizens case, and it's a narrow question
- 25 but -- I'll give you a moment to...

1	Page 48 MR. REUTZEL: Thank you. I'm there.
2	MR. LEVAR: So near the bottom of that
3	paragraph it says, "A legal interest involves more
4	than a mere expression or concern. Instead, it must
5	amount to a sufficiently particularized injury to
6	livelihood, health, and property values."
7	Would you comment on the use of "and"
8	before the word "property values" as opposed to "or"?
9	MR. REUTZEL: Let me take a moment to look
10	at that.
11	Yeah, I'm not sure that as you pulled that
12	quote out that it means that you have to have all of
13	those, but I do believe that we have all of those
14	here as we've indicated in our brief. We have an
15	injury to our livelihood and being able to market the
16	property. We have an injury to our health in terms
17	of safety related to locating a power line next to
18	residential units, and we have an injury to our
19	property in the form of decreased property values.
20	MR. LEVAR: Okay. Thank you. That's all
21	the questions I have. Mr. Clark?
22	MR. CLARK: No. No questions.
23	MR. LEVAR: Ms. Holbrook?
24	MS. HOLBROOK: No questions.
25	MR. LEVAR: Mr. White?

Page 49 I think there was some 1 MR. WHITE: 2 discussion between the Chair and Mr. Moscon in terms of, you know, potential relevance and the difference 3 between relevance and the standards under the Sevier 4 5 case and under UAPA generally. I mean, is it your contention that you can -- and, again, we have not 6 7 gotten to those issues yet because there is pending 8 discovery motions before the Board that we'll get to, I guess, at some point. 9 10 But is it your contention that you can 11 divorce those two issues? There was relevance and 12 the right to intervention. Are you saying that ultimately you have some colorable, legal interest 13 14 that UAPA allows intervention under the Sevier case, 15 I quess? 16 MR. REUTZEL: That's what we're saying. 17 Now, we're not saying that because it provides us a right to intervene that those are the issues that 18 need to be litigated. Today we're talking about 19 20 whether we have a legal interest. At the final 21 hearing, we're going to be talking about whether or 22 not it's a necessity to construct the Wasatch County segment. There are different standards for different 23 24 procedures. 25 MR. WHITE: That's all I have, Chair.

Page 50 Okay. Mr. Wilson, do you have 1 MR. LEVAR: 2 any questions for Mr. Reutzel? 3 MR. WILSON: I have no questions. Thank 4 you. 5 MR. LEVAR: Okay. Thank you. 6 Mr. Berg, if you are still on the line, 7 you have not filed anything with respect to any 8 motions, but I'll give you the opportunity if you want to make any comment with respect to them since 9 10 you are a party to this proceeding. 11 Thank you. This is Mr. Berg. MR. BERG: 12 We've not filed any motions on either the intervention or the discovery issues. This --13 Wasatch County does not have any objection to Black 14 15 Rock Ridge intervening nor to Promontory intervening at this point. 16 17 Okay. Thank you, Mr. Berg. MR. LEVAR: 18 If any Board member has questions for 19 Mr. Berg, let me know. I assume there's none. 20 I think we'll move to Board discussion 21 then. 2.2 (BOARD DISCUSSION) 23 MR. LEVAR: We have a motion to reconsider 24 our previous action granting intervention to the 25 Black Rock Intervention Group. I'll just clarify for

Page 51 the Board that under the Administrative Procedures 1 2 Act, we can -- we can either act on that motion --3 grant the motion or deny the motion. But also under the Utah Administrative Procedures Act, if this Board 4 5 does not act on that motion and takes no action with respect to it, after 20 days it's denied by statute. 6 And I think 20 days expires in the middle of next week. So no action results in a denial of the 8 motion, but we also could take affirmative action 9 10 today with respect to the motion. With that background, I'll open it up to 11 12 Board discussion. 13 Don't all speak at once. 14 This is -- for the record, MR. WHITE: 15 this is Jordan White. You know, again, as I mentioned earlier, the -- I'm struggling a bit here 16 because it's a -- on the one hand, in terms of a 17 policy consideration, I will reiterate my concerns I 18 voiced on the initial petition arguments a few weeks 19 20 ago, which is I recognize that the petition deadline 21 is over, and I respect Mr. Reutzel's contentions 2.2 that, you know -- that these are, you know, tailored 23 specifically to get to the issues he believes are 24 pertinent to this Board, et cetera. But, again, I --

knowing the time lines that we have, what we've been

25

Page 52 tasked to do, I am a little bit concerned about 1 2 opening this up. 3 But, again, under the Sevier case, it seems like a pretty low bar. I mean, I read that and 4 5 I thought, hum, well, you know, if you are an environmental group, would you have potential 6 7 standing to intervene, for example, if you could 8 arque that, hey, this upgraded line might potentially flow or facilitate additional fossil fuel electrons? 9 10 And, again, you addressed the slippery slope argument. But, you know, from a policy 11 12 standpoint and from this Board's precedent going forward, that does give me concern of when that would 13 Is it a contiguous property owner that could 14 15 claim a potential, you know, infliction to their property value? Is it half a mile away? Et cetera. 16 17 With that being said, again, I was -- from the UAPA and the interpretation of the Utah Court of 18 19 Appeals on that case, that seemed to set a pretty low 20 bar. And so, again, I'm trying to grapple with 21 2.2 I'm not sure if I would change my decision. 23 But, again, that's based upon more of what I believe this Board is mandated to do, you know, the 24 25 administration of what I see as a pretty narrow focus

```
Page 53
 1
     in a short time line. But that's just -- I quess I'm
 2
     just thinking out loud.
 3
                 MR. CLARK: For those on the phone, this
     is David Clark. To be succinct, having read the
 4
 5
     papers and reviewed the act and in particular
     considered the prior order of the Board in the 2010
 6
     case as it relates to what the act asks this Board to
 8
     do, the narrow question that we would address here,
     the expedited time frames, it seems unworkable to me
 9
10
     to apply the kind of test that is in the Sevier case
11
     as broadly as the associations interpret it.
12
                 So my inclination is to reconsider my own
     vote and to deny the petition for intervention.
13
14
                 MR. LEVAR:
                             This is Thad LeVar. As I look
15
     at the issues in front of us on intervention, I think
     there is a different standard that applies to that as
16
     opposed to potential discovery issues or relevance
17
     issues in the hearing. And just to be straight-
18
19
     forward, as I look at the language in the Sevier
20
     Citizens case, I don't think it does any parties to
     this proceeding any good if any potential appeal of
21
2.2
     an ultimate decision by this Board hinges on an
23
     intervention motion under the standard that the Court
     of Appeals has established.
24
                 I think in the event that the intervention
25
```

```
Page 54
    previously granted is not disturbed by this Board, we
 1
 2
     would then be forced to make a decision on what the
 3
     scope of this proceeding is for the purposes of the
     discovery motions. And whether the scope of this
 4
 5
     proceeding extends to considering any alternate route
 6
     other than the proposed route would then be a ripe
     question that we would then have to jump into.
 8
                 But as I look at the specific standard, it
 9
     seems to me that the UAPA standard is met.
10
    personal opinion that the Facility Review Board
11
     language is not exclusionary. And with respect to
12
     the slippery slope argument, to me, that's what the
     second part of the UAPA test is in terms of orderly
13
     conduct of the proceedings, and that would go to how
14
15
     we handle both discovery issues and any objections at
     the hearing.
16
                 So that's where I'm still leaning right
17
           And I guess we'll entertain continued
18
     discussion or any motion from any board member.
19
20
                 MS. HOLBROOK: This is Beth Holbrook.
                                                         And
21
     I come at this from a slightly different perspective.
2.2
    Having sat on a planning commission for seven years,
23
     I think one of the challenges that I have found is
     that inevitably an argument comes forward that
24
25
     addresses specifically property values. And that's
```

Page 55 where I always find it to be a challenge because, as 1 2 an individual on a commission or any of these other 3 entities, the scope is very clear that property values cannot be a part of the discussion in relation 4 5 to land use issues, as well as any zoning or anything that pertains to neighbors or a land use issue that 6 the city or entity has established overall. 8 And I am struggling with the challenge to have this be an intervention that is going to be of 9 10 value without having any discussion about property I don't think that it's pertinent here 11 12 because there is an established need for this utility. So that's where I am struggling right now. 13 14 MR. WHITE: Chairman LeVar, would you mind 15 reviewing the potential options before the Board to give us time and how we may or may not act on this 16 17 Petition for Reconsideration? MR. LEVAR: Well, that's just my own 18 personal reading of the Administrative Procedures 19 20 Act, but my view of our options with respect to a Motion to Reconsider are that we could act on that 21 22 motion and either deny the motion, which would leave 23 Black Rock Intervention Group's intervention intact; we could grant the motion, which would open up 24 25 multiple options but considering the time line, you

Page 56 know, the most likely result of granting that motion 1 2 would be to grant the motion, either accompanied by a denial of the intervention or decide to conduct 3 further proceedings on it, but with our required 4 5 schedule, that could be difficult. And then if the Board takes no action with respect to the motion, my 6 reading of the Administrative Procedures Act is that it's denied by a matter of law after 20 days from 8 9 when it's filed. And I count that 20 days to end around the middle of next week. And since we don't 10 have any Board meetings noticed up between now and 11 12 then, failure to act would be a denial of the motion, which would mean Black Rock's intervention continues. 13 14 MR. WHITE: And just so I understand, when 15 you were -- previously when you were laying out kind of the path for today, at least in terms of the 16 pending motions, if the Board's previous 17 determination stands, and the Board were next to turn 18 to the issues of the pending discovery issues, was I 19 20 hearing you correctly that at that time it would be 21 your position that the Board would need to address, I 22 guess, essentially the scope of the Board's, I 23 quess -- or the purview of their -- what they would actually be determining under the act? 24 25 I mean, I know we got into this a little

Page 57 bit earlier with Mr. Moscon with respect to, you 1 2 know, do we have, as the Board, the discretion under the act to make a call of, you know, this alignment 3 4 is preferred over that alignment? Is that what you 5 are thinking if the decision stands or if it -- if the Board were not to act, that that would be the 6 7 next, I guess, decision point for the Board? 8 MR. LEVAR: Tell me if I'm understanding 9 your question right, Mr. White. I mean, I think to 10 summarize my view of that issue, I think that if -whatever action or inaction by this Board results in 11 12 Black Rock's continued intervention, then we have to move on to both Promontory's motion to intervene, 13 which is unopposed, and then the discovery issues. 14 15 And, to me, my read of the Administrative Procedures Act in the Sevier Citizens case and the Millard 16 County case are that while I don't see relevance as 17 necessarily controlling to intervention, relevance 18 and proportionality are the key factors with respect 19 20 to the discovery disputes that we have in front of us 21 today. And, to me, I don't know how we could move 2.2 forward on the discovery disputes without 23 affirmatively making the conclusion of law whether we have the jurisdiction to consider any alternate 24 routes besides the one that's in front of us. 25

Page 58 think we would have to decide that before we decide 1 the discovery dispute. That's my personal opinion. 2 3 MR. WHITE: That is helpful. I appreciate 4 it. 5 MR. LEVAR: Further discussion or any motion from any Board member? 6 7 (MOTION) 8 MR. CLARK: I'm going to move that we reconsider our order granting intervention to the 9 10 association. MR. LEVAR: For clarification, is your 11 motion that we reconsider and deny intervention or 12 that we reconsider and do something other than deny 13 14 intervention? 15 MR. CLARK: Thank you. That we reconsider and deny intervention. 16 17 MR. LEVAR: Okay. Discussion on the motion or a second? 18 MS. HOLBROOK: Mr. Chair, I'd like to have 19 20 some discussion about the motion. This is Beth Holbrook. 2.1 2.2 (DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION) 23 I want to make sure that I'm understanding 24 the definition in terms of what you are relating, 25 Mr. LeVar, about how we would have to make a decision

Page 59 1 on -- based upon the -- not only the location, but 2 also whether to grant discovery. How -- how would that -- would that be a decision that would 3 ultimately be made if we allow intervention to 4 continue with Black Rock? 5 MR. LEVAR: Well, you're asking my 6 7 personal opinion on this. But obviously if 8 Mr. Clark's motion passes, then the discovery issues 9 become moot. If his motion does not pass, then we 10 have a discovery dispute. And, to me at least, the 11 key issues on discovery are relevance to the proceeding and the proportionality to the proceeding, 12 but probably more important is relevance. And to 13 decide whether any of their requested discovery is 14 15 relevant to this proceeding, I think we would have to decide whether we have jurisdiction to consider any 16 alternate route besides the one that was rejected by 17 18 Wasatch County. 19 And obviously we have language from the 20 Board in the Tooele County case going to that issue, but I think, personally, deciding that jurisdictional 21 2.2 issue is prerequisite to deciding whether -- whether 23 the discovery is relevant. 24 And so I think that is somewhat germane to 25 the motion that we're talking about, but it's not

```
Page 60
 1
     entirely germane because that would be the next step
 2
     if Mr. Clark's motion fails.
 3
                 (MOTION SECONDED)
                 MR. WILSON: So there was not -- this is
 4
 5
     David Wilson. There was not a second but I will
     second that motion if there wasn't one.
 6
 7
                 MR. LEVAR: Thank you. We have a motion
 8
     and a second. Any further discussion?
 9
                 MR. WHITE: Can I just say one thing?
10
     My -- you know, my vote would not change from where I
11
     originally stood for the same reasons I've iterated
12
     today.
                 I guess one thing I wanted to explore
13
14
     before we take the final vote is, again, that option
15
     of a no vote and let me tell you why. In other
     words, no action. I still stand by the same
16
17
     rationale for why I'm not sure if intervention is
     right for this Black Rock Group. I guess my concern
18
     is the one you previewed earlier, which is I'm not
19
20
     sure what -- under the Sevier Power case, although
21
     it's a very attenuated interest that they've
2.2
     outlined, there is still some type of colorable
23
     argument for parties to make. And I guess I just
     have a little bit of concern about what that does for
24
25
     the purposes of going forward if a party like Black
```

1	Page 61 Rock, for example, appeals. You know, maybe that
2	shouldn't be a consideration, but I guess I'm just
3	thinking out loud. That's all I have.
4	MR. LEVAR: Okay. We have a motion and a
5	second. Any further decision before we put the
6	motion to a vote?
7	Does any Board member want a moment to
8	decide if you want further discussion before we put
9	the motion to a vote?
10	MR. WHITE: Are you asking
11	MR. LEVAR: Okay. Well, I'm asking if any
12	Board member wants more time to think about whether
13	they want more discussion before I put it to a vote.
14	It's doubling the question, but it seems to me we are
15	about ready to put it to a vote unless any one of the
16	five of us says otherwise.
17	Okay. In the last hearing we voted
18	alphabetically. That seems to make sense to me. So
19	the motion is to reconsider our action and deny
20	intervention to the Black Rock Intervention Group.
21	(VOTE ON THE MOTION)
22	Mr. Clark?
23	MR. CLARK: I vote yes.
24	MR. LEVAR: Ms. Holbrook?
25	MS. HOLBROOK: I vote yes.

1	Page 62
1	MR. LEVAR: I vote no.
2	Mr. White?
3	MR. WHITE: I vote yes.
4	MR. LEVAR: Mr. Wilson?
5	MR. WILSON: I vote yes.
6	(MOTION PASSES)
7	MR. LEVAR: Okay. The motion passes with
8	a four to one vote.
9	It appears we may not have any further
10	business for the Board today. Does anyone have a
11	position to the contrary?
12	Promontory indicated that you will be
13	withdrawing your intervention motion?
14	MR. BUDGE: It's withdrawn. Thank you.
15	MR. LEVAR: And the discovery issues are
16	moot at this point. This decision will be
17	memorialized in a written decision that will issue at
18	some point. I don't think we can commit to a time
19	frame for that.
20	This hearing is adjourned.
21	(THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 10:14 A.M.)
22	
23	
24	
25	

	Page 63
1	REPORTER'S HEARING CERTIFICATE
2	
3	STATE OF UTAH)) ss.
4	COUNTY OF SUMMIT)
5	T. Tanaifan D. Gaman Danistanad
6	I, Jennifer E. Garner, Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for
7	the State of Utah, do hereby certify:
8	That said proceeding was taken down by me
9	in stenotype on April 14, 2016, at the place therein named, and was thereafter transcribed, and that a
10	true and correct transcription of said testimony is set forth in the preceding pages;
11	
12	I further certify that I am not kin or otherwise associated with any of the parties to said
13	cause of action and that I am not interested in the outcome thereof.
14	
15	WITNESS MY HAND AND OFFICIAL SEAL this 15th day of April, 2016.
16	
17	
18	0 1 2 2 6
19	Jenney C. Carner
20	Jennifer E. Garner, RPR Notary Public
21	Residing in Summit County
22	
23	
24	
25	

Index: (2)..application

	04.00 05 40-45	42.0		appiicatioi
	34:23,25 48:15	13:8	agency 43:12	51:3,9
(Absolutely	adjudicate	ago 51:20	alternate 41:22
(2) 33:9	9:10 24:10	42:15 44:20	agree 17:24	42:7 54:5
(2)(b) 40:1	accommodates	administer	27:4 36:22	57:24
(a) 33:9	36:25	39:25	agreed 16:9	always 37:23
(a) 55.5	accompanied	administration	air 38:17	55:1
1	56:2	52:25	alignment	among 25:22
	Accordingly	administrative	16:14 57:3,4	amount 34:10
10 10:20 47:23	10:9	29:1 44:3	all 5:23 6:25	48:5
11 10:20	acquiesced	46:13 51:1,4	7:11,25 8:11	analogy 20:7
16-035-09 5:7	16:8	55:19 56:7	14:6 16:14	25:18 27:12
	across 35:14	57:15	18:6 23:5	analysis 42:1
2	act 23:1 29:10,	Admiral 25:21	27:18 30:13	analyzing
	22 30:1,4,7,8	admissions	32:2 33:20	37:23
20 9:4 51:6,7	32:17 33:1	13:19	34:21 35:22	another 11:2
56:8,9	36:23 38:6	advanced 37:2	39:3,20 40:19	27:10 29:13,24
2010 53:6	39:24,25 43:16	advocate	44:5,18 46:1	32:25 41:8
	51:2,4,5 53:5,7	42:19	47:20 48:12,	answers 30:5
3	55:16,20,21	Advocates	13,20 49:25	anyone 6:13
303(d) 10:7	56:7,12,24	19:10	51:13	7:8 19:14,15
12:1,4	57:3,6,16	affect 21:11	alleged 19:4	anything 20:25
12.1,1	action 33:10	44:16 45:6	allow 14:20	30:16 34:19
5	50:24 51:5,8,9	affected 12:17	27:17 37:21	50:7 55:5
	56:6 57:11	17:14,18,23	39:15 46:14	
50-day 39:13	acts 39:23	18:3 33:11,15	allowed 11:22	apologize 24:21 25:1
54-14-301	actual 34:19	37:6,19 43:2	14:16 19:14	
32:20	actually 9:16	· ·	30:9 37:16,17	appeal 53:21
54-14-303 33:9	11:25 28:2	affects 42:11,	40:4 42:10,12	Appeals 52:19
54-18-102 37:6	42:23 44:1	17 45:22,24	45:5,7 46:4	53:24
	46:2 56:24	affirmative	47:5	appear 14:20
6		51:9	allowing 28:9	16:15
	add 38:7 39:10	affirmatively	31:18	appearances
60-day 39:13	addition 7:25	57:23		6:1,20,25
64G-4-102	additional	after 47:19	allows 33:1 44:14 49:14	appears 15:15
43:11	35:24 52:9	51:6 56:8	alluded 14:21	applicability
<u> </u>	address 5:7	again 12:25		43:24
7	7:17 11:17	20:3 25:18	almost 5:21	applicable
75-day 39:14	14:12 23:13	27:19 34:17,18	along 26:5	14:9 41:14
•	40:24 46:25	42:14 44:4	already 9:1,2,	44:5
Α	53:8 56:21	49:6 51:15,24	12,17 12:4,14,	applicant 22:3,
	addressed	52:3,10,17,21,	25 13:12 28:7,	6,15
ability 11:19	52:10	23	11 30:4 34:7	application
12:23 45:18	addresses	against 19:7	39:5 45:21	20:22 22:10
able 8:5 15:4	11:15 54:25	agencies 44:6	also 8:14,22	27:11,16,17,
16:13 26:13	adequate	46:11,14	36:12 38:7	20,23
27:21,24	10:12 11:20		46:25 47:9	

Index: applies..cases

applies 28:2	assuming 29:4	begin 5:4	57:12	ppirescases briefs 24:22
1		_		
29:5 43:11	34:4	beginning 28:6	blockade 8:11	41:11
44:8 53:16	attorneys	begins 11:13	board 5:6,9,12	broad 38:5
apply 17:11	46:20	behalf 6:16	7:13,17,23,24	39:23 43:8
29:6 35:13	audience 6:23	7:22	8:2,8,9,20	broadly 53:11
43:11,21 44:7	authority 22:5	being 18:11	10:1,4,6,15,21,	Budge 6:15,19
53:10	29:16 32:20	34:20 37:1	24 11:4,6,17	36:19 40:17
appreciation	37:14 38:11,13	48:15 52:17	12:25 13:12,15	build 14:7
7:23	41:23 44:25	belied 20:23	14:1,5,11,14,	builds 25:23
approach 8:25	automatic	belief 8:17	15,19,21 15:6	built 15:20
appropriate	43:16,17,20,23	believe 5:12	16:18,20,25	26:25
39:6 40:1	automatically	8:9 9:11 10:15	21:2,3,5,8	bunch 46:9
area 29:19,20	18:24	14:5 29:10,22	22:11,17,18,25	burdens 46:13
33:11,18	availability	31:8 35:7,19	23:1,6 27:3	business 16:2
areas 14:3 38:4	41:21	37:9,11,20	28:6,7,8,11	35:11
argue 26:16,17	available 15:12	38:1 48:13	29:10,21 30:4,	33.11
28:10 52:8	18:19 21:18	52:23	11 31:22,25	
arguing 42:14	awarding	believes 51:23	32:16,19,21	C
argument 8:18	45:16	below 21:15,23	33:1 34:2	call 57:3
12:12,14 17:10	away 18:11	22:6 47:1	35:23 36:20	calls 32:18
20:2,13 34:5	52:16		39:25 42:13,15	came 25:17
1	52.10	Berg 6:7 8:5	44:14,19 46:8	can't 13:23
41:21 43:10		50:6,11,17,19	49:8 50:18,20,	31:3
44:24 46:8	B	besides 57:25	22 51:1,4,12,	cannot 5:24
52:11 54:12,24	back 28:22	Beth 5:10	24 52:24 53:6,	55:4
argument's	31:19 33:5	54:20	7,22 54:1,10,	care 18:6,7
29:5	34:4 39:17	better 5:21	19 55:15 56:6,	case 15:6,8
arguments	backdrop 39:4	between 13:16	11,18,21 57:2,	,
13:1,3 14:21	background	16:20 22:2,19	6,7,11	19:14 20:10,12
16:16 18:4	51:11	23:2 29:12,23	Board's 9:21	23:13,18,20
36:25 37:19	bad 8:16 15:22	32:12,22 37:13	10:2,9 16:23	25:3,10,21
38:3 40:25	16:4	49:2,4 56:11	20:23 30:7	26:7 27:4 28:7,
41:10 42:9	bankers 44:17	Beverage	31:16 43:16	22 30:19,24
46:18 51:19		25:21	52:12 56:17,22	34:8 35:21
around 56:10	bar 28:23,25	bit 28:24 51:16	both 6:16	36:22 37:14
articulate 28:4	52:4,20	52:1 57:1		38:8,12,15,16
asks 53:7	based 24:25	Black 6:9 7:5	36:23 54:15 57:12	39:24 41:4,12,
assessed 45:9	52:23	8:15 11:12,14	57:13	13,19,20 45:3,
associated	basically 29:17	12:6,9,21 13:5,	bottom 48:2	4,21 46:11
10:6	basis 10:25	18 18:19 19:4,	brief 14:11	47:24 49:5,14
associations	26:1	24 20:20 21:16	21:9 24:2,11	52:3,19 53:7,
23:14 25:10	before 5:19	36:13,16 37:2,	25:2 41:1,18	10,20 57:16,17
46:17 53:11	7:14 11:17	10,16,21 38:4,	48:14	cases 14:23
assume 50:19	24:9 42:13	16,24 39:8,18	briefing 40:20	19:9,11 30:13
assumes 34:1	48:8 49:8	40:4 50:14,25	briefings 7:11	38:9 41:17
assumes of i	55:15	55:23 56:13		44:12
		00.20 00.10		
	<u> </u>	1	<u> </u>	l

Index: catchall..county

	F0-4F			cnallcounty
catchall 30:3,	52:15	comments	condemnor	contention
10,12	claiming 19:5	33:25	25:22	49:6,10
categories	clarification	commission	conditional	contentions
31:13	8:12	14:25 45:15	37:8 47:12	51:21
century 11:24	clarified 22:22	54:22 55:2	conditions	contentious
certain 44:3,4	35:2	community	10:6	8:2
certainly 8:1,	clarifies 26:7	34:22 46:1	conduct 21:12	context 14:23
17 15:25 20:15	clarify 50:25	Company 10:4,	54:14 56:3	16:1 41:15
31:18	Clark 5:11	15 30:24	conducted	contiguous
cetera 25:6	23:7,9 24:3,5,	Company's	47:16	52:14
51:24 52:16	14,17,19 25:9	24:7 29:6	conducting	contingent
Chair 32:3	28:14 34:7	30:21	42:24,25 43:2,	36:11
36:20 49:2,25	35:25 36:1	compare 19:7	4	continue 12:8
Chairman 7:16	40:6,8 48:21,	comparing	conflate 42:9	continued
8:24 55:14	22 53:3,4	19:3	consider 7:1	54:18 57:12
challenge	Clark's 33:24	compensations	10:23 11:7	continues
55:1,8	Clean 19:9	26:10	13:3,13 14:1	56:13
challenges	clear 13:6	competent	20:24 21:4,5	controlling
54:23	14:16 22:18	10:11	28:8,12 31:17,	30:7 57:18
chance 40:20	37:4 47:15	complaints	23 57:24	cooperatively
change 52:22	55:3	11:7	consideration	16:13
changes 16:15	clearly 11:17	complete 20:8	22:14 51:18	copies 9:12
charge 19:19	22:23 38:1	completely	considered	copy 9:9,22
chips 15:2	client 7:23	38:23	11:1 41:7 53:6	core 31:25
circumstance	client's 44:16	concede 15:8	considering	corporation
29:14,15 31:6	45:19	concern 34:10	21:3 54:5	15:17,21 21:25
39:21	Club 19:9	48:4 52:13	55:25	correct 5:13,14
circumstances	collect 45:18	concerned	conspiring	13:21
39:5,17	collected	38:2 46:9 52:1	8:16	correctly 32:13
cite 15:6 23:14	45:13	concerns 8:7	construct	56:20
32:17 41:19	colorable	51:18	11:19 12:18	costs 10:6 15:3
	49:13	conclude	49:22	
cited 20:10,12 27:4	come 41:5	39:22	constructed	count 56:9
	46:10 54:21	conclusion	14:17	county 6:6,7
citing 23:16	comes 8:19	57:23	constructing	8:6 10:4,16,25
citizen 18:5			45:24 47:13	11:24 13:23,24
citizens 22:4	20:21 54:24	condemn 16:11	construction	16:21 18:5,17
23:13,19 34:8,	comfortable	condemnation	15:13	20:15,16 22:1,
21 47:24 53:20	5:23	14:23 15:16	Consumer	9 27:11,19
57:16	comfortably		6:22	30:25 37:13 38:9 42:20
city 18:17 22:1	6:23	16:1,7 20:4,5 25:19 34:24	consuming 8:3	43:3,19,20
55:7	coming 10:1	condemned	contained	45:2,4,11,16,
civil 20:4 30:24	comment	25:25	38:23	21 46:11 47:1,
claim 20:18,19	21:17 36:15		contemplated	10 49:22 50:14
26:21 27:1	48:7 50:9	condemning 41:23	38:6	57:17
		41.20	30.0	07.17
	l .	I	l	I

couple 9:23	decreased	difference 8:19	16:12,20 19:1	either 17:11,
17:7	48:19	19:12 49:3	37:13	16,21 50:12
court 5:18 15:9	default 29:25	different 9:4	disputed 44:19	51:2 55:22
20:15 23:18	defined 33:12	17:11 20:1	disputes 8:23	56:2
26:12 41:21	37:6,12	33:3 34:15	22:19 23:2	electric 11:20
46:2,11 52:18	definition	45:4 47:10,11	29:11 32:22	electrons 52:9
53:23	31:24 33:3	49:23 53:16	57:20,22	Enabling 22:25
courteous	definitions	54:21	distraction	32:17
14:19	42:24 43:8	differently 7:8	31:25	end 10:9 52:14
create 8:16	definitive 31:7	difficult 56:5	disturbed 54:1	56:9
12:20 38:17		diminish 26:18	Division 6:21	Energy 19:9
39:2 46:14	delivery 13:8	diminution	divorce 49:11	
created 32:19	demonstrating	23:23 25:5,14		enjoyment 23:24 25:15
credible 10:10	44:18	26:2,22	Docket 5:6	
1	demonstration	•	domain 15:22	enough 14:19
CUP 10:5,6,17	16:3	direct 19:15,21	41:15,17,23	entertain 54:18
11:1 22:10	denial 10:5	20:9 26:11 27:5 29:16	done 16:4 37:8	entire 9:21
27:11,16	23:17 51:8		44:5 46:16	34:21,24
customer	56:3,12	45:14	door 27:9	entities 55:3
19:16,18	denied 25:11	directly 29:22	down 8:19	entitled 9:25
customers	51:6 56:8	45:25	26:17,18 35:1,	45:12
11:21 13:9	deny 11:1 51:3	disagrees	13 40:1	entity 21:24
19:20	53:13 55:22	30:11	draw 25:18	32:12 55:7
	dependable	discovered	26:13 35:3	environmental
D	13:7	5:20		52:6
damage 25:24	depending	discovery 8:7,	E	equally 15:11
26:1,23 35:20	19:6 45:12	23 13:17 14:3	earlier 51:16	essentially
damages 26:9	deposition	16:23 17:13,21	57:1	56:22
34:25	13:20 14:13	37:1 39:16	easement	established
dating 39:17	DEQ 23:13	42:22,23,25	16:10 38:18,19	14:24 25:12
David 5:11	38:12	43:1,2,4,7	easier 9:18	53:24 55:7,12
53:4	described 26:6	47:16,17 49:8	32:18	even 20:2
day 7:25	37:12	50:13 53:17	easiest 7:6	25:25 26:3
days 51:6,7	describes	54:4,15 56:19	echo 36:21	28:4 39:17
56:8,9	29:15 36:23	57:14,20,22		41:6 44:19,21
deadline 46:22	despite 43:21	discretion	economic	event 53:25
51:20	determination	15:23 16:23	12:20 13:9	every 18:5
dealing 36:23	56:18	57:2	effect 45:17,19	27:16 43:12
38:10 39:24	determine	discuss 44:21	effectuate	47:6,7
46:23	15:19	discussion	15:16	evidence 10:11
decide 36:11	determining	44:10 49:2	efficient 10:12	41:4 44:18
1	41:22 56:24	50:20,22 51:12	11:20 13:25	example 41:12
1 56.3	1	54:19 55:4,10	14:8 37:25	52:7
56:3	device 42:5			32.7
decision 18:25	device 42:5 dictate 14:16	dispute 10:3,	effort 39:8 44:2	
decision 18:25 52:22 53:22	dictate 14:16	dispute 10:3, 16 11:10,15	effort 39:8 44:2 efforts 8:11	exclusionary
decision 18:25		dispute 10:3,		
decision 18:25 52:22 53:22	dictate 14:16	dispute 10:3, 16 11:10,15		exclusionary

Index: excuse..here

excuse 33:1	facts 39:16	54:24 57:22	governing 22:5	excuselere
exempted	factually 46:24	fossil 52:9	29:15 30:8	Н
43:13	failed 23:19	found 54:23	government	
exercises	fails 11:16	four 5:9 12:13	18:16 22:2	half 52:16
15:22	failure 56:12	21:11	29:23 32:12	hand 9:5 14:4
exhibit 9:16	fair 25:8	four-part 21:11	33:10,17	30:5 51:17
exist 15:14	faith 15:22	frames 53:9	governments	handle 37:13
44:13	16:4	frankly 28:24	22:20 23:2,4	54:15
existed 11:24	fall 15:2	friction 13:16	29:12 32:23	handout 9:1,24
expedited	farm 35:11	front 9:20	grab 32:17	10:18 11:11
39:11,15 53:9	farther 39:17	53:15 57:20,25	gradually	12:8
expires 51:7		frustrate 31:20	26:18	happen 11:8
express 7:22	feels 7:8	fuel 52:9	grant 19:16	happened 45:8
expression	few 7:10,12 40:19 51:19		38:12,13 39:23	47:6
34:10 48:4		fundamental 12:5 13:14	51:3 55:24	happens 8:19
expressly	filed 8:13 9:2,		56:2	18:8 20:14
15:10	17 12:10 33:10	funds 20:14	granted 27:11,	27:8,9 47:8
extends 13:17	50:7,12 56:9	further 36:15 56:4	19,22 54:1	happy 16:21
20:11 54:5	filing 11:14 final 49:20	30.4	granting 50:24	22:3,11 40:3
extent 24:7	1111011		56:1	47:20
30:11 36:13	find 6:24 10:10	G	grapple 52:21	harder 35:17,
eyebrows	24:22 55:1	general 15:21	gratitude 7:23	18
28:24	finding 25:1	19:8 30:10,12	great 44:2	harm 12:22
20.24	fine 7:18	generally 49:5	green 9:25	46:3,5
	firm 46:18	Gibbons 15:7	grounds 20:12	hate 31:7
F	first 6:18 7:2,9,	41:13	group 6:9,14	having 12:5
face 30:4	22 9:24 17:8	give 9:8 16:9	7:5 8:15 11:13,	31:23 39:25
facilitate 52:9	32:21	24:5 25:4	25 19:4,20	46:9 53:4
facilities 11:19	flip 9:4	42:16 47:25	21:16 27:21	54:22 55:10
14:17 15:2	flipping 33:6	50:8 52:13	36:10 50:25	head 28:5
16:3 25:20	flow 52:9	55:16	52:6	health 23:23
43:15	focus 52:25	given 9:25	Group's 36:13	25:15 34:12
facility 5:6 8:1	follow 23:10	32:19 39:3,4	55:23	48:6,16
11:9 14:6	follow-up 32:9	gives 25:6	guess 14:10,14	hear 5:21,24,
22:25 25:23	33:23 35:23,24	goes 30:12	25:16 28:25	25 22:3,12
29:9,21 30:4	following	gone 35:1 38:4	32:9 33:25	32:5,6 41:10
31:1 32:16	10:25 13:18	44:2	49:9,15 53:1	hearing 5:5,7
34:2 54:10	17:25 29:9	good 5:3 8:4	54:18 56:22,23	17:12,21 25:18
fact 13:10	33:24	32:15 53:21	57:7	41:10,16 47:6,
20:21 27:16	forced 54:2	Gordon 6:3	guidelines	7 49:21 53:18
39:4,10 43:22	form 48:19	gotten 49:7	12:12	54:16 56:20
44:1 45:25	forum 20:3	govern 22:19	guilty 15:23	hearings 14:18
factors 21:11	22:13 27:14	governed		Heidi 6:3
57:19	forward 27:23	33:16		here 5:10 6:13,
	52:13 53:19			16 11:1,14,21,
	•	1	•	1

			Inde	ex: heyissue
25 12:13 13:6		including	intended 22:24	intervener 39:9
15:18 16:6	l I	42:23	31:5,8 39:11	interveners
18:7 19:23	idea 32:16	inconsistent	intends 13:5	47:2
20:18,19,24	idea 32.10	35:7	intent 8:1	intervening
21:23 24:22	33:6 37:5 39:5	indicate 14:11,	intention 8:10	29:1 50:15
27:20 29:11,	46:3,5	15	interest 12:11,	intervention
22,23 31:3	identifies 10:2	indicated	15 17:13,17,22	6:9,14 7:4,5
35:16 39:14	30:8	10:21,24 12:25	18:2,3,5,9,21,	8:15 11:25
41:5,19 42:4		14:22 37:12,22	23,24 19:4,5,	12:6 13:18
43:16 44:5,7	identify 23:19	47:2 48:14	21 20:6,9 21:2,	17:3,10 19:1
46:10,16,20	identifying	indicates 25:3	4 25:4,7 27:7	21:19 22:23
47:8,12,19	40:2	29:22	28:23 30:15,17	23:17 24:9
48:14 51:16	immediately	indirect 45:17,	31:21 34:6,9	25:11 27:21
53:8 55:11	13:18	18	35:12 37:18	30:23 32:11
hey 12:1,10	imminent	individual	39:1 42:1 44:9,	34:1,22 36:14,
18:6 19:24	15:22 41:14,	19:20 55:2	22 45:23 48:3	16 37:9 38:14
27:22 29:18	17,23	indulge 21:8	49:13,20	39:23 42:1
35:1 46:2 52:8	impact 12:20	industrial	interested 18:7	43:16,18,20,23
high 40:19	13:3,9,22 19:6	19:20	interesting	46:12,15 47:4,
higher 34:14	23:19,22 25:5,	inevitably	29:2,3	5 49:12,14
highlight 7:10	13 26:3,11,16,	54:24	interests 12:21	50:13,24,25
9:18,22	17,21 27:13	infliction 52:15	19:8 23:21	53:13,15,23,25
highlighted	28:10 30:16	influence 24:8	25:11 38:20	55:9,23 56:3,
9:25 10:22,24	34:18 38:13	information	42:11 43:2	13 57:12,18
20:20	impacted	9:2	46:19	into 8:23 9:24
highlighting	18:25 23:3	initial 51:19	interfered	11:24 13:17
8:25	25:24 26:5	initiate 27:21	15:24	16:22 17:7
highlights 7:12	29:13 33:2,4 35:2	injury 34:11	interpret 53:11	22:14 38:4,10
hinges 53:22		48:5,15,16,18	interpretation	39:16,19 45:14
hit 40:19	impacts 13:2 15:3 27:24	input 17:20	13:21 32:14	54:7 56:25
Holbrook 5:11		22:3	52:18	introduce
28:16,18 36:2,	impair 21:12	inquiry 10:9	interpreted	39:19
3 40:9,10	important	14:3	30:14	inverse 20:4
48:23,24 54:20	15:18 47:9	instance 33:17	interrogatories	involved 10:5
homeowner	importantly	instances	13:20	18:17 27:18
21:25	12:22	33:14,16	intervene	involves 10:3
hope 6:24	impose 45:12	Instead 48:4	11:12 17:22	34:9 48:3
42:23 43:6,7	improper 16:4	instigated	19:10,14 28:10	issue 11:17,21
host 13:20	improvement	43:18,19	29:24 31:18,24	13:22 14:1,4
hundreds	45:24	instructions	33:2 34:23	17:4,8 21:9,21
46:17,19	inaction 57:11	23:11	36:10 37:7,17,	35:21 38:8
hypothetically	inclination	intact 55:23	18 39:6 40:2	42:4,6,8,13
17:20	53:12	intend 9:15	42:10,12,18	46:24 47:15,
Hyrum 15:7	included 25:12	47:15	46:4,22 49:18	16,18 55:6 57:10
41:13			52:7 57:13	37.10

Index: issued..middle

				issueamiaale
issued 13:19	35:4 43:22	8,11 16:24	livelihood	market 12:23
issues 14:7	53:19 54:11	17:3,6 19:3	23:22 25:13	48:15
43:1 49:7,11,	last 5:20 41:16	21:7 23:5	34:11,18 35:6,	marketing
18 50:13 51:23	law 14:15,23	28:16,19 32:4,	12 48:6,15	35:17
53:15,17,18	15:25 16:9,14	7 33:20,23	local 18:16	massive 12:18
54:15 55:5	26:20,21 30:24	35:22 36:2,4,6,	22:20 23:2,4	materials 8:12
56:19 57:14	31:9 35:2 39:1	8 40:5,9,11,13,	29:12,23	16:19
	41:4 56:8	15,18 47:22	32:12,22	Matt 6:3
J	57:23	48:2,20,23,25	33:10,17 45:12	matter 20:4
Jeremy 6:10	lawsuit 34:20	50:1,5,17,23	locating 48:17	39:19 41:2,8
1	laying 56:15	53:14 55:14,18	location 15:1	56:8
jobs 7:25	lays 10:7	57:8	16:12	may 15:3,20
Jordan 5:11	lead 37:24	light 41:17	looking 13:1	18:5,6 26:18
6:15 51:15	leaning 54:17	like 5:4 7:22	32:20 33:8	29:6 37:7
jump 17:7 54:7	least 17:9 20:5	17:7 18:8 19:9	looks 5:3	39:22 43:22
jurisdiction	25:10 29:1	20:3 22:17	loss 11:2	45:17 46:21,22
17:16 32:22	56:16	25:20 30:2	lot 26:15,24	55:16
57:24	leave 55:22	33:23 45:18	44:10	maybe 14:10
		47:6 52:4	loud 53:2	mean 28:22
K	Lee 6:16	likely 23:20	low 28:23,25	31:4 33:4 49:5
keep 14:10	legal 12:11,15	56:1	· ·	52:4 56:13,25
33:5	17:8,13,17	limited 14:4	52:4,19	57:9
	18:3,9,20,21,	23:3 26:10	LUDMA 38:9	
key 57:19	24 19:4,5,8	43:5		means 10:22
kind 20:6 26:23	20:6,19,20	line 8:5 11:23	M	48:12
30:2 37:21	21:2,4 22:7	12:3,18 13:11,	made 12:14	meant 42:8
39:16 53:10	23:21 25:7	23,24 15:8,9,	13:6 18:4	meetings
56:15	27:7 30:15,17	20 16:16	33:25 36:10	56:11
kinds 26:10	31:10 34:6,9	26:14,24 35:3	38:4 40:25	member 5:12
knowing 51:25	42:1 44:9,10,	39:13 42:5	make 7:12 8:1,	35:24 50:18
	11,22,24 45:23	44:15 47:13	18 9:15,19	54:19
L	48:3 49:13,20	48:17 50:6	10:8 16:15	member's
land 15:11,12,	legislative	52:8 53:1	23:25 29:18	23:21,23 25:15
15,24 19:23,24	32:20	55:25	46:15 50:9	members 5:9
20:1 33:7	legislature	lines 18:21	54:2 57:3	7:25 46:17
37:14 43:6	17:15 22:19,		makes 7:7 14:2	mentioned
55:5,6	22,23 31:5,9	26:6 51:25	16:24 32:18	21:15 25:13
landowner	44:1	list 25:12	making 9:4	51:16
	let 5:25 14:11	lists 43:12	34:5 46:18	mere 34:9 48:4
1 12:1/1 22:// 1:7	·	literally 19:25		Merriman 6:11
18:14 33:4,12,	22:9 23:9 24:5	_	57.22	
15 37:6	22:9 23:9 24:5 28:21 48:9	27:5 34:21	57:23	met 38:1 54:9
15 37:6 landowners		27:5 34:21 litigate 47:15	manageable	
15 37:6 landowners 33:2 43:17	28:21 48:9	27:5 34:21 litigate 47:15 litigated 49:19	manageable 46:16	mic 23:10
15 37:6 landowners 33:2 43:17 language	28:21 48:9 50:19	27:5 34:21 litigate 47:15 litigated 49:19 little 9:1 28:24	manageable 46:16 mandated	mic 23:10 microphone
15 37:6 landowners 33:2 43:17 language 17:15 23:14	28:21 48:9 50:19 letters 44:17	27:5 34:21 litigate 47:15 litigated 49:19	manageable 46:16 mandated 52:24	mic 23:10 microphone 5:22
15 37:6 landowners 33:2 43:17 language	28:21 48:9 50:19 letters 44:17 Levar 5:3,15	27:5 34:21 litigate 47:15 litigated 49:19 little 9:1 28:24	manageable 46:16 mandated	mic 23:10 microphone 5:22 middle 35:10
15 37:6 landowners 33:2 43:17 language 17:15 23:14	28:21 48:9 50:19 letters 44:17 Levar 5:3,15 6:5,8,12,17,20	27:5 34:21 litigate 47:15 litigated 49:19 little 9:1 28:24	manageable 46:16 mandated 52:24	mic 23:10 microphone 5:22

Index: might..overall

might 7:13	54:19 55:21,	42:7,20 43:4	noticed 56:11	43:17
8:25 9:5,18	22,24 56:1,2,6,	necessity	notices 13:20	open 51:11
17:23 18:16	12 57:13	15:14 42:5	noting 18:13	55:24
20:3 38:13	motions 5:8	47:13 49:22	nullify 46:12	
52:8	7:1 43:7 49:8	need 21:4 22:6	_	opening 52:2
mile 52:16	50:8,12 54:4		nullity 31:15	operation
	56:17	37:9 49:19	number 29:11	23:20
Millard 20:10,		55:12 56:21	30:6 31:13,14	opinion 8:20
15 45:2,3,4,11,	Mountain 6:2,4	needed 10:11	43:13	30:16 35:6
16 46:11 57:16	7:3 8:10 11:16,	11:19 14:6		54:10
mind 19:3	18,22 12:10,17	15:13	0	opinions 11:5
55:14	13:8 16:10	negate 43:24	objection 9:6	opponent 8:22
mindful 8:3	19:8 27:12	negative 23:22	17:6 50:14	opportunity
minute 24:6	38:22 41:10	25:13	objections	50:8
27:22	44:15 45:3	negotiated	10:25 54:15	opposed 48:8
minutes 7:10	mountaintop	38:21		53:17
modification	12:19	neighbor 18:15	obligation	opposition
33:11	move 6:1 7:14	26:8,15 28:4	46:12	23:15 24:12,14
modify 33:18	11:23 12:3	neighboring	observations	oppression
moment 24:19	16:22 43:10	11:8 27:18	6:24	15:23 16:5
47:25 48:9	44:15 50:20	neighbors	observing 6:23	option 21:18,
money 19:19	57:13,21	26:25 55:6	obtain 38:25	19
20:18 45:16,18	moving 27:23	neighbors'	obtained 39:1	options 55:15,
more 19:19	much 45:12	18:15	obviously 7:2,	20,25
21:8 30:1 34:9	multiparty	neither 36:24	11 24:11 40:20	order 9:21,22
48:3 52:23	39:16	never 18:20	offer 31:11,12	10:19,21 13:1
morning 5:3	multiple 55:25	32:11	Office 6:22	15:16 24:12
Moscon 6:3	must 34:10	new 9:3,15	often 38:10	31:10 39:7
	48:4	41:4,10	once 51:13	53:6
7:9,15,21 9:10, 14 17:2,5,24	mutually 16:13	•	one 5:12,16	
19:12 21:22	matauny 10.10	next 11:11	11:1,13 12:4	orderly 26:20 54:13
	N N	26:16 27:9	14:19,20 18:4,	
23:7,12,25		36:9,14 48:17	12,13 20:8	ordinance
24:4,10,16,18,	name 5:19 6:18	51:7 56:10,18	21:8 24:1,23	13:11
21 25:16 29:8	narrow 39:5	57:7	25:3 29:3,11	organized
31:3 32:8,14	47:24 52:25	next-door	30:6 31:13	22:18
34:17 36:21	53:8	26:8,15	32:21 33:23	otherwise
37:4,11,22	near 48:2	noise 12:20	43:14 46:3,18	26:13
49:2 57:1	nearly 11:24	none 50:19	47:22 51:17	outcome 17:23
most 10:2 43:5	43:8	Northern 15:7	54:23 57:25	19:7 44:23
56:1	necessarily	note 5:17 8:4,	ones 38:21	outside 38:5
motion 7:3,9	8:10 20:2	14 47:9	only 8:8 9:22	over 12:19
23:15 24:15	27:17 29:25	noted 10:4	21:18 22:4,16	14:8 20:12
29:3 36:10,12,	31:24 57:18	29:3	26:21 28:14	38:18,19 46:1
14,16 41:2,6	necessary	nothing 9:3	30:1,21 32:25	51:21 57:4
50:23 51:2,3,5,	15:15 22:5	41:25 44:6	33:16 41:3	overall 55:7
9,10 53:23			33.10 41.3	

Index: overly..properties

				yproperties
overly 8:2	20:10 22:4,16,	51:19,20 53:13	potential 19:5	procedure 7:8
own 20:23 30:7	19,24 23:3	55:17	28:25 30:22	39:14
53:12 55:18	25:4 26:9,21	Petitioner's	49:3 52:6,15	procedures
owner 16:8	27:18 30:8,21,	24:14	53:17,21 55:15	46:14 47:11
25:23 26:23	22 31:1 32:25	philosophy	potentially	49:24 51:1,4
29:14,20 30:25	34:25 35:13	32:16	31:2 52:8	55:19 56:7
52:14	38:14 45:25	phone 5:16,17,	power 6:2,4	57:15
owners 15:1	46:23 47:3	21,24,25 32:5	8:10 10:15	proceeding
25:20 26:11	53:20	53:3	11:22 12:10,17	8:2,21 11:18
owning 33:7	party 5:16 12:7	phrase 17:16,	13:8 15:8,22	13:15 16:20
	13:6 17:19	17	16:10,11 19:8	17:14 19:15,22
P	20:22 21:1	physically 5:10	23:20 26:3,24	21:13,19
l ———	22:6,10,14	picks 15:1	27:12 35:10	22:15,17 27:25
pages 9:4,16	27:15 28:10	place 5:5	37:25 38:11,22	29:1,7 39:12
10:20 33:6	29:24 32:10	•	41:11 44:15	40:3 42:17
papers 12:10	33:13,15 37:5,	plain 43:22	45:3 48:17	43:19,23,25
29:4 53:5	10 40:3,4	planning 54:22	Power's 7:3	50:10 53:21
paragraph	50:10	plant 35:10	11:16,18 13:8	54:3,5
47:23 48:3	passed 46:23	plant's 23:20	precedent	proceedings
parallel 12:19	path 56:16	point 7:14 8:24	52:12	5:1 22:25
part 9:15 10:19	payer 19:15	10:8,14 14:12	_	34:24 43:13,18
15:18 21:10	20:8	16:25 20:11	precipitating 13:16	44:2,3,23
43:5 54:13		21:17,23 23:8		45:10,15 47:4
55:4	pending 49:7	28:9 29:9	preferable 7:16	54:14 56:4
partially 45:7	56:17,19	36:22 40:15	preferred 57:4	process 27:17,
participant	people 5:20	41:7 44:2 49:9	preliminary	22 31:20 36:24
29:14	8:16 9:4 46:1,	50:16 57:7	41:2,8	
participate	3,10,20	pointed 22:21	present 5:9	prohibited
22:10 45:6	perhaps 20:1	points 7:10	pretty 28:23	10:17
47:2,6,7	permission	8:25 9:18	52:4,19,25	Project 10:11
1 ' '	19:19 22:16	40:19	previous 9:21	Promontory
participated	permit 20:21	pole 26:3,14	10:21 14:18	6:13,16 16:9
21:16	person 21:24	27:6 35:10	25:17 50:24	36:10 37:5
participating	26:16	policy 51:18	56:17	40:7 43:6
5:16	personal 54:10	52:11	previously	44:14 46:21
participation	55:19	posed 20:8	11:4 54:1	_50:15
21:15 47:1	personally	position 8:15	56:15	Promontory's
particular	19:17	10:14 11:5	prior 39:7 53:6	38:18 43:21
23:14,23 25:14	perspective	21:21 28:12	private 14:16	57:13
53:5	34:16 54:21	29:6 30:3,13,	22:24 30:8	proper 14:13
particularized	pertains 55:6	21 31:22 32:10	32:10 35:13	20:3 21:1 39:7,
34:11 48:5	pertinent 51:24	34:3 42:21	probably 7:7	21 41:3,6
partied 8:22	55:11	56:21	16:24	properly 11:1
parties 8:11	petition 11:12,	positions 37:1	problem 21:14	40:2
13:16 14:16	16 18:13 19:17	•	problems 8:17	properties
16:12,15 19:9	24:9 42:4	possible 17:19	12:5	12:24 38:24
	21.0 12.7		12.0	
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>

Index: property..Reutzel's

			Index: proper	
property 11:2,	provisions	quickly 41:20	55:21	reply 12:9,14
8 12:19,23	44:4	46:25	reconsideratio	report 8:4
13:4,10 14:25	public 6:21	quote 48:12	n 7:3 18:13	reporter 5:18
16:7 18:16	14:25 15:13	quoted 28:6	23:16 24:15	represented
19:6 20:24	21:17 32:23		36:12 55:17	25:10 43:9
23:22 25:5,14,	41:24	R	record 9:3,13,	46:18
20,23,24,25	pull 42:3	raise 19:17	15,17 33:8	requested
26:2,5,11,22	pulled 41:19	raised 17:15	51:14	27:12
27:6,8,13,24	48:11	21:10 27:3	recover 45:7	requests 13:19
28:3,8,11,12	pump 26:4	28:24	recreational	38:3 47:18
29:13,20 30:25	purpose 8:20		23:24 25:15	require 12:21
31:17,21,23	16:5 31:25	rate 19:8,14,15	refer 7:4,6	required 27:15
34:12,18,19	purposes 5:18	20:8	referenced	56:4
35:1,6,11,12,	15:16 54:3	rates 19:17	29:8 37:4	residential
15,20 38:18,	purview 56:23	rather 9:3 10:5	referred 30:1	48:18
19,20,21,23	put 13:23 16:2	11:21 46:13	refers 33:3	resolve 23:1
42:11,15,17,25	18:12 26:3,4,	rationale 26:12	regularly 19:10	32:22
44:16,22	14 27:10 29:19	read 40:1,20	regulated	Resources
45:19,22,24,25	41:11,18	42:23 43:6,7	37:14 38:11	19:10
46:6 48:6,8,16,	putting 19:25	47:17 52:4	reiterate 40:25	respect 17:12
19 52:14,16	25:19 35:9,16	53:4 57:15	51:18	36:11 38:7
54:25 55:3,10	,	reading 55:19	reject 39:8	50:7,9 51:6,10,
proportionality	Q Q	56:7	rejected 41:21	21 54:11 55:20
57:19		ready 5:4	related 43:1	56:6 57:1,19
proposed 31:1	quality 25:7	real 46:24	48:17	respective
37:24 54:6	question 12:1	reality 45:8	relates 21:14	12:24
proposition	14:22 15:5,9,	really 12:11	53:7	respond 12:13
17:25 25:22	10,12 21:8	16:20 21:1	relation 55:4	25:17
45:1	23:9 25:2 27:3	22:7,15 37:12	relevance	Respondent
protection	28:15,21 30:2,	41:3 42:6	17:12,16 49:3,	15:19
31:11,12	5,6 32:10	44:19 47:18	4,11 53:17	response
Protective	33:24 34:1	reason 16:7	57:17,18	12:16 21:17,20
24:12	47:23,24 53:8	19:13 22:11	relevant 10:17	rest 23:6 25:24
protects 13:11	54:7 57:9	26:12 37:8	11:5 13:25	26:5
provide 10:12	questions 7:13	42:10,12	14:3 17:21	result 17:18
11:19 22:12	8:11 14:11	reasons 17:25	41:22	38:13 45:9
37:25	16:22,25 17:7	23:16 39:20	reliable 10:12	56:1
provided 39:3	23:6,7 28:17,	recent 10:2	11:20 13:7,25	results 51:8
provides 33:2	20 32:7 33:20	recognize 7:24	37:25	57:11
43:16,17 49:17	35:23,24 36:1,	16:6 51:20	relief 37:21	Reutzel 6:10
providing	3,5 40:6,8,10,	recognized	38:12,13	9:7 40:18,23
21:16	12,14 47:21	23:21	remaining 26:1	48:1,9 49:16
provision	48:21,22,24	reconsider	_	50:2
29:13 40:1	50:2,3,18	39:7 41:3,6	remedy 36:23, 24 38:14 39:2	Reutzel's
47:5	quick 47:23	50:23 53:12	42:16	51:21
			42.10	01.21
1	1	1	1	1

Index: Review..standing

				newstanding
Review 5:6 8:2	42:7 54:5,6	16,17	settled 45:9	snippet 42:3
10:1 22:25	routes 57:25	says 10:8 12:1,	seven 24:3,12	solar 38:19
29:10,21 30:4	rule 15:21 16:9	4 20:24 26:7,	54:22	solely 17:3
32:16 34:2	25:19 26:20	13 29:11 31:19	several 5:7 7:1	somehow
54:10	31:19	32:21 33:9	9:12,16 46:17	41:14
reviewed 16:18	ruled 20:15	34:9 41:20	severance	someone 25:6
53:5	rules 22:23	43:11 44:6	26:1,23 34:25	33:7 39:6
reviewing	29:25	45:22 48:3	Sevier 23:13,	something
55:15	ruling 10:2	scenarios	18 25:9 28:22	9:12 12:2 22:1
rhetorical 42:5	20:23 28:5	32:19	34:8 35:4,19	29:2,3,4,16
Ridge 50:15	31:16	schedule 56:5	38:9 45:20	somewhere
ridge- 13:10	run 38:10	scope 10:1,9	47:24 49:4,14	12:3 14:7
rights 19:1	Ryan 6:10	38:5 54:3,4	52:3 53:10,19	25:23 35:14
32:11 34:23		55:3 56:22	57:16	sorry 6:18
35:20 38:8	s	seat 20:13	shed 41:17	24:16
39:23 42:15,17		seated 7:17	short 53:1	sort 42:16
46:12,15	safe 10:12	second 21:10	should 11:22	sorts 44:18
ripe 54:6	11:20 13:7,24	41:9 54:13	16:2,16 21:22,	sought 15:13
road 26:17,18,	37:24	section 32:25	23 24:8 46:14	speak 5:17
24 35:14	safety 12:20	seek 26:9	shouldn't	18:8 31:7
Rock 6:9 7:5	48:17	37:22	22:11	51:13
8:15 11:13,14	said 6:18 9:14	seeking 12:18	show 41:18	speaking 5:19
12:6,9,21 13:5,	13:12 15:20	33:10,17	shown 15:14	speaks 37:23
19 18:19 19:4,	18:2 19:24	38:14,16 39:18	41:9	•
24 20:20 21:16	23:1 28:7 29:2,	seem 34:13	sides 7:11	specific 23:19
36:13,16 37:2,	4 35:3 36:21	seemed 52:19	Sierra 19:9	26:24 30:1
10,16,21 38:4,	41:16 42:13	seems 17:9	simply 8:19	46:3 54:8
16,24 39:8,18	43:21 45:3	34:5,14 52:4	14:5,15 15:14	specifically
40:4 50:15,25	46:2,11 52:17	53:9 54:9	18:1 39:15	33:6 51:23
55:23	sake 29:5			54:25
Rock's 56:13	same 10:19	seen 13:18 44:11	since 5:15 7:9 16:12 50:9	specifics 14:13
57:12	22:11 46:18,19			16:22
Rocky 6:2,4	sat 54:22	segment 42:20	56:10	spend 12:21
7:2 8:10 11:16,	satisfied 30:18	43:3 49:23	single 44:24	20:16
18,22 12:9,17	say 8:8 11:16	selection	sir 5:14 33:22	stake 30:18
13:8 16:10	12:10 18:1,6,	15:24	sit 31:3	35:7,13
19:8 27:12	18,23 19:16	selling 35:18	sitting 6:23	standard
38:22 41:10	21:3 22:12	sense 7:7 14:2	situation 10:3	17:10,11 34:14
44:14 45:3	24:25 27:2,11,	16:25	20:5 38:11	42:19 44:12
role 8:21,22	13,22 29:13,17	service 10:13	skipped 10:20	47:12 53:16,23
12:6 13:15	32:24 33:4	11:21 14:25	slightly 54:21	54:8,9
room 5:10,20	35:1,5,14 42:4,	Services 6:22	slippery 46:7	standards 38:1
rounds 8:7	6,8,14 45:23	set 37:12 44:25	52:10 54:12	47:10 49:4,23
route 11:23	saying 12:1	52:19	slope 46:7	standing 12:12
	44:17 49:12,	sets 28:23	52:11 54:12	22:8 52:7
37:24 41:22				
-				

Index: standpoint..UAPA

otondnoint	44.4	00.0 40 04.40	their 11:14	anapointUAPA
standpoint	44:4	22:3,13 24:13,		51:10 56:16
52:12	submitted	19 30:3,13	12:10,19,22,23	57:21
stands 25:21	44:17,18	48:9 51:9	13:21,22 16:3	Tooele 10:4
35:19 56:18	subpoenas	taken 11:5	17:22 18:14,15	28:7
57:5	13:19	18:11 34:20	19:6,16 21:17	took 21:21
start 5:19	substantial	takes 51:5 56:6	23:15 24:12	topic 14:13
27:25	10:10 12:22	taking 7:24	25:25 26:22	topics 13:21
state 5:18	37:18	28:12 31:22	27:5,6,8 28:11	touch 38:24
18:17 22:2	substantially	34:3 35:15	31:21 37:19	transmission
30:14 43:12	12:17 17:14,18	talk 5:22 10:21	41:11,18 45:17	10:11 11:23
44:6 45:10,13	18:3,25 21:12	12:2,3 13:7,9	52:15 56:23	12:18 18:21
stated 15:10	substation	18:18 45:2,20	theory 30:20,	26:14 44:15
STATEMENT	26:4	47:14	24	tribunal 31:12
7:20 36:18	succinct 53:4	talked 18:1	therefore	tribunals 31:11
40:22	such 11:7	41:12 43:7	10:24 18:22	true 45:7
states 37:5	23:22	45:21	27:15	try 5:23 40:24
statute 10:7	sudden 16:14	talking 35:5,8	thin 38:17	trying 38:25
17:25 19:2	sufficiently	39:14 42:2	thing 11:11	39:2 52:21
22:18 29:9	34:11 48:5	47:11,12	30:3	turn 10:18
33:3,5,12,16	suggest 39:21	49:19,21	things 9:23	11:11 13:5
34:2 37:3,11,	41:13	talks 39:13	10:22 11:7	56:18
20,23 39:3,4,	suggesting	target 33:11,18	13:12 18:2,12	turned 24:11
12 42:1 51:6	32:15	tasked 52:1	21:3 25:4,12,	turns 10:7
statutes 32:18	summarize	tax 20:14,18	22 29:10	TV 15:7
39:22 44:11	57:10	45:12,13,15	thinking 24:8	two 8:6 18:2
statutory 17:10	Summit 13:23,	taxes 20:14,17	31:7 53:2 57:5	22:16,19 29:10
stay 7:16	24	45:6,8,10	thought 9:17	31:13,14
still 17:21	sums 12:22	telegraph 15:9,	52:5	32:18,25 42:9
18:23 19:1	supplied 16:19	20	thoughts 22:13	46:20 49:11
30:12,14,18	support 44:25	telephone 5:12	three 11:14	Tyler 6:7
50:6 54:17	Supreme 15:9	14:20	through 8:6	type 10:16
stop 26:19	41:20	ten 39:17	24:22	30:22 36:25
straight- 53:18	sustained	terms 7:7 12:6	throw 28:5	37:1
street 35:14	23:18	28:25 31:7	ties 8:23	37.1
struggling	swallow 5:21	37:23 48:16	time 5:5,20	U
51:16 55:8,13	23:10	49:2 51:17	7:24 8:3,8	
study 29:17	synonymous	54:13 56:16	28:18 31:20	UAPA 12:12
33:11,18	34:6,13	test 21:10	32:1 35:17,18	22:22 25:7
Sub 33:9	J T .U, IJ	53:10 54:13	39:13 41:9	29:2,5,6,25
subdivision	T	Thad 53:14	51:25 53:1,9	30:23 31:19
22:1 34:22		than 9:4 10:5	55:16,25 56:20	34:5 39:22
subdivisions	table 20:13	17:11 34:9,19	today 5:10,23	42:18 43:11,
34:24	tailored 51:22	39:18 48:4	6:23 7:2,6	12,13 44:4,5,8
subject 11:9	take 7:10 8:8	54:6	40:25 41:12,19	49:5,14 52:18
18:11 34:20	11:6 15:15		42:2 49:19	54:9,13
10.11.01.20				
	1	1	I	I

			Index: U	JAPA'Szoning
UAPA'S 30:10,	51:4 52:18	24:7 31:17,22,	weeks 51:19	words 21:13
12 43:24	utilities 6:22	23	weighed 36:12	work 8:5 15:14
ultimate 53:22	16:2 22:20	viewshed	Western 19:10	16:13
ultimately	23:2,4 25:19	38:18	whatever	wrong 24:11
49:13	29:12,20 32:23	viewsheds	26:25 57:11	
under 12:12	utility 5:6	11:2	whether 10:10	Υ
19:2 25:7	10:13 14:17,24	violate 31:19	11:22 12:3	years 39:17
26:20 27:12	15:1,4 16:21	violated 13:12	13:2 14:6	54:22
29:2 30:20,23	21:25 29:17,	virtually 19:13	15:10,12 19:19	yet 49:7
31:12 42:18	18,23 32:13	virtue 11:9	21:12,24 25:6	you 40.7
49:4,5,14 51:1,	37:15 38:2	voice 27:14	30:23 37:23	z
3 52:3 53:23	55:13	voiced 51:19	41:22 42:19	
56:24 57:2		voices 22:4	43:3 44:8	zone 29:18
understand	V	vote 53:13	49:20,21 54:4	zoning 55:5
24:6 25:2 46:7,	valuable 6:24		57:23	
8,10 56:14	value 11:3	W	while 7:17	
understanding	13:4,22 25:5	Wester 0:45 40	39:22 43:15	
19:13 31:9	26:2,22 27:1	Wade 6:15,19	57:17	
32:13 57:8	28:9,11,13	wait 6:17 27:22	White 5:11	
understood	31:17,21 35:1	want 7:12 8:9,	28:19,21 30:20	
24:25	44:21 52:16	14,18 10:8	32:2 36:4,5	
undoubtedly	55:10	12:2 13:9	40:11,12 48:25	
44:16	values 11:9	14:15 24:6,19 29:18 36:9,15	49:1,25 51:14,	
units 48:18	12:23 13:10	37:17 40:19	15 55:14 56:14	
unless 7:8	19:6 20:25	43:10 45:2,20	57:9	
15:21 16:3	23:23 25:14	46:25 47:14	whole 46:9	
unopposed	31:23 34:12	50:9	will 9:20 10:19	
19:11 57:14	42:25 44:22	wanted 9:22	11:6 12:16,20,	
unusual 16:8	45:19 48:6,8,	38:7	21,22 15:24	
31:6	19 54:25 55:4,	wanting 37:21	18:3 38:1	
unworkable	11	Wasatch 6:6,7	41:17 43:6,7 44:16 45:6	
53:9	verbal 21:20	8:6 11:24	51:18	
upgraded 52:8	verbally 36:15	27:19 42:20	Williams 15:7	
upper 24:17	vested 18:10,	43:3 47:1,10,	41:12	
use 37:14	14,20 27:7,9	13 49:22 50:14	Wilson 5:13,14	
41:24 47:12	28:3 30:17	waste 31:20	32:4,6,9 33:19,	
48:7 55:5,6	31:10,14 34:6,	32:1	21,22 36:6,7	
used 10:25	13,14 35:19	water 26:4	40:13,14 50:1,	
17:15,17	38:8 44:10,11	way 7:6 9:1	3	
using 41:23	view 13:2,11	24:10 25:16	without 8:7	
Utah 5:6 14:15,	28:8 55:20	27:10 35:3	55:10 57:22	
24 15:7,9,25	57:10	37:25 38:22,24	wonder 23:12	
16:14 19:9	viewpoint 17:8	week 51:8	word 48:8	
26:21 31:9	views 11:7	56:10	11010 TO.0	
35:2 43:15	18:6,20 20:25			