## **ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER**

VS

## **MIDWAY CITY**

Docket No. 20-035-03

# PUBLIC HEARING

March 31, 2020

**ADVANCED REPORTING SOLUTIONS** 

801-746-5080 | office@advancedrep.com | advancedrep.com SALT LAKE | 159 West Broadway, Broadway Lofts, Suite 100 | Salt Lake City, Utah 84101 PROVO | 3507 North University Avenue, Suite 350-D | Provo, Utah 84604 ST. GEORGE | 20 North Main Street, Suite 301 | St. George, Utah 84770



	Public Hearing March 31, 2020
1	
2	
3	
4	PUBLIC HEARING DOCKET NO. 20-035-03
5	STATE CONTRACT #MA2908
6	ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER, PETITIONER,
7	VS. MIDWAY CITY, RESPONDENT
8	HEARING ON INTERVENTION REQUEST AND ELECTRONIC MEETINGS
9	UTAH UTILITY FACILITY REVIEW BOARD
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	Taken on March 31, 2020
15	At 10:00 a.m.
16	
17	Via teleconference
18	At ADVANCED REPORTING SOLUTIONS 159 West Broadway
19	Broadway Lofts, Suite 100 Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
20	Sare Lake crey, scan stror
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	Reported by: Deirdre Rand, RPR, CSR, CCR

		i ugo
1	APPEARANCES	
2		
3	Public Service Commission:	
4	THAD LEVAR, CHAIR	
5	DAVID R. CLARK, BOARD MEMBER JORDAN A. WHITE, BOARD MEMBER	
6	TROY FITZGERALD, BOARD MEMBER GLENN J. WRIGHT, BOARD MEMBER	
7		
8	Rocky Mountain Power:	
9	HEIDI GORDON BRET REICH	
10	BREI REICH	
11	Midway City: CORBIN B. GORDON	
12	JOSHUA D. JEWKES	
13	Valley-Wide Opposition to	
14	Large Transmission Lines (V.O.L.T.) MARK O. MORRIS	
15	ELIZABETH BRERETON	
16		
17		
18	-00000-	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

	Public Hearing March 31, 2020	Page 3
1	INDEX	
2	AGENDA ITEM	PAGE
3	INTERVENTION REQUEST	
4	Statement by V.O.L.T	9
5	Statement by Midway City	28
6	Statement by Rocky Mountain Power	30
7	Reply Statement by V.O.L.T	48
8	Discussion by the Board	49
9	Vote taken by the Board	55
10	Discussion by the Board	57
11	Vote taken by the Board	65
12	ELECTRONIC MEETINGS	
13	Discussion by the Board	66
14	Vote taken by the Board	69
15	HEARING SCHEDULED FOR APRIL 20, 2020	
16	Discussion by the Board	69
17	Vote taken by the Board	82
18		
19	-00000-	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Public Hearing March 31, 2020 Page 4 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 3 CHAIR LEVAR: This is the hearing for the 4 Utility Facility Review Board scheduled for today, March 31, 2020, in Docket 20-035-03, Rocky Mountain Power 5 6 versus Midway City. My name is Thad LeVar. And the other four 7 board members, David R. Clark, Troy Fitzgerald, Jordan 8 9 A. White, and Glenn J. Wright, are all confirmed to be 10 on the call. 11 We will take appearances from others in just a 12 moment. 13 We have, in our notices of today's hearing, 14 identified three issues that we will address today: The 15 petition to intervene by V.O.L.T.; a rule filing that 16 the board could publish on electronic meetings, and we 17 can discuss that further when we get to that point; and 18 then a decision on the hearing that's currently 19 scheduled for April 20th, how to conduct that. 20 So I think we'll start first with the 21 intervention, though, which was the original issue this 22 hearing was scheduled for. 23 Just a couple of reminders. Please mute your 24 phone when you're not speaking, unmute it when you need 25 to start speaking. Identify yourself when you begin

1	speaking so the court reporter can have a transcript
2	that accurately reflects today's hearing. And please
3	try to speak slowly, because it is a little more
4	challenging where the court reporter cannot see each of
5	us as she is preparing the transcript.
6	So why don't we next go to appearances. Who
7	do we have on the line for Rocky Mountain Power?
8	MR. REICH: Yeah, good morning. This is Bret
9	Reich. I'm an attorney with Rocky Mountain Power,
10	representing Rocky Mountain Power.
11	MS. HEIDI GORDON: This is Heidi Gordon with
12	Fabian VanCott for Rocky Mountain Power.
13	CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Thank you.
14	For Midway City who do we have on the line
15	for Midway City?
16	MR. CORBIN GORDON: Corbin Gordon and Joshua
17	Jewkes.
18	CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Thank you.
19	And then for Valley-Wide Opposition Large
20	Transmission Lines.
21	MR. MORRIS: Good morning, Mr. Chairman. My
22	name is Mark Morris, and with me is Elizabeth Brereton.
23	Liz, if you could just speak up to let us know
24	you're still on.
25	MS. BRERETON: This is Liz Brereton on behalf

of V.O.L.T.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Thank you.

And then just a reminder. As you speak -since we have two attorneys for each of the three participants today, we'll ask that when you speak, you still identify which one you are and who you're speaking on behalf of.

8 And it seems to me that since our first issue 9 today is the petition to intervene by Valley-Wide 10 Opposition to Large Transmission Lines, we should let 11 Mr. Morris or Ms. Brereton start.

12 And, you know, we've received your petition. 13 It's safe to assume all the board members have read your 14 petition and Rocky Mountain Power's opposition. So you 15 don't need to repeat everything you've already given to 16 us in writing, but if you want to take a few minutes and 17 highlight any issues, and then we'll see if any board 18 members have any questions for you, and then we'll move 19 to the other paries.

20 So why don't we start with Mr. Morris or 21 Ms. Brereton.

MR. MORRIS: Thank you very much. This isMr. Morris on behalf of V.O.L.T.

We also filed last night our reply memorandum
in support --

Dogo T	7
Page /	

1 I'm having a hard time hearing THE REPORTER: 2 This is the court reporter. Could you you, Mr. Morris. 3 please speak up? 4 MR. MORRIS: Yes, I will. Is that any better? THE REPORTER: That is much better. 5 Thank 6 you. Okay. Thank you. 7 MR. MORRIS: We also filed a reply memorandum. 8 Candidly, we were surprised that Rocky Mountain Power opposed our 9 10 position, but -- although we had a constricted timeframe 11 in which to file a reply memorandum, we did that 12 vesterday. 13 Could I ask if the board members have had a 14 chance to review what we filed yesterday, the reply 15 memorandum? 16 CHAIR LEVAR: This is Thad LeVar. I have not 17 received that reply memorandum. If it was filed late 18 yesterday, it possibly has not yet been distributed 19 through our email service list. It's not posted to our 20 docket, and I haven't received it through our normal distribution list. 21 22 So the short answer is, no, we don't have that 23 in front of us. And I think it's safe to say that other 24 board members may not, but if any other board member 25 does have it in front of you, please let us all know.

Pag	e	8
i au		U.

This is Liz Brereton 1 MS. BRERETON: 2 representing V.O.L.T. I am looking at my email, and --3 my assistant received an e-mail this morning stating that the Commission had received the briefing, but there 4 was an issue with uploading it through a link that we 5 had provided, because the file was too large to be sent 6 via email. 7 So perhaps the best way to 8 MR. MORRIS: 9 proceed is to at least advise the board that this is --10 this was filed -- we did file, and we have served it on 11 other parties. I presume they received the email and 12 the means by which to download the information and 13 view it. 14 The reason it was so large primarily is 15 because of Rocky Mountain's claim that V.O.L.T. wasn't 16 authorized or could not act on behalf of affected 17 landowners here. And so in support of the petition, we 18 filed 50-something declarations from landowners, 19 including the 10 or 11 landowners that Rocky Mountain 20 claims are the only people affected by this line. And so that's the reason for the substantial 21 22 nature of the filing, because we were forced by Rocky 23 Mountain to satisfy their apparent concern that V.O.L.T. 24 did not represent the interests of affected landowners. 25

I'm happy to proceed with the arguments that

1	we now have responded to on behalf of V.O.L.T. It will
2	be summarizing our reply memorandum. But I guess I
3	would ask the board to take our petition for
4	intervention under advisement until you have had an
5	opportunity to review the substantial materials we were
6	forced to file yesterday to respond to the claims that
7	Rocky Mountain was making in opposition to the petition.
8	CHAIR LEVAR: Okay, this is Thad LeVar. I'll
9	just jump in.
10	Why don't we go ahead this way. You know, it
11	looks like the written materials are being distributed
12	to board members as we speak. Considering our timeframe
13	in this docket, considering that our hearing is
14	scheduled to start the hearing on the merits three
15	weeks from yesterday on a schedule that probably legally
16	cannot be adjusted, why don't we go ahead and let you
17	summarize your arguments for us verbally here, and then
18	we'll move to questions, then we'll hear from the other
19	parties, and then we will discuss as a board our path
20	forward.
21	So why don't you go ahead and give us any
22	high-level summary you would like to of your arguments.
23	MR. MORRIS: Thank you very much. Yeah, and
24	this is Mr. Morris on behalf of V.O.L.T.
25	So there are two independent bases,

1	statutorily, by which this board could grant the
2	petition for intervention. The first is under Section
3	54-14-303 sub (2)(b), which states that a potentially
4	affected landowner, as defined in 54-18-102, or affected
5	entity, as defined in that same section, shall have a
6	right to intervene as a party in a proceeding.
7	Section let's see 63G and let me get
8	that in front of me. Section 63G-4-207 also states that
9	a person not a party may file a signed, written petition
10	to intervene, and that the presiding officer shall grant
11	the petition if the presiding officer determines that
12	the petitioner's legal interest may be substantially
13	affected by the formal adjudicative proceeding and the
14	interests of justice and the orderly and prompt conduct
15	of the adjudicative proceedings will not
16	THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, you cut out. This
17	is the court reporter. I'm sorry, could you start
18	after, "may be substantially affected," and go over that
19	one more time, please?
20	MR. MORRIS: Yes. I will slow down. I'm
21	sorry.
22	THE REPORTER: Well, the volume dropped down
23	and I missed a couple of words, so I just want to make
24	sure I'm getting it correct.
25	MR. MORRIS: Okay. Thank you.

1	So the phrasing of the statute is "may be
2	substantially affected by the formal adjudicative
3	proceeding, and the interests of justice and the orderly
4	and prompt conduct of the adjudicative proceedings will
5	not be materially impaired by allowing the
6	intervention."
7	I submit that V.O.L.T. qualifies under
8	either or actually under both statutory schemes as a
9	party that the board should permit to intervene and
10	participate in these proceedings.
11	Historically, V.O.L.T. was formed two years
12	ago, when the citizens of Midway City and other citizens
13	in Wasatch County learned that Rocky Mountain Power was
14	intending to place these towering, high-voltage lines
15	through the valley, and had entered into this agreement
16	with Heber Light & Power.
17	V.O.L.T. now while it originally
18	represented many interests across all of Wasatch County,
19	V.O.L.T. now is more particularly concerned with the
20	mile or so that is proposed to go through Midway.
21	V.O.L.T. is a collection of citizens who have
22	concerns about the substantial impact these lines are
23	going to have on the value of their properties and on
24	the aesthetic in Midway, and have very kindly offered to
25	facilitate going underground by doing things such as

charging nothing for any additional easement that may go 1 2 through their property. They have also come out of 3 pocket and are in the process of making donations and 4 collections to assist financially in this effort. V.O.L.T., for years now, not just months, has 5 6 been very concerned with the claims that Rocky Mountain Power has made and is making that it essentially does 7 not need any new easements in order to construct higher 8 9 towers with greater voltage running through these 10 people's yards, in some cases, literally. And so this collection of people have formed a 11 12 nonprofit entity that is a legally recognized, separate 13 and distinct legal entity, who, in fact, does represent 14 these landowners and has proceeded to represent them to 15 the extent that last fall Midway, in granting the 16 conditional-use permit, put conditions on there that 17 specifically reference V.O.L.T. and gave V.O.L.T. the 18 opportunity to acquire more in donations and more in 19 money to facilitate any added expense that would be 20 incurred to take these lines underground rather than 21 overhead, and recognized the fact that these easements 22 that would be necessary would have no charge and would 23 not add an additional economic burden.

24 V.O.L.T. joins with Midway in recognizing that25 Rocky Mountain has not provided adequate cost

When Rocky Mountain opposed the petition 1 information. 2 to intervene, it was our understanding that Rocky 3 Mountain had not yet even provided final bids. It had 4 some initial or preliminary numbers, but that the requirements that it provide copies of hard bids for 5 6 going underground rather than overhead was not met, because those final bids -- at least as of a week ago 7 when I spoke with Mr. Gordon, the attorney for Midway, 8 9 these bids had not yet been provided by Rocky Mountain. 10 And so V.O.L.T. shares Midway's concerns, and 11 there is no one better suited than V.O.L.T. to present 12 evidence at the hearing on -- later this month or later 13 in April concerning the impact that these lines are 14 going to have on the individual landowners in Midway 15 along this corridor. 16 The statutory requirements here are met. The individuals behind V.O.L.T. are affected landowners. 17 18 And the standard set forth in Section 63G that the 19 interest of justice and the orderly and prompt conduct 20 of these proceedings will not be materially impaired by 21 allowing V.O.L.T. to participate. 22 V.O.L.T. is represented by counsel. It's not going to be a free-for-all. But we expect to be able to 23 24 participate in the orderly presentation of evidence in

> Advanced Reporting Solutions 801-746-5080

support of Midway and in opposition to Rocky Mountain's

25

1	petition, and also to cross-examine and to allow this
2	board to have all of the evidence fairly aired at the
3	hearing.
4	So, Liz, is there anything else that we should
5	do from a high level here before they review the
б	paperwork we filed yesterday?
7	MS. BRERETON: This is Liz Brereton.
8	No, I think that covers it. V.O.L.T. worked
9	very hard to collect the 50 petitions from its members
10	who are also affected landowners, and in your review of
11	the briefing, I'd ask you to consider I'd ask the
12	Commission to consider those.
13	CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Thank you. This is Thad
14	LeVar.
15	I think where we'll go forward now is, I had
16	one question for V.O.L.T., and then I'll see if other
17	board members have questions before we go to other
18	participants.
19	The only question I wanted to ask at this
20	point is, what's your position on the assertion made by
21	Rocky Mountain Power that if V.O.L.T. were granted
22	intervention and if Rocky Mountain Power and Midway were
23	to come to some kind of a settlement agreement and
24	again, that's a hypothetical, but it's a hypothetical
25	raised by Rocky Mountain Power in their response to your

1	intervention motion what would you view as V.O.L.T.'s
2	role with respect to any potential settlement or
3	agreement between Rocky Mountain Power and Midway City?
4	MR. MORRIS: This is Mark Morris on behalf of
5	V.O.L.T. I believe that V.O.L.T. would ideally need to
6	be a part of that settlement agreement, because V.O.L.T.
7	was made a party to the conditional-use permit by Midway
8	City when it placed conditions on going underground that
9	included obligations that V.O.L.T. and its respective
10	members would have to comply with.
11	And so obviously V.O.L.T. is interested in
12	participating. I don't think V.O.L.T. is interested in
13	getting into a fight if Rocky Mountain and Midway are
14	looking to make any sort of side deal to the exclusion
15	of V.O.L.T. and the interest of its members. Hopefully,
16	because V.O.L.T. has been speaking to and communicating
17	with both Rocky Mountain and Midway for years now about
18	this issue, any settlement discussions should absolutely
19	include V.O.L.T. members, because it is their property
20	rights that are going to be affected by whatever is done
21	here.
22	So that's the ideal. That's V.O.L.T.'s
23	position. And I think by reason that Midway included
0.4	

V.O.L.T. in the conditional-use permit, I believeV.O.L.T. has standing to and ought to be party to

Public Hearing March 31, 2020 Page 1
whatever settlement agreements might in prospect.
CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.
This is Thad LeVar. Let me go to Mr. Clark.
Do you have any questions at this point for V.O.L.T.?
MR. CLARK: Just one question, and it relates
to the membership of V.O.L.T. I wonder if Counsel could
advise us how many members are within the Midway City
limits and how many are not, and what is his view on the
status of those as affected landowners depending upon
the location of their property with respect to Midway
City's limits?
MS. BRERETON: This is Liz Brereton. I'll
on behalf of V.O.L.T. I'll jump in here, because I
spent yesterday poring through all of the declarations
attached to our reply as Attachment 1.
First, based on my brief review of those
declarations, I believe that the 50 members or the 50
declarants are residents or property owners in Midway.
Beyond that, if you'll look at your brief on
page 11, there's a table included there. That table is
from Rocky Mountain Power's appraisal report, presented
before the Midway City Commission, I believe on
November I saw it was it 19th, in 2019.
Each of those impacted there's a list of 11
properties 12 properties that say they're

identified as impacted parcels. And then there is a 1 2 Days, Wells, Price, Medallion, Fellow list of names. 3 Creek, Johnson, Bodenstiener, Almondon, Twin Creeks, and 4 Burke (phonetic). Each of those property owners have property in Midway, as noted by the address, and have 5 6 also submitted declarations stating that they're an affected landowner. 7 Rocky Mountain Power has identified these 11 8 9 members as affected landowners, and has sited their 10 property as parcels where they may need to obtain or 11 expand additional easement rights. 12 So in terms of V.O.L.T.'s representing members 13 who are actually affected landowners in Midway City, 14 there arguably shouldn't be a dispute, based on Rocky 15 Mountain Power's own analysis and V.O.L.T.'s 16 declarations, that V.O.L.T. represents affected 17 landowners. 18 Chair LeVar, if I could just ask a MR. CLARK: 19 follow-up question and be more precise. So is there any 20 distinction in Counsel's argument or advocacy regarding 21 those property owners whose property lies within the 22 easements that are at issue and those which do not? 23 MS. BRERETON: The position of -- the purposes 24 of this brief, V.O.L.T. has identified these particular landowners, these ten landowners, as affected landowners 25

Γ

1	that don't seem to be in dispute that they're affected,
2	and that everyone can agree construction underground or
3	overhead will impact their property.
4	In a broader sense, V.O.L.T. does represent
5	additional landowners who are not directly on the line
6	or who have are on the line, but who Rocky Mountain
7	Power has not identified as an affected landowner, and
8	there are a number of them.
9	So for purposes of this intervention, V.O.L.T.
10	is acting on behalf of each of the 15 landowners who are
11	on and within the transmission corridor. But
12	specifically, I think all parties can agree that these
13	ten property owners that V.O.L.T. represents are
14	affected landowners in Midway.
15	Does that answer the question?
16	MR. CLARK: Thank you, yes.
17	And just for the court reporter, the follow-up
18	question was made by me, Board Member Clark.
19	And that concludes my questions. Thank you,
20	Chair LeVar.
21	CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Thank you.
22	Mr. Fitzgerald, do you have any questions for
23	V.O.L.T. at this point?
24	MR. FITZGERALD: This is Troy Fitzgerald. I
25	do have two.

1	If you could just help me connect some dots.
2	I'd like you to explain how you believe V.O.L.T.
3	qualifies as an affected entity, and then also on your
4	63G citation, how V.O.L.T. qualities under that one as
5	well.
6	MR. MORRIS: This is Mr. Morris on behalf of
7	V.O.L.T.
8	I'll begin with the 63G. I'm looking at the
9	language under subsection 1 of 63G-4-207, which states,
10	"Any person who is not a party may file a signed,
11	written petition."
12	And so there is no requirement initially for
13	anyone to that says someone cannot file a petition.
14	Subsection 2 goes on to say, "The presiding
15	officer shall grant a petition for intervention if the
16	presiding officer determines that," and the first
17	requirement is that "the petitioner's legal interests
18	may be substantially affected" by this proceeding.
19	So, first of all, V.O.L.T. and its members'
20	legal interests certainly may be substantially affected
21	by the formal adjudicative proceeding here.
22	The second requirement under subsection 2(b)
23	is that, "The interests of justice and the orderly and
24	prompt conduct of the adjudicative proceedings will not
25	be materially impaired by allowing the intervention."

In order words, this puts the burden, I think, 1 2 on Rocky Mountain to show that the interests of justice 3 and that the orderly and prompt conduct of these 4 proceedings would be materially impaired. I don't think that V.O.L.T. has the obligation 5 or the burden to prove a negative here. What we are 6 suggesting is simply the ability to call a couple of 7 witnesses and participate in the cross-examination of 8 9 Rocky Mountain's witnesses. 10 But there is no dispute that V.O.L.T.'s 11 members' legal interests may be substantially affected 12 by what goes on in these proceedings. Rocky Mountain, 13 as my colleague, Ms. Brereton, pointed out, admits and 14 acknowledges there are at least 10 or 11 of V.O.L.T. 15 people, members, whose legal interests are going to be 16 substantially affected by what goes on here, who are 17 directly on the transmission corridor and whose property 18 is going to be affected by what goes on here. 19 So we feel that that's how we'll certainly 20 meet the standards set forth in Section 63G. 21 MR. FITZGERALD: This is Troy Fitzgerald. 22 This is Troy Fitzgerald again. Excuse me. 23 I probably didn't ask the best question. Does that 63G-4-207 reference in subsection 1 indicate a 24 25 formal adjudicative proceeding with the agency?

Page	21
------	----

1	I'm new to the board. Maybe we are an agency,
2	maybe we're not. I'm more curious how 63G applies to
3	these particular proceedings, what ties that section to
4	what we're doing here.
5	MS. BRERETON: This is Liz Brereton on behalf
6	of V.O.L.T. I can jump in here and take the first stab.
7	But under the Utah Facility Review Board Act,
8	the board is empowered under the Administrative
9	Procedures Act to make rules and conduct proceedings.
10	So the standard put forward in 64G under the
11	Administrative Procedures Act does apply to this
12	context, because it is subject to the APA procedures.
13	MR. MORRIS: If I could append on that,
14	section 63G applies to a number of different agencies,
15	including this board.
16	THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, who is speaking?
17	MR. MORRIS: I'm sorry. That was Mr. Morris
18	on behalf of V.O.L.T.
19	THE REPORTER: Thank you.
20	MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you.
21	And the other question I had was specifically
22	how V.O.L.T. qualifies as an affected entity under the
23	Utility Board Act. And this is Troy Fitzgerald.
24	MS. BRERETON: This is Liz Brereton. I can
25	jump in here again.

1	Under the act, the term "affected entity"
2	under 54-14-303(2)(b) has cross-references to
3	improvement districts and local districts formed under
4	title 17B and 17D. I know under title 54, entity or
5	local governments have the authority to create
6	improvement districts to finance construction of or
7	underground construction of infrastructure without
8	having to impose a general tax on the populus. In this
9	way, the burden is more targeted to affected landowners.
10	V.O.L.T. provides in the same position and
11	serves the same function here. Under condition 3,
12	V.O.L.T. is required to pay for a portion of excess
13	costs, and V.O.L.T. has already collected more than
14	\$500 million toward excess costs, whatever they may be.
15	MR. MORRIS: Excuse me. \$500,000. This is
16	Mr. Morris.
17	MS. BRERETON: Yes, \$500,000.
18	MR. MORRIS: 500,000. Sorry.
19	MS. BRERETON: Additionally, under the act,
20	V.O.L.T. is a private entity that is authorized or
21	required, pursuant to Midway City's conditional-use
22	permit, to pay for excess costs. And the definition of
23	"pay" under the act includes payment by the improvement
24	district referenced in 54-14-303(2)(a), and it also
25	includes private entities such as V.O.L.T.

1	MR. MORRIS: And so this is Mr. Morris on
2	behalf of V.O.L.T. again.
3	If you look at the statutory definitions under
4	section 54-18-102, subsection 1 provides for an affected
5	entity; subsection 2 defines an affected landowner as an
6	owner of a property interest, as reflected in the most
7	city or county tax records whose property is located
8	within a proposed corridor.
9	That's how V.O.L.T. and its members fit within
10	the definition.
11	MR. FITZGERALD: This is Troy Fitzgerald.
12	Thank you. No further questions.
13	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you, Mr. Fitzgerald.
14	Mr. White, do you have any questions for
15	V.O.L.T. at this point?
16	MR. WHITE: Yeah, thank you, Chair. This is
17	Board Member White.
18	One question I had and I appreciate the
19	you pointing out the this is to Ms. Brereton the
20	list of the property owners. It sounds like it's
21	undisputed that there's at least 11 or so folks who
22	actually have parcels that are within the corridor, or
23	they're going to have either a part of the right-of-way
24	or part of the facilities will get on their parcel.
25	

Γ

1	describe the interests of the other members of V.O.L.T.?
2	Are these members of the community or what help me
3	understand what their interest is beyond those specific
4	parcel owners there.
5	MR. MORRIS: This is Mr. Morris on behalf of
6	V.O.L.T.
7	Mr. White, in addition to the 10 or 11 that
8	Rocky Mountain at least acknowledges are directly on the
9	corridor and as I indicated earlier, the original
10	members of V.O.L.T. were all throughout Wasatch County.
11	The process has now been distilled down to this one-mile
12	stretch through Midway, and the members of V.O.L.T. now
13	who are most particularly affected and interested in
14	this pardon me are in addition to the 10 or 11,
15	are an additional 40 or so whose declarations we filed
16	whose properties may not lie within the corridor, but
17	they are immediately adjacent to it, and whose property
18	values are, nevertheless, going to be affected by having
19	these enormous proposed towers and lines running through
20	their neighborhood.
21	And so the 50 whose declarations we filed are
22	right along the corridor, either on it or adjacent to
23	it, and not miles away.
24	MR. WHITE: So this is
25	MS. BRERETON: This is Liz Brereton.

MR. WHITE: 1 Go ahead. This is Board Member 2 White. 3 MS. BRERETON: Additionally, the 50 members 4 have also been -- from what I understand, contributed to the money that V.O.L.T. has already collected, the 5 \$500,000, that will go toward funding any excess costs 6 of underground construction. 7 MR. WHITE: 8 Okay. This is Board Member White. So just to follow 9 10 up with Mr. Morris's explanation. That's helpful. So 11 these -- we'll call them the noncorridor owners or 12 however you want to describe them. But their claim of interest is more of a potential diminution of property 13 14 based upon view shed or something of that -- is that 15 their claim of affected interest? 16 MR. MORRIS: It's more than view shed. They 17 have retained the services of an appraiser that I 18 believe V.O.L.T. -- Midway and V.O.L.T. have identified 19 as a potential witness in the case, Mr. Jerry Webber, 20 who has opined that property values, not just for the 10 21 or 11, but for all of these people who V.O.L.T. 22 represents, are going to be substantially impacted by 23 these proposed overhead lines. 24 MR. WHITE: Thank you. 25 One final question. This has been helpful.

1	I think in your initial opening statement, Mr. Morris,
2	you were discussing or maybe it was Ms. Brereton who
3	indicated there was a, you know, dispute about whether
4	Rocky Mountain Power had a legal right to upgrade their
5	facility based upon their existing easement versus the
6	need to acquire new easement.
7	Is it the intent of V.O.L.T., or their hopes
8	or request, that the board adjudicate those legal rights
9	or the ability to upgrade that versus the existing
10	easement? Is that what would be the hope or scope of
11	the proceeding if the board were to grant intervention
12	of V.O.L.T.?
13	MR. MORRIS: The
14	MR. WHITE: Let me just clarify it. Oh, sorry
15	you go ahead.
16	MR. MORRIS: No, no, I'd appreciate some
17	clarification. I don't want to start answering a
18	question you didn't ask.
19	This is Mr. Morris.
20	MR. WHITE: Yeah, this is Mr. White now.
21	I guess to put a finer point on it, is it the
22	request or the intent of V.O.L.T. to have the board
23	adjudicate the specific legal question of whether or not
24	Rocky Mountain Power has the legal right under their
25	existing easement to construct or perform, etc., their

upgrade for the project, or is it beyond that? Or is 1 2 that an additional factor that you hope to resolve in 3 this -- with the board? 4 MR. MORRIS: This is Mr. Morris on behalf of 5 V.O.I.T. 6 I believe the question for the board at the hearing later in April is whether to grant Rocky 7 Mountain's petition over the objections of Midway City, 8 9 and also V.O.L.T. I don't believe that the board is 10 going to be in a position -- and I could be wrong on 11 this, but I don't think the board will be in a position 12 legally or procedurally to adjudicate the existence or 13 not of easements. 14 V.O.L.T.'s position all along has been that 15 the existing 48 kV line going through this corridor is 16 there by reason of prescriptive easement that landowners 17 haven't signed, but have essentially come into existence 18 to allow for the existence of the line. But those 19 easements are limited by law only to accommodate that 20 line with those poles that exist now. There are no 21 easements that would currently allow for that. 22 And I believe it will be part of our proof and 23 part of Midway's proof at the hearing to show that Rocky

25 of going overhead, because Rocky Mountain has not

24

Mountain has failed to adequately account for the cost

Γ

1	properly shown that it already has rights to go through
2	here that have been paid for and compensated the
3	landowners for.
4	But I don't anticipate that the board is going
5	to be making any dollar decisions, only that I think
6	the relief that Midway is asking and that V.O.L.T. joins
7	in asking for here, is that Rocky Mountain has failed to
8	provide enough information and enough accurate
9	information in order to proceed with the overhead lines
10	it has proposed.
11	MR. WHITE: That's helpful. I appreciate it.
12	That's all the questions I have, Chair LeVar.
13	CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. This is Thad LeVar.
14	Thank you, Mr. White.
15	Mr. Wright, do you have any questions at this
16	point?
17	MR. WRIGHT: No further questions.
18	CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Thank you.
19	I think at this point we'll go to Midway City.
20	Mr. Gordon and Mr. Jewkes, do you have any position
21	you haven't filed anything with us, but do you have a
22	position on V.O.L.T.'s petition to intervene?
23	MR. CORBIN GORDON: We do not object to it.
24	We actually think it would be helpful to have them
25	there. I'd just remind the board that these are

Γ

Page 2	29
--------	----

1	citizens of Midway City. They're the ones that are most
2	impacted by the line. We feel strongly they should have
3	a voice in this process.
4	In reviewing what it is that they're
5	proposing, I mean, one of the issues is the easements,
6	and we have listed one of their experts as one of ours
7	as well, and we think that it would be a good thing to
8	have the parties that are most impacted at the table.
9	So we have no problem with having their
10	intervention granted and participating.
11	THE REPORTER: This is the court reporter.
12	Was that Mr. Gordon?
13	MR. CORBIN GORDON: Yes. I'm sorry it was
14	Mr. Gordon.
15	THE REPORTER: Thank you.
16	CHAIR LEVAR: Okay, this is Thad LeVar. If
17	any board members have any questions for Midway City,
18	please jump on and indicate whether you do. If you
19	don't have any questions, you can just stay silent for a
20	few seconds.
21	Okay, I'm not hearing any questions from board
22	members for Midway City, so why don't we go ahead to
23	Rocky Mountain Power. If either Mr. Reich or
24	Ms. Gordon, if you want to summarize your position.
25	Again, we've all read your opposition motion, so if you

1	want to just summarize any high points, and then we can
2	move to any questions from board members. Thank you.
3	MR. REICH: Thank you. This is Mr. Reich, and
4	I'll start.
5	Just a couple of points of clarification. We
6	filed our opposition on March 23rd. I know that
7	V.O.L.T. has represented that it was a surprise to them,
8	but that was over a week ago. So I just wanted to point
9	that out.
10	Mr. Morris also referred to this as a
11	high-voltage line. High voltage is defined in the
12	High-Voltage Power Line Act as anything at 230 kilovolts
13	or greater. This line is not 230 kilovolts; it's 138
14	kilovolts. So just wanted to clarify that for the
15	record.
16	He also represented that V.O.L.T. was a party
17	to a conditional-use permit, and certainly Rocky
18	Mountain Power would object to that classification.
19	V.O.L.T. was mentioned in the conditional-use permit,
20	but they were not a party to that proceeding. That
21	proceeding was between was a request by Rocky
22	Mountain Power with Midway City, and we don't think that
23	mentioning V.O.L.T. in the conditional-use permit makes
24	them a party to that proceeding, although they
25	definitely participated in that proceeding, their

1 attorneys were present in many of the hearings, and they 2 actually stood up and presented before Midway City. 3 So now I'll just kind of briefly summarize our I think the fatal flaw of the intervention --4 position. I know V.O.L.T. has relied on the Administrative 5 Procedure Act, specifically Section 63G-4-207. And that 6 statute requires, in addition to a statement of facts 7 demonstrating a petitioner's legal right -- Section 8 9 (1)(d) of that section says, "a statement of the relief 10 that the petitioner seeks from the agency." 11 And I think this goes to the very point that 12 some of the board members asked V.O.L.T. that they 13 didn't respond to. In fact, in their petition, in 14 paragraph nine it says, "V.O.L.T. supports the City's 15 counterpetition, but has not fully determined specific 16 positions it will take or the relief it will seek." 17 So I think the fatal flaw in their position is 18 they don't identify the relief they're requesting, and 19 the statute specifically requires them to provide a 20 statement to the board identifying what the relief is 21 that they are seeking. So I think that's a fatal flaw. 22 In addition, as we outlined in our brief, the 23 Facility Review Board Act, the reference to potentially 24 affected landowners is defined in Section 54-18-102, 25 which is the high-voltage siting act. That act applies

to, as we already said, high-voltage transmission lines,

1

not this type of proceeding that is between a 2 3 governmental agency, Midway City in this case, and Rocky 4 Mountain Power, where we're seeking a conditional-use 5 permit. 6 So those are kind of the -- a summary of our statements. I also know that in the reply brief that 7 they filed late last night -- I think it was around 8:30 8 or 9:00 -- they cited the Sierra Club's holding, and I 9 10 think the reliance is misplaced on that case. That case 11 looks at standing to bring suit. It talks about the 12 traditional standing test, the alternative test. 13 In fact, the Utah Supreme Court said in that 14 case, "Utah standing law operates as a gatekeeper to the 15 courthouse, allowing in only those cases that are fit 16 for judicial resolution." 17 This is not a judicial case, so I don't think that their reliance on Sierra Club applies to this. 18 19 And then finally, I know there's a Questar 20 case, and we cited this in our brief, that went over five factors that the board should look at. So in 21 22 addition to their fatal flaw of not identifying what the 23 remedy is they're seeking, the five factors that the 24 supreme court has outlined is -- one is timeliness. We 25 have no dispute that their motion to intervene is

But on the next four factors, we think they 1 timely. 2 weigh heavily in rejecting their application to 3 intervene. 4 First, the increased time and expense. Ι think as is evident today, to allow them to intervene --5 I mean, they filed 50 affidavits. I think that is --6 shows exactly how this proceeding will be significantly 7 increased with the complexity. 8 I know they filed several nonbinding letters 9 10 of intent that basically say these property owners are 11 not going to charge for an underground easement, but the 12 letters say -- in the letters themselves, it doesn't 13 impose any legal, binding obligation on the property 14 owners. 15 So I think that there's a lot of flaws in 16 their filings, there's a lot of statements that don't 17 have any -- there's no binding impact. 18 Number three, they participated in the 19 administrative proceedings before Midway City. Their 20 attorneys were present. They were open with who they 21 That got up and participated in those represented. 22 proceedings. 23 Number four is probably the biggest factor. 24 Another party adequately represents their interest. 25 Midway City adequately represents these property owners'

Page 3	34
--------	----

1	interest, specifically, the 10 property owners that own
2	the 11 properties that are within the easement
3	boundaries of the project. Midway City has you know,
4	they're it's very clear they're attempting to get the
5	excess costs adequately defined. So we believe that
6	those property owners are already represented through
7	Midway City's efforts.
8	And finally, number five is whether the
9	complications can be minimized by the agency of the
10	board, and we think that the way to do that is to deny
11	their request.
12	So with that, I don't know if you have any
13	questions for Rocky Mountain Power.
14	Or Heidi, if you want to add anything.
15	CHAIR LEVAR: This is Thad LeVar. Ms. Gordon,
16	did you want to add anything before we go to questions?
17	MS. HEIDI GORDON: No, thank you. We're happy
18	to answer questions.
19	CHAIR LEVAR: Again, this is Thad LeVar. I
20	think I'd like to throw out one question and then move
21	on to the other board members.
22	As I read your interpretation of the Facility
23	Review Board's automatic intervention provision that
24	cross-references definitions from Chapter 18, I just
25	want to make sure I understand your position as it would

1	carry through to its conclusion.
2	Is it your position that if an individual
3	landowner, for example, from the list of 11 that
4	V.O.L.T. has provided if one of those individual
5	landowners filed for intervention under Section
6	54-14-303, subsection (2), without organizing like they
7	have with the organization of V.O.L.T., but if they just
8	filed on their own behalf, that they would not have a
9	right to intervention under the statute because the line
10	is under 220 kV?
11	MS. HEIDI GORDON: That is the way the statute
12	is written. It specifically refers to Section 54
13	Excuse me. This is Heidi Gordon for Rocky
14	Mountain.
15	It specifically refers to Section 54-18-102,
16	the entire section there, which is the definitions of
17	the Siting of High-Voltage Power Line Act.
18	So because it refers to the entire Section 102
19	and not just subparagraph (2) that specifically defines
20	affected landowner, we need to read all of these
21	definitions together in order to ascertain what is meant
22	by affected landowner.
23	It gets kind of confusing as you drill down,
24	because the definition for affected landowner contains a
25	lot of defined terms embedded in this. And that's why
1 in our memorandum we provided that sort of amalgamation, 2 I quess, of the different defined terms in 102, is 3 because they all need to be read together. 4 Specifically, under (2)(b) it says affected entity is defined as Section 102, and you can't refer to 102 and 5 6 just refer to subparagraph (2), the definition for an affected landowner, without reading the rest of the 7 definitions that also help define that defined term. 8 9 So, yes, that is our conclusion from reading 10 this 102, is that an affected landowner -- it has to be 11 within a corridor for a 230 kV line or higher. 12 This is Thad LeVar. CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Just 13 one more follow-up. 14 I mean, when you look at the context of the two chapters -- when you look at the context of Chapter 15 16 14 and the context of Chapter 18, doesn't that make the 17 interpretation a little bit counter-logical? Where 18 Chapter 18, everything in that chapter is limited to 19 lines over 230; where Chapter 14 is cross-referencing 20 one definition, but nothing else in Chapter 14 related 21 to interventions or proceedings is limited to anything 22 under 230 volts, does it -- is it logical that Chapter 23 14 would have made the distinction -- the voltage 24 distinction just for intervention and not for anything 25 else?

Page 37

So this is Heidi Gordon 1 MS. HEIDI GORDON: 2 aqain. 3 So if you look at 54-14-303, subpart 4 (1)(b)(iv), this is one of the reasons for which a party may seek review by the board, and it's talking about the 5 geographic boundaries of a proposed corridor under the 6 Siting of High-Voltage Power Line Act. 7 So it actually does refer back to that act. 8 So that's why (2)(b) makes sense, is because under the 9 10 scenario where the review is sought for siting a 11 high-voltage power line under 54-18, an affected landowner under that section can intervene. 12 13 The reason this makes sense is because -- it's 14 for the same reasons that Mr. Reich was talking about 15 just a minute ago. There is a certain level of 16 participation that's appropriate for citizens and 17 affected parties in the conditional-use process, and 18 that's as, you know, commenters but not as actual 19 parties to the permit. 20 It doesn't make sense to say that every 21 person -- every member of the public who stands up to 22 make public comment in a meeting before the -- you know, 23 Midway City Council, for example, automatically becomes 24 a party to that permit process. The correct parties are 25 the applicant and the governmental entity that's hearing 1 the application.

So just because they participated below -well, they participated appropriately below by being public commenters, that does not give them standing as a party to that permit.

The same is true when reviewing that permit; they were not parties below, and that's appropriate. 7 And so they shouldn't be parties here, except in the case where we're talking about special siting provisions under the high-voltage siting act.

11

10

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.

12 This is Thad LeVar again. I just have one 13 follow-up, then, to that answer, if you don't mind. I'm 14 understanding your position -- and tell me if I'm 15 misunderstanding it. But I'm understanding what you're 16 saying is that when you look at 54-14-303 and you look 17 at the intervention section in subsection (2)(b), that 18 the only situation that that would be relevant and that 19 would grant an intervention right, according to your 20 argument, is in a case under subsection (1)(b)(iv). Is 21 that your argument? 22 MS. HEIDI GORDON: Yes, that's correct. 23 CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Thank you. That's all

24 the questions I have.

25

Mr. Clark, do you have any questions for Rocky

1	Mountain Power?
2	MR. CLARK: No questions. Thank you very
3	much.
4	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.
5	Mr. Fitzgerald, do you have any questions?
6	MR. FITZGERALD: This is Troy Fitzgerald. I
7	guess I'll ask the opposite of the one I asked before,
8	which is, Rocky Mountain, why then does 63G-4-207 not
9	apply in these proceedings?
10	MR. REICH: For the reason that we mentioned
11	earlier, that they we're saying that it applies. We
12	agree that it applies, so but we're saying that the
13	V.O.L.T. failed to meet the requirement in section
14	(1)(d), where they had to identify the relief that
15	they're seeking from the board.
16	MR. FITZGERALD: This is Troy Fitzgerald.
17	Thank you. No further questions.
18	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.
19	Mr. White, do you have any questions?
20	MR. WHITE: Yeah. Thank you, Chair LeVar.
21	Let me come at the question I asked this
22	is, again, Jordan White, board member come at the
23	question I asked Mr. Morris earlier, but maybe a little
24	different angle.
25	I'm trying to wrap my head around what the

adjudicated purpose of the board would be with respect to the easements and Rocky Mountain Power's rights. So J guess my question to Rocky Mountain Power, either Ms. Gordon or Mr. Reich, is, at what point -- if there was a disagreement with the property owners regarding the scope of the easement and the rights to build the project on it, who would adjudicate that?

8 Would that be under condemnation at district 9 court? Who is -- I'm just trying to figure out what our 10 lane is versus a potential district court discussion 11 about legal rights of easements and valuations and all 12 that kind of issues. Give me your opinion on that.

MS. HEIDI GORDON: This is Heidi Gordon. Yeah, I agree with what is, I think, behind your question, is you're struggling with, what -- does the board have the right to adjudicate versus what is properly before a court.

18 And I think the answer is pretty clear. This 19 board does not have authority to decide the scope of the 20 easements and what the appraised value of any land that is needed for -- additional land is needed for this 21 22 That would properly proceed before -upgrade project. 23 well, I quess I would just say, first of all, for the 24 easement rights, the first thing to do is negotiate with 25 the property owners. But after that, if there's still a

remaining dispute, that's something they could have 1 2 brought before the district court. And that's a typical 3 eminent domain case, is where those would be heard. 4 MR. WHITE: Let me ask you this. If -- this is -- again, this is Jordan White, board member. 5 Tf --6 and again, going back to Mr. Reich's argument that they didn't argue a particularity of their -- or specify 7 their interests in resolution from the board. 8 Going back to 63G, kind of, again, looking 9 10 more at kind of the -- not the -- under the facility intervention -- facility board's intervention --11 12 statutory right intervention, but more of a broad, I 13 guess, concept under 63G, what other types of -- from 14 a procedural standpoint, what might we be able to 15 resolve or address with respect to the V.O.L.T. members 16 if it were not for -- or if we were not able to 17 specifically address the question of legal rights of 18 property owners?

19 MS. HEIDI GORDON: This is Heidi Gordon. Ι 20 think nothing -- nothing that's unique to V.O.L.T., at 21 I think there's an active dispute that needs anv rate. 22 to be resolved with regard to the cost between Rocky 23 Mountain Power and Midway City, but as to V.O.L.T. or 24 its individual membership, there is nothing that this board has jurisdiction to hear. 25

1	MR. WHITE: This is Jordan White again. Would
2	it matter if I mean, if you look at the you know,
3	the provisions of the facility board statute, it allows
4	some type of scope modification, etc., from the
5	presiding officer.
6	Does it matter, in Rocky Mountain Power's
7	mind (background noise) I hope someone's okay
8	there. Does it matter in Rocky Mountain Power's mind
9	that if for example, if the membership is limited
10	to only those 11 or so parcel owners that are actually
11	affected specifically? Does that make a difference at
12	all in our evaluation?
13	In other words, if you were able to separate
14	out those 11 property owners from the remainder of the
15	V.O.L.T. members, does that matter at all to our
16	evaluation of the petition to bring an intervention?
17	MS. HEIDI GORDON: Sorry, I forgot to take it
18	off of mute there. This is Heidi Gordon.
19	To the extent those 10 or 11 properties have
20	interest that's different from the other members of
21	V.O.L.T., those interests are still aligned with the
22	interests of Midway City, which is, you know, regarding
23	ascertaining what the actual costs are and the payment
24	of those costs.
25	MR. WHITE: Thank you.

Γ

1	Chair LeVar, that's all the questions I have.
2	Thank you.
3	CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner
4	White.
5	Let me just remind everyone who's listening
б	that if you're not speaking to please keep your phone on
7	mute. That will significantly help our audio and will
8	help the court reporter keep an accurate transcript.
9	Mr. Wright, do you have any questions for
10	Rocky Mountain Power at this point?
11	MR. WRIGHT: Just one question. As a
12	nonlawyer on this board, I'd like an opinion from Rocky
13	Mountain Power. Even if you are somewhat right in
14	saying that V.O.L.T. doesn't have direct ability to be
15	adjudicated by this board, is it your opinion that they
16	should not have any ability to give opinions about the
17	issues that directly affect the property owners that
18	they represent?
19	MR. REICH: We're not sure we understand your
20	question. Could you clarify that?
21	MR. WRIGHT: I'll try. You seem to be arguing
22	that the board has no right to adjudicate anything that
23	V.O.L.T. is asking is petitioning about. But my
24	question is, they're clearly affected property owners
25	under in a right-of-way. Is it your opinion that

Page 4	14
--------	----

1	they have absolutely no right to give their opinion on
2	issues before the board at this time?
3	MS. HEIDI GORDON: This is Heidi Gordon. So I
4	guess I'm a little bit hung up over the question of
5	whether they have a right to give an opinion on this.
6	Rocky Mountain Power doesn't dispute
7	I'm sorry, I think is there someone who
8	needs to put their thing on mute? I'm sorry, I'm
9	getting a little bit of feedback or something.
10	CHAIR LEVAR: This is Thad LeVar. I'll
11	interrupt you and jump in. Yeah, there is someone who
12	needs to put their phone on mute. There's background
13	noise, and I can't tell if it's a child or some other
14	a television set, but it's making it pretty difficult to
15	continue with the background noise that we're hearing.
16	I know we have a lot of people who are
17	listening who aren't okay, it seems to be gone at
18	this point, so I will stop interrupting and let you get
19	back to answering his question.
20	MS. HEIDI GORDON: Okay. Thanks. This is
21	Heidi Gordon again.
22	So to the extent that these property owners
23	have the transmission lines physically affecting and
24	crossing their property, they have property rights that
25	they can defend in a court of law, if necessary.

Rocky Mountain Power doesn't dispute that in 1 2 the kind of colloquial sense they are affected by this 3 transmission line, but there's a difference between 4 whether they're affected by the transmission line and whether they're entitled to have, first of all, 5 6 negotiations with Rocky Mountain Power about what expanded easements might look like and how much they 7 might be compensated for those, versus the question of 8 9 whether they are an affected landowner as defined in the 10 statute.

And so that's the difference. Rocky Mountain Power believes that they have legally protectable interest in the property that they own that entitles them to discussions with Rocky Mountain Power about the extent and scope of that use and the extent and scope of payment that may be due to them as the result of this project.

That is not something we dispute. But the question really has to do with whether they're an affected landowner under the statute, and it's our position that they do not meet the define term "affected landowner" under 54-18-102.

CHAIR LEVAR: This is Thad LeVar. I'm sorry,
Mr. Wright, to interrupt your questioning, but the noise
that we're hearing on the line has come back, and it

1	sounds like a crying baby or something similar to that.
2	And I'm just asking everyone if you're not participating
3	in the hearing, please put it on mute. I know we have a
4	lot of people listening. I apologize that our streaming
5	wasn't up this morning, and I know that's part of the
6	problem. But if you're listening and you have
7	background noise, it's making it very different for us
8	to conduct this hearing.
9	We might have to just get off the line and
10	have everybody re-call in if it continues. And it's
11	still there, so whoever is having the noise has not put
12	their phone on mute yet.
13	MR. WRIGHT: So this is Glenn Wright. Let me
14	at least say I have no further questions.
15	CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Well, let me say this.
16	It's probably time for the board to begin discussing
17	this issue. At some point in the next little while, we
18	need to give our court reporter a break, just because,
19	you know, every hour and a half or so, we need to give
20	the court reporter a break. I realize that's a little
21	awkward with a telephonic hearing, but I still think we
22	need to do that.
23	Is there any objection, then, right now to

Is there any objection, then, right now to taking a ten-minute break and reconvening? I think most people could just keep their phones on mute during that

1	time or call back in.
2	Do any board members object to taking a short
3	break and then moving to board discussion of the
4	intervention?
5	MR. WHITE: Chair LeVar, this is Jordan White.
6	No objection here. What time would you like us to
7	reconvene for the break?
8	CHAIR LEVAR: Since we're all telephonic, let
9	me ask the court reporter, Ms. Rand, is a five-minute
10	break adequate for you at this point?
11	THE REPORTER: Yes, that would be great.
12	CHAIR LEVAR: If anyone objects to that, go
13	ahead and speak up.
14	Okay, why don't we just go on to a brief
15	recess for five minutes, and then we'll move to board
16	discussion of the motion. So just five minutes from now
17	we'll restart. Thank you.
18	THE REPORTER: Thank you.
19	(Whereupon a short recess was taken.)
20	CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. We will be back on the
21	record now.
22	Mr. Clark, do you have a question to address
23	to the board or one of the parties or participants?
24	MR. CLARK: It's a question for counsel for
25	V.O.L.T. And I apologize if this is already clear in

their papers, but it would be helpful to me if they 1 2 would specifically address the argument being presented 3 by Rocky Mountain Power that they failed to qualify for 4 intervention under the UAPA framework because they have 5 failed to identify any relief that they seek from the 6 board. MR. MORRIS: Thank you, Mr. Clark. This is 7 Mark Morris on behalf of V.O.L.T. I was actually going 8 to ask for two minutes to reply in support of our 9 10 petition to the arguments that Rocky Mountain made. 11 That is the primary argument they appear to be 12 making, and I would draw the board's attention to 13 paragraph six in our petition, which shows -- or which 14 relates to Midway City submitting its counterpetition 15 requesting that the board ascertain actual costs of 16 rights-of-way. That is a relief that Midway City has 17 asked for. 18 Now, in paragraph nine, as Mr. Reich 19 indicated, V.O.L.T. supports the city's counterpetition. 20 And so V.O.L.T. seeks that relief, that it ascertain 21 actual costs of rights-of-way.

V.O.L.T. -- and we can argue about whether it can or can't do this, but V.O.L.T. went on to say it reserves the right to present evidence, etc., and hasn't determined maybe all the relief it wants, but we're

happy to limit the relief to the relief that we did expressly set forth in our petition. It's the same relief that Midway City's counterpetition is seeking here.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

17

25

The only other issue that Rocky Mountain raised that I just wanted to respond to in two sentences is their fear that V.O.L.T. is going to make this a circus somehow. I'm happy to stipulate now that we would only call, at most, an additional two witnesses in addition to witnesses that Rocky Mountain Power and Midway have already identified.

12 And so hopefully that answers your question, 13 Mr. Clark, on the relief, that we did spell out 14 expressly we join Midway in the relief that it seeks.

MR. CLARK: Thank you, Chair LeVar. This is
Dave Clark. I don't have anything further.

CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Thank you.

I think at this point we can move to just discussion among the board members. We need to make a decision, well, first, whether to act today on this intervention motion. V.O.L.T. filed something with us late yesterday, and they indicated earlier in their presentation that they might have a preference that we take it under advisement.

Logistically, you know, we don't have any

1	board meetings scheduled between today and the beginning
2	of the hearing on April 20th. So we can discuss whether
3	we feel it's ready for action today or whether we feel
4	more time for advisement I have some thoughts on
5	that, but I want to open it up to the board members
6	first if they want to express any thoughts or discussion
7	about the pending intervention motion we have in front
8	of us.
9	So if anyone wants to speak to the other board
10	members, please let me know that you would like to do
11	that at this point.
12	MR. WHITE: Chair LeVar, this is Jordan White.
13	I'm happy to start off discussions, if that's okay.
14	I guess what I would say is kind of cutting
15	to the chase here, I would vote to grant intervention,
16	and let me articulate the reasons why.
17	I don't believe that V.O.L.T. meets the
18	requirements for intervention under the 54-14-303(2)(b)
19	section. I think that's a very specific
20	intervention-of-rights statute. I don't they think they
21	qualify for that, but I do believe that under the
22	broader threshold under UAPA, they do meet that.
23	I think that Mr. Morris has sufficiently
24	addressed the question or I guess the issue of what
25	their what relief they seek under the board's

1 jurisdiction.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

I would say that with respect to whether we should take this under advisement, I don't -- I think that -- at least from my perspective, I think that having the ability to review that this morning, at least with respect to the specific property owners that have been identified who will actually be affected was helpful for me.

9 With all that being said, I do think that, as 10 a board, we should reserve the rights under the facility 11 siting act to address the scope or modify the 12 intervention, if necessary. I think that, you know, 13 I'll take Mr. Morris for his word, you know, that this 14 will be conducted, you know, in a way that will be 15 precise with respect to the interests that V.O.L.T. 16 specifies and we will not have a circus. We certainly 17 have a very tight timeline that's not negotiable, at 18 least from my perspective.

But I would say that with respect to -- we should reserve the right to discuss, at some point, if necessary, the need to potentially level the scope of actual interveners through -- in the membership of V.O.L.T. I believe that question is unanswered at this point. I don't know if we need to address that today, but that may be something that we need to address, if I also think that, you know, based upon some

of the questions and answers at least that I've had this morning, that I think we will also need to reserve the right to limit relevant scope in terms of the intervening parties with respect to what we, as a board, do and do not have a right to adjudicate. Again, that's still a little bit fuzzy in my There's a little bit of a chicken-and-the-egg we mind. may have to address at some point. But I guess, circling back, I think all that being said, I would vote to grant V.O.L.T.'s intervention under the UAPA provision. That's all I have. Thank you. CHAIR LEVAR: Okay, this is Thad LeVar. you, Mr. White. Does any other board member want to provide comments or discussion at this point? This is Glenn Wright. MR. WRIGHT: I agree with the previous statement. I would vote to approve intervention. This is Troy Fitzgerald. MR. FITZGERALD: Mr. White's statement I think was helpful for me as well. If we're limiting the scope of the intervention to the relief sought in the counterpetition of Midway, I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank

would be comfortable allowing the intervention as well. 1 2 MR. CLARK: And this is David Clark, and I 3 also vote to allow the intervention under the UAPA 4 criteria and with the clarification that both counsel 5 has offered with respect to the relief sought, and limit it to that. 6 And I want to echo what Mr. White said 7 regarding -- because I feel similarly, that the -- I 8 9 haven't seen anything to this point that persuades me 10 that we have any relief available to us with respect to 11 the time constraints that the statute places us under to 12 act. So we're going to have to -- I'm going to be mindful of that as we consider the scope of testimony 13 14 and the issues that we consider when we get to the 15 merits hearing in just a few weeks. 16 Thank you. 17 CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you, Mr. Clark. 18 And this is Thad LeVar. Let me just comment 19 before we move to a board vote, but I think we're pretty 20 close to a board vote, I think I agree with everything 21 Mr. White said, with one exception. I, personally, 22 believe that we have at least 11 members of V.O.L.T. who 23 qualify for automatic intervention under 54-14-303. And 24 if that's not the prevailing view of the board, I'm also 25 happy to join a vote to grant intervention under UAPA

rather than under the Facility Review Board. 1 But in my 2 view, the 11 members of V.O.L.T. appear to qualify for 3 automatic intervention, and I don't think they defeat 4 that by joining together in an organization that also includes other members who don't have that automatic 5 intervention right. I think as a matter of policy, we 6 would want to encourage the affected landowners who have 7 that intervention right to join together, rather than 8 9 discouraging it.

But, again, that viewpoint doesn't prevent me from supporting the motion as described by Commissioner White to grant intervention under the more general UAPA provision. And I agree with everything that's been said on limiting the scope.

15 For example, if we -- you know, if we grant 16 intervention today and any discovery disputes arise, with the hearing scheduled to start three weeks from 17 18 yesterday, there's probably very little opportunity for 19 this board to reconvene and address any discovery 20 disputes or any other matters. But once the hearing 21 begins, we certainly will have in mind to make sure the 22 scope is kept relevant to our statutory right.

23 So does anyone else on the board feel like we 24 need more discussion, or is someone ready to make a 25 motion for board action?

	Public Hearing March 31, 2020 Page 55
1	MR. CLARK: This is David Clark. I
2	MR. WHITE: This is
3	Go ahead.
4	CHAIR LEVAR: Sorry, we have two okay, go
5	ahead.
б	MR. CLARK: I yield to Mr. White.
7	CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. Clark, why don't you go
8	ahead.
9	MR. CLARK: Okay. I move that we approve the
10	intervention petition of V.O.L.T.
11	CHAIR LEVAR: Any second?
12	MR. WHITE: This is Jordan White. I second
13	the motion.
14	CHAIR LEVAR: Okay, let me just go through the
15	board members.
16	Mr. Clark, how do you vote on the motion?
17	MR. CLARK: I vote yes. I vote in favor.
18	CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. Fitzgerald?
19	MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.
20	CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. White?
21	MR. WHITE: Yes, I vote in favor of
22	intervention for V.O.L.T.
23	CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. Wright?
24	MR. WRIGHT: Yes.
25	CHAIR LEVAR: And I vote yes. So that motion

Advanced Reporting Solutions 801-746-5080

1 passes. 2 I'm going to make a second motion that we --3 since under this statue the Public Service Commission 4 provides staffing to the board, I'm going to make a motion that we direct the attorney for the Public 5 Service Commission to draft an intervention order 6 7 consistent with our discussion today. Would anyone be willing to second that motion? 8 MR. WHITE: This is Jordan White. I'll second 9 10 the motion. 11 CHAIR LEVAR: And Mr. Clark, how do you vote 12 on that motion? 13 MR. CLARK: I vote in favor. 14 CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. Fitzgerald? 15 MR. FITZGERALD: I vote yes. 16 CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. White? 17 MR. WHITE: I vote in favor. 18 CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. Wright? 19 MR. WRIGHT: Yes. 20 CHAIR LEVAR: And I vote yes. 21 Let me ask the board members, is there 22 anything else we need to do before we move on to the 23 other two items that we noticed up for this hearing 24 today? 25 Chair LeVar, this is Jordan White. MR. WHITE:

I just want to be clear -- potentially this is a 1 2 clarification for you or the participants. There's 3 nothing further we need to do with the respect to the 4 filed reply today? In other words, that -- we sufficiently have considered that and made our decision, 5 so we don't need to have further advisement or 6 discussion on that, right? Correct? 7 CHAIR LEVAR: This is Thad LeVar. You're 8 9 addressing the schedule -- like the remaining schedule 10 from the scheduling order? 11 MR. WHITE: No, I was referring to the reply 12 memorandum filed and the certification filed by V.O.L.T. 13 last evening. I would presume that even 14 CHAIR LEVAR: 15 though V.O.L.T. asked us to take it under deliberation, 16 that they have no objection to the action we've taken 17 today. Let me just ask counsel for V.O.L.T. to confirm 18 that to us. 19 MR. MORRIS: I'm sorry, what was the question? 20 Confirming... CHAIR LEVAR: Well, at the beginning of the 21 22 hearing you said, "We hope you'll take this under 23 advisement since we just filed something late 24 yesterday." But I assume, considering the board action, 25 that that's not any longer your position?

1	MR. MORRIS: I will withdraw that request.
2	This is Mr. Morris on behalf of V.O.L.T.
3	CHAIR LEVAR: Does that address your question,
4	Mr. White?
5	MR. WHITE: Yes. Thank you.
6	MR. REICH: Chairman, I have a question. This
7	is Bret Reich with Rocky Mountain Power.
8	CHAIR LEVAR: Yes.
9	MR. REICH: I was not clear on the vote. I
10	didn't hear if there were some members that talked
11	about limiting the intervention to paragraph six of the
12	petition, and I just wanted a clarification. Is that
13	included in the order or not?
14	CHAIR LEVAR: That's a good clarification
15	question that I agree was not crystal clear in the
16	motion. If any board member wants to address that or
17	propose a motion that would direct the drafting of our
18	intervention order, feel free to speak up.
19	MR. WHITE: Chair LeVar, this is Jordan White.
20	I would I guess I don't know if we can amend or
21	just clarify the motion to vote to include the specific
22	grant of relief as clarified by Mr. Morris in his
23	response to Board Member Clark's question. And I do
24	believe that should be part of the order drafted by the
25	board's attorney. And I also think we should include,

Γ

1	you know, some flexibility in terms of addressing
2	additional scope questions sua sponte going forward with
3	respect to some of the items that we articulated earlier
4	about the actual legal rights that we have to
5	adjudicate.
6	CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. So let me just see if I'm
7	restating your motion correctly. Your motion is that as
8	we direct the PSC attorney to draft this order on
9	intervention, the intervention should be limited to the
10	paragraph six as the in terms of the scope of
11	intervention, and that the board retains the right to
12	address relevant and scope issues as this proceeding
13	moves forward.
14	Am I restating your objection correctly or am
15	I summarizing it wrong?
16	MR. WHITE: No, that's perfectly
17	CHAIR LEVAR: Not objection. Not objection.
18	Motion. Sorry.
19	MR. WHITE: No, that restates it perfectly.
20	This is Jordan White.
21	MR. MORRIS: This is Mr. Morris. May I
22	respond to that request?
23	CHAIR LEVAR: Yes.
24	MR. MORRIS: To be clear, V.O.L.T. joins in
25	all of the relief that Midway City is seeking. We

wouldn't ask any relief other than what Midway is 1 2 Paragraph six of our petition specifies seeking. 3 ascertaining actual costs of rights-of-way, but if 4 Midway has asked for any other relief, V.O.L.T. doesn't seek to expand on that. But I don't know that it would 5 6 be appropriate to limit V.O.L.T. solely to that particular relief. 7 So I -- my, I quess, request for an amendment, 8 9 if that's what it is, would be that V.O.L.T. is granted 10 leave to intervene, but could not seek any relief that 11 Midway did not seek by way of its counterpetition. 12 CHAIR LEVAR: This is Thad LeVar. Let me --13 just to clarify what you're saying, I mean, I think what 14 this boils down to is -- you know, since there's not 15 much discovery time left in this proceeding, I feel what 16 we're really boiling down to is witnesses you'll 17 present at the hearing and issues that you might 18 cross-examine on. 19 So -- and I'll tell you my -- personally, I'm 20 probably not inclined at this point of the intervention to limit you in terms of cross-examination, but if we 21 22 could get some clarity on what you intend to do in terms 23 of calling your own witness. I think you addressed this earlier, but if you could just address that briefly for 24 25 us, Mr. Morris.

1 I'm happy to. This is Mr. Morris MR. MORRIS: 2 again for V.O.L.T. 3 In addition to witnesses that other parties 4 are calling, I think I would agree to limit V.O.L.T. to only two other witnesses. One witness would be one of 5 the ten that is identified by Rocky Mountain and 6 acknowledged by Rocky Mountain as being an affected 7 landowner. 8 9 And then I would want to call just one of the 10 many 40 or so others that Rocky Mountain does not 11 believe are affected landowners, but that we would want 12 to present evidence on that issue to show Rocky 13 Mountain's failure to include the effect on landowners 14 other than the ten that they've identified. 15 So I'm happy to limit our witness pool, if you will, to only two additional witnesses, with those 16 characteristics. 17 18 I'll jump in. CHAIR LEVAR: This is Thad 19 LeVar. 20 I mean, I know we have a pending motion before My -- personally, I would view the appropriate way 21 us. 22 to limit the -- to limit this intervention right now 23 would be to do so as described by Mr. Morris. I think 24 if we grant an intervention order that limits their new witnesses to those that he's described, I'm not sure 25

1	
1	it's necessary at this point to limit their
2	cross-examine options. That's something that I think
3	might be more appropriate to deal with during the
4	hearing, but that's just my view.
5	Mr. White, do you want to address your pending
6	motion in light of what we've heard from Mr. Morris?
7	Or any other board members who want to discuss the
8	issue.
9	MR. WHITE: Yes, thank you, Chairman LeVar.
10	This is Jordan White.
11	I think that sounds reasonable. I think it
12	would be difficult to make relevance calls without
13	actually doing a specific cross-examination or
14	objections in advance. So I think the way that it was
15	articulated by Mr. Morris sounds reasonable to me.
16	I think the concern, you know, really from my
17	perspective initially was really, again, based upon our
18	limited scope of jurisdiction and what we have a right
19	to adjudicate and the very limited timeframe we have to
20	do that in. My concern was, again, to getting going
21	far afield on issues that we have no right to be
22	adjudicating would be inefficient.
23	And so I think from a relevance standpoint
24	and you, as the presiding officer, ultimately can make
25	that call on a case-by-case basis if there are relevance

1	objections at the time of that hearing later in April.
2	CHAIR LEVAR: So is it accurate to say,
3	Mr. White, that we have a pending motion from you before
4	the board to limit the intervention in terms of
5	witnesses that V.O.L.T. will call to the two witnesses
6	they've described in the hearing today?
7	MR. WHITE: Yes, that's correct. And with the
8	caveat that there may be again, depending on how
9	things go, if there's any potential evidentiary or
10	discovery disputes, etc., that the board reserves the
11	right to again address the scope of that, if necessary,
12	based upon our limited jurisdiction.
13	CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Thank you.
14	Does any other board member want to discuss or
15	second the motion?
16	MR. CLARK: Chair LeVar, this is Dave Clark.
17	I've got a question. My understand of the heart of the
18	motion was that we're expressing a limitation on the
19	intervention that we're authorizing to be confined to
20	the relief that Midway City has requested in its
21	petition. And is that not the core of what we're
22	addressing? Are we addressing something else?
23	CHAIR LEVAR: I agree that's how Mr. White
24	originally phrased his motion. I'm not sure if that's
25	the motion that's as modified in front of us. I

,	
1	mean, I that was the original issue raised.
2	Personally, I think, at this point of the proceeding,
3	three weeks before the hearing, it we accomplish what
4	we need with the limitation on new witnesses
5	additional witnesses, but if there's interest in
6	expanding the motion to be more general, that's what's
7	in front of us, I suppose.
8	Mr. White, do you want to comment on
9	Mr. Clark's question?
10	MR. WHITE: Yeah. Well, let me ask a
11	clarifying question, then, Mr. Clark. Are you
12	supporting the clarification discussed by Mr. Morris, in
13	other words, that rather than just paragraph six, that
14	ultimately they would be limited to the issues addressed
15	by Midway in their motion?
16	MR. CLARK: Yeah, I guess what I'm really
17	saying is that's what that's what I would favor doing
18	at this stage, is just simply do permit their or
19	authorize their intervention, and limit their
20	intervention to seeking relief that Midway City seeks in
21	its petition. And any efforts beyond that would be
22	outside of or beyond the intervention that we're
23	authorizing here. That to me, that seems like the
24	cleanest way to avoid getting into evidentiary questions
25	now, but you know, I guess I can be persuaded

1	otherwise.
2	MR. WHITE: Chair LeVar, this is Jordan White.
3	I'm happy to take that as a substitute. That's
4	articulated clean enough for me; I'm happy to take that
5	as a substitute. If you want to put up Mr. Clark's
6	clarifications about that, that seems reasonable and
7	clear to me.
8	CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Any discussion or second
9	to the motion as refined by Mr. Clark?
10	MR. FITZGERALD: This is Troy Fitzgerald.
11	I'll second Mr. Clark's motion.
12	CHAIR LEVAR: Any discussion before we vote?
13	Okay. Let me go first to Mr. Clark. How do
14	you vote?
15	MR. CLARK: I vote yes.
16	CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. Fitzgerald?
17	MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.
18	CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. White?
19	MR. WHITE: Yes.
20	CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. Wright?
21	MR. WRIGHT: Yes.
22	CHAIR LEVAR: And I vote yes. So that motion
23	passes.
24	Anything else from board members before we
25	move on to the other issues on our agenda today?

In the second notice, board members were 1 2 provided with a draft administrative rule. And as was 3 explained, I think, in that notice, we're currently 4 holding electronic meetings pursuant to an executive 5 order issued by Governor Herbert recently, but this board does not have an administrative rule addressing 6 electronic meetings. And the governor's executive order 7 recommended that any board or commission that doesn't 8 9 currently have a rule in place implement on as soon as 10 possible. Plus, the electronic meeting provisions in 11 the Open and Public Meetings Act do require us to have a 12 rule in place, which this board has not done in the 13 past.

14 The rule that was distributed is basically the 15 same language that is in the electronic meetings rule 16 for the Public Service Commission. And so I sent that 17 out as a starting point. If the board approves that 18 rule language, it could be published in the state 19 bulletin, and then the board could have a future decision to make whether to make it effective following 20 21 that public comment period after the state bulletin 22 That timeline should accommodate having a publication. 23 rule in place by the time the governor's executive order 24 expires or is rescinded, hopefully.

25

So is there any discussion to that rule

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

language that was distributed in the notice?
MR. CLARK: This is Dave Clark
MR. WHITE: Chair LeVar, this is Jordan
You go ahead, Mr. Clark.
MR. CLARK: Thanks. Sorry. I note how
awkward this is for all of us.
But I want to thank the Chair for his personal
initiative in providing and, I presume, drafting the
rule or the proposed rule, and I move that we adopt
it. And I also recognize that the board meets very
rarely and does not have much opportunity to consider
rulemaking.
But I move that we approve the rule as
proposed.
MR. WHITE: This is Jordan White. I second
Mr. Clark's motion.
CHAIR LEVAR: Any discussion before we vote?
MR. FITZGERALD: This is Troy Fitzgerald.
This could easily come after the vote. I'm in favor of
the rule as proposed.
And as somebody that's rapidly doing far more
electronic meetings than I care to admit to, in sitting
through this one, I'd just like to suggest that we
consider, if we're going to be in the same setting in
April, that we do an electronic format that includes

ſ

1	video. I think the rule can stay as it is, but it's
2	just a suggestion moving forward.
3	CHAIR LEVAR: And this is Thad LeVar. I mean,
4	the rule as drafted doesn't define audio versus audio
5	and visual. I was assuming we would discuss that issue
б	as we discussed the specific hearing.
7	So you don't have any objection to the rule
8	language as proposed, but you want to discuss that issue
9	as we consider our April 20th hearing; is that correct?
10	MR. FITZGERALD: This is Troy Fitzgerald.
11	That is correct.
12	CHAIR LEVAR: Any other discussion?
13	So this is Thad LeVar. Just to clarify,
14	Mr. Clark, your motion is for this board to approve the
15	rule, but what that means is approving it for
16	publication in the state bulletin, and then it will be
17	published for a public comment period, and this board
18	will still have to take action to approve it once that
19	public comment period is concluded.
20	So we have a is that an accurate summary of
21	your motion, Mr. Clark?
22	MR. CLARK: Yes, thanks, Chair LeVar. That's
23	much more attendant to the legal niceties involved here.
24	Yeah. Thank you.
25	CHAIR LEVAR: And so we have that motion and a

Page 69	
---------	--

1	second. So I'll just go down the line for a vote.
2	Mr. Clark, how do you vote on the motion?
3	MR. CLARK: I vote yea.
4	CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. Fitzgerald?
5	MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.
6	CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. White?
7	MR. WHITE: Yes.
8	CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. Wright?
9	MR. WRIGHT: Yes.
10	CHAIR LEVAR: And I vote yes. So that motion
11	passes.
12	And so let's move to the final issue, then,
13	that Mr. Fitzgerald already started alluding to. You
14	know, we have a hearing scheduled to start April 20th.
15	And in terms of our statutory timeframe, that's not
16	much you know, that's pretty close to the end of the
17	60 days that we're required to start the hearing under
18	the statute.
19	I think it's also safe to say that an
20	in-person hearing on April 20th is not an option for any
21	of us, not on the table.
22	So why don't I go to parties, if they want to
23	comment on this issue first before we come to discussion
24	on the board. But I will give a little bit of well,
25	as think I'm thinking about it, why don't we discuss it

_		
Daga	70	
r aue	10	

as a board first and then go to parties. 1 2 I just want to give my own perspective that we 3 have done a lot of telephonic meetings here at the 4 Public Service Commission. We haven't used and tested video conferencing technology in hearings, and my worry 5 is that without beta testing and without, you know, an 6 established format and procedure -- I know that there 7 are some things that are more difficult with audio only, 8 9 but I fear that if we try to add videoconferencing for 10 this long of an evidentiary hearing, that we introduce 11 more complications than we solve. That's my worry, that 12 it might create more problems than it eliminates. 13 But why don't we discuss that among the board 14 and then get comments from participants in the hearing 15 on this issue. 16 Does any board member want -- Mr. Fitzgerald, 17 do you want to jump in and -- it sounds like you've 18 got -- had some experience with technology recently for 19 official meetings. So... 20 MR. FITZGERALD: This is Troy Fitzgerald. I'm happy to do whatever the board is most comfortable with. 21 22 Our first city council meeting in electronic format is 23 tomorrow night, so I might change my tune quickly by 24 tomorrow night. But as we've done it at the staff 25 level, the platform is -- the various platforms, and

1	we're using multiple actually, are relatively easy to
2	use and allow you to see each other. We are playing
3	today with the ability to mute others that are watching
4	in and so forth.
5	So it's certainly a format that works and is
6	stable and is viable. But if you're more comfortable
7	with audio, it's worked acceptably today.
8	MR. WHITE: Chair LeVar, this is Jordan
9	White
10	MR. WRIGHT: This is Glenn
11	MR. WHITE: You go ahead, Mr. Wright.
12	MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, I unfortunately, over
13	the last two weeks, being on a county council that
14	passed the you know, we had, I think, the first
15	closing orders in the state, I've been on a both a
16	telephonic and a video meeting almost every day for the
17	last 14 days. I think video meeting we have, in
18	Summit County, used the Zoom product, and it works
19	pretty well. And the advantage it gives to the
20	presenters is they can share screens and show us if
21	they have visual and graphical presentations that they
22	would like us to consider, it puts us all on the same
23	page.
24	It will require someone who really knows how

to set up Zoom and make it work. But like I say, I've

25
1 been involved in these Zoom meetings probably 11 of the 2 last 14 days, and they work pretty well once you get 3 into it. 4 MR. WHITE: Chair LeVar, this is Jordan White. What I would suggest is -- I've certainly seen video 5 6 proceedings handled with some success, but what I would maybe suggest that -- based upon some of the recent 7 fails I've seen conducting meetings videoconference, 8 9 maybe potentially we would just have some flexibility 10 that we will endeavor to explore that in that timeframe. 11 But ultimately, because we have the current 12 situation with the virus and staffing and the governor's 13 order, whether we have time or not to actually test that 14 and prove up on that, we certainly could endeavor to do 15 But I know that the Commission uses its own that. 16 staff, and whether we have the capability technically or 17 even staffing-wise to accomplish that by then, may be an 18 open question. 19 So I quess what I would say is that we'll 20 endeavor to do that -- or suggest that we endeavor to do 21 that, but whether we can do that successfully or not, we 22 maybe will just kind of reserve that right until some 23 point.

24 CHAIR LEVAR: This is Thad LeVar. Let me just 25 jump in on that comment, too. I mean, we do -- the

Page	73
------	----

1	limitations we're operating under here at the Public
2	Service Commission which provides the staffing and the
3	office support for this board is as you described; we're
4	mostly teleworking right now. Opportunities to beta
5	test, at least in a hearing format in an evidentiary
6	format with a court reporter, where we're also going to
7	try to stream it for there are people who won't be
8	participants in the hearing but will want to watch it,
9	and we can stream audio through YouTube, even though
10	we're not doing that today.
11	We also have issues with any technology we
12	use has to be approved by the State Department of
13	Technology Services, and I don't know what platforms
14	they have approved for use on the state equipment.
15	So I'm nervous about trying something new in
16	context of this evidentiary hearing, where our focus, I
17	think I hate to have our focus distracted by trying a
18	technology that we haven't tested and debugged here.
19	I realize that if there's exhibits and
20	visuals, that they would have to be emailed to everyone
21	in advance of the hearing, and we'd have it would be
22	a little bit more cumbersome that way.
23	But that's my personal worries about it. But
24	I'm not I'm not completely opposed to trying
25	something, but I'm a little nervous about it.

Should we hear from the -- those who will be 1 2 participating in the hearing at this point, and see if 3 that enlightens our discussion any further? 4 Attorneys for Rocky Mountain Power, do you want to comment on this general issue of the format for 5 the hearing that's currently scheduled for April 20th? 6 MR. REICH: Yeah, we are supportive of either 7 audio or visual, and we'd be fine with either one. 8 9 CHAIR LEVAR: Okav. Thank you. 10 Anyone from Midway City? Do you have a 11 position on this issue we're discussing? 12 MR. CORBIN GORDON: This is Corbin. We're 13 probably fine either way. I was assuming it was going 14 to be by video, but if we can't put that together between now and then, then we'll just have to do it in 15 16 the way that is available. So whatever you want to do, 17 we'll deal with it. 18 CHAIR LEVAR: And attorneys for V.O.L.T.? 19 This is Mr. Morris MR. MORRIS: Excuse me. 20 for V.O.L.T. We're happy to proceed any way that the 21 board decides to go. I -- personally, I share the 22 Chair's concern about having -- being the guinea pig for 23 this hearing for a video system that hasn't been beta 24 tested, as you say. If that's the way the board goes, 25 we'll certainly do that. My firm's IT department is

pretty good about arranging things so that would work
 for us.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

One suggestion I might make, though, if -whether we do video or not, I think binders with tabbed exhibits that everyone shares before the hearing would be an orderly way to proceed. That Rocky Mountain, as the petitioner, would propose a set of exhibits and send binders around, at least to the parties. And then we could determine if there were any objections.

And then the respondents, Midway and V.O.L.T., could propose their own exhibits. And then once the parties have agreed on what they all want to show, then the board could receive those binders, and then we're all on the same page when we refer to Exhibit 15 or tab L or something like that.

16 CHAIR LEVAR: Yeah, this is Thad LeVar. I'11 17 comment on that, too. I mean, we have generally been 18 moving -- at least -- again, I'm speaking for the Public 19 Service Commission, since this board doesn't meet that 20 often. We've been moving towards electronic filings, 21 and currently, all the filings that we're receiving in 22 this board are electronic only.

23 We're also likely not to have a specific 24 anchor location. So, for example, all five board 25 members are likely to be at five different locations Γ

1	when we hold this hearing.
2	So there are some logistical challenges, but I
3	wonder if your concerns would be addressed if simply the
4	electronic documents are electronically tabbed and
5	organized well enough that we can know where we're
6	referring to as we move forward.
7	I'm just thinking of some logistical
8	challenges of getting binders together and getting them
9	to all five of us at five different locations.
10	But let me
11	MR. MORRIS: Well
12	CHAIR LEVAR: come back to the board at
13	this point, I think, just to discuss this hearing
14	generally among board members. Any additional thoughts?
15	MR. CORBIN GORDON: This is Corbin. Can I
16	make one other just raise one other concern,
17	Mr. Chair?
18	CHAIR LEVAR: Yes. Yes, you may.
19	MR. CORBIN GORDON: Thank you.
20	So the only other question I have as far as
21	putting it doing it the way that we've done it today,
22	I think there was probably someone, I'm guessing from
23	the public, who has every right to listen in to this,
24	that may not have the technology that we have as far as
25	mute buttons on our phones. And so we need to think

1 that through as well. 2 It's distracting to have -- you know, we're 3 all at home, we've got kids running around. But I want 4 to make sure that the public has every opportunity to listen in, but without doing it in a way that makes it 5 difficult to proceed. 6 So I don't know how we address that, but I'd 7 just raise that as a concern. My guess was that's 8 9 probably what was happening today when we had that 10 background noise. 11 CHAIR LEVAR: And this is Thad LeVar. Let me 12 clarify this, too. In whatever electronic format we 13 hold this hearing, I think our intention would be to 14 also stream it onto YouTube so that a participant could 15 listen to the proceedings without being on the telephone 16 line. That's what we intended to do today --17 MR. REICH: Okay. 18 CHAIR LEVAR: -- and a staffing issue 19 prevented us from doing that today. 20 But I think what I've learned from today's 21 hearing is that we simply will have to do what we have 22 That if we hold it telephonically on the 20th, to do. 23 that we'll need to make sure that that audio is 24 live-streamed onto YouTube so that interested residents 25 can listen on YouTube without having to call in and be

1	on the conference line.
2	MR. REICH: That would solve that. That's
3	great. Thank you.
4	CHAIR LEVAR: Any other thoughts
5	MR. WHITE: This is Jordan White.
6	CHAIR LEVAR: Go ahead.
7	MR. WHITE: Yeah, this is Jordan White. So
8	just to clarify, I guess, the discourse between you and
9	Mr. Morris. The idea would be that we would just handle
10	exhibits as we do in typical fashion with commission
11	proceedings, and that is, the parties would file those
12	and indicate them appropriately, and they would be
13	available on our website.
14	So they could say, for example, you know,
15	V.O.L.T., you know, Exhibit, you know, X, whatever,
16	appendices, whatever, so we could just easily navigate
17	that.
18	Is that what you're thinking, is that the
19	parties would each file their own separate exhibits,
20	etc., that we could easily view on the Commission's
21	website or pull up on the Commission's website?
22	CHAIR LEVAR: This is Thad LeVar. Yes. I
23	mean, I think I was expressing concern that I'm not sure
24	logistically binders is the best option for us, but I
25	think considering Mr. Morris's comments, I would

encourage parties to organize your filings as well as 1 2 you can, so that when we're having this electronic 3 hearing when we're not all in the same room, it will be as simple and direct as possible for us to identify 4 what's being referred to. 5 6 And if you intend to use hearing exhibits, it would be ideal if they were attached to the testimony in 7 the filings, but at the very least they would need to be 8 9 distributed to parties electronically prior to the 10 hearing beginning. 11 Those are my thoughts, but if -- you know, if 12 there's other thoughts or other board members are seeing 13 it differently, please jump in. 14 MR. WHITE: That makes sense to me. This is 15 Jordan White. 16 CHAIR LEVAR: Well, I'm not hearing any further discussion. I'm not sure if this is an issue 17 18 that needs a board motion. Although, if it's going to 19 be an electronic meeting, it probably would be good to 20 have a board motion on how we're going to proceed. 21 If anyone is inclined to make a motion, feel 22 free to do so. 23 MR. WHITE: Thad -- Chair LeVar, this is 24 Jordan White. I quess the motion -- let me try to make 25 this clear. The motion would be that the -- for the

board to conduct the hearing either telephonically or 1 2 via videoconference on the designated date; the board 3 will endeavor to pursue video options, but understand 4 that there is limited staffing and technological issues that may prevent us from doing so; and that parties 5 6 would hopefully file exhibits along with their testimony that have not been at least filed in time for the 7 hearing, so to the extent possible, the board members 8 9 can refer to those easily and reference those as marked 10 and described. 11 CHAIR LEVAR: Let me comment on that motion a 12 little bit. I'm feeling like I'm kind of the biggest 13 downer in the room on trying to do video technology. Ι 14 worry about a motion that still leaves open the 15 expectation that we're going to try to work that out. 16 As I think about both our internal challenges 17 and then coordinating that technology with Rocky 18 Mountain Power's legal department and two other law --19 three other law firms, I'm just --20 MR. WHITE: Chair LeVar --21 CHAIR LEVAR: -- I'm having trouble seeing 22 that as a reasonable goal between now and April 20th, 23 at least to -- but maybe I'm just being overly 24 pessimistic, and if I am, I'm happy to do my -- make my best efforts to work out those logistical issues between 25

1 now and the 20th. 2 Chair LeVar, this is Jordan White. MR. WHITE: 3 I'm happy to amend it or substitute it just to take out 4 the videoconference, understanding that the -- really, 5 in light of the current circumstances and the governor's 6 order and the order of Salt Lake City and Salt Lake County regarding essential folks being in the office, I 7 think that it would probably be a very heavy lift, if 8 9 not impossible, to accomplish that by that time. So I'm 10 happy to still leave that to a telephonic hearing for 11 that date. 12 CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. Fitzgerald or Mr. Wright, 13 how are you feeling about this issue at this point? 14 MR. WRIGHT: This is Wright. I can live with 15 telephonic. I understand the limitations of never 16 having used a videoconferencing, and you will need 17 somebody at a base location to really, you know, 18 organize the electronic conference. And if you don't 19 have anybody on the Commission -- on your staff to do 20 that, it's going to be difficult. 21 I will say there -- you know, the state 22 government certainly has that ability. I've been on at 23 least one Zoom call with the governor and lieutenant 24 governor each in the last couple weeks. So it does

exist within the state infrastructure, but if you're not

25

1	comfortable with accessing that and if you don't have
2	somebody really good on staff to manage it, then we're
3	probably best to go telephonic.
4	MR. FITZGERALD: This is Troy Fitzgerald.
5	I'll echo those comments of Mr. Wright.
б	CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Any second or further
7	discussion to Mr. White's motion?
8	MR. WRIGHT: This is Wright. I'll second the
9	motion.
10	CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Mr. Clark, how do you
11	vote on the motion?
12	MR. CLARK: Yes.
13	CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. Fitzgerald?
14	MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.
15	CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. White?
16	MR. WHITE: Yes.
17	CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. Wright?
18	MR. WRIGHT: Yes.
19	CHAIR LEVAR: And I vote yes.
20	And I think that concludes our business today,
21	unless anyone is aware of anything further that we need
22	to discuss.
23	MR. WRIGHT: I have one possible request.
24	This is Glenn Wright again.
25	We've been having video Summit County Council

emergency meetings pretty much every day at 4 o'clock. 1 2 I think we're going to start weeding them out so we 3 don't have them every day. But if we can possibly have 4 the option to stop at 4 o'clock if I need to, can that be part of our scheduling? 5 6 CHAIR LEVAR: This is Thad LeVar. T'm certainly willing to be mindful of that as we go 7 We have four days scheduled for this hearing. 8 forward. 9 I think that should accommodate that need as you know 10 closer to then what specific days that might be an 11 issue on. 12 Does anyone else, either board member or 13 party, have a desire to comment on that? MR. CORBIN GORDON: Midway City has no 14 15 objection. 16 MR. MORRIS: No objection from V.O.L.T. 17 MR. REICH: No objection from Rocky Mountain 18 Power. 19 CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. I don't think we need a 20 board motion on that issue, but we'll just be mindful of 21 that, and as we get -- begin the hearings, we'll just 22 talk to you about what the specific needs are that week. 23 MR. WRIGHT: I will -- I'll most certainly 24 know the schedule by the preceding Friday. 25 CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Thank you.

1 Mr. LeVar, this is Troy MR. FITZGERALD: 2 Fitzgerald. I just -- I have similar concerns. I mean. 3 at the current time, the pandemic is likely to be 4 peaking there, and in the real world, I'm trying to keep a city functioning. 5 6 And so just -- it's, again, not a board motion or -- necessarily, or anything, but just simply a 7 And not to lessen the importance of this to 8 comment. 9 Again, I'm involved in a city that does the parties. 10 public power; I know how important this is to citizens 11 and how important it is to Rocky Mountain. I know how 12 essential it is to keep power running. 13 But anything we can do to streamline through 14 effective briefing and reduction of testimony would be 15 helpful. 16 CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you, Mr. Fitzgerald. I'm 17 going to restate what you said in a little different 18 way, too. 19 I think it's worth everybody recognizing that 20 of the five members of this board, three of us this is 21 our day job, and two of us this isn't their day job, and 22 their day job is certainly more impacted by the pandemic 23 going on right now than normal operations. 24 So I think we need to be mindful of that as we

25 | prepare for this hearing and as we move forward. I

2 restating of it is acceptable to you. 3 MR. FITZGERALD: It absolutely is. Thank you. 4 CHAIR LEVAR: Any other comments from anyor 5 before we adjourn? 6 Okay, we are adjourned. Thank you. 7 (Hearing adjourned at 12:09 p.m.) 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	
4 CHAIR LEVAR: Any other comments from anyor 5 before we adjourn? 6 Okay, we are adjourned. Thank you. 7 (Hearing adjourned at 12:09 p.m.) 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	
before we adjourn? Okay, we are adjourned. Thank you. (Hearing adjourned at 12:09 p.m.) (Hearing adjourned adjourned at 12:09 p.m.) (Hearing adjourned adjourned adjourned at 12:09 p.m.) (Hearing adjourned adjourne	ou.
6 Okay, we are adjourned. Thank you. 7 (Hearing adjourned at 12:09 p.m.) 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	le
7 (Hearing adjourned at 12:09 p.m.) 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	
8       9       10       11       12       13       14	
9         10         11         12         13         14	
10         11         12         13         14	
11 12 13 14	
12 13 14	
13 14	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	STATE OF UTAH )
3	COUNTY OF UTAH )
4	
5	I, DEIRDRE RAND, a Certified Court Reporter and
6	Registered Professional Reporter, hereby certify:
7	THAT the foregoing proceedings were taken via
8	teleconference, at the time and place therein set forth,
9	with the parties appearing from their respective
10	locations; that the proceedings were taken down by me in
11	shorthand and thereafter my notes were transcribed
12	through computer-aided transcription; and the foregoing
13	transcript constitutes a full, true, and accurate record
14	of such arguments adduced and oral proceedings had, and
15	of the whole thereof, which were audible to me via
16	teleconference.
17	I further certify that I am not a relative or
18	employee of any of the parties, nor do I have a
19	financial interest in the action.
20	I have subscribed my name on this 6th day of
21	April, 2020.
22	Juland
23	DEIRDRE RAND, RPR, CSR, CCR
24	
25	

	Public Hearing March 31, 2020	Index: \$500acqui
	<b>2(b)</b> 19:22	
\$	<b>20-035-03</b> 4:5	6
<b>\$500</b> 22:14	<b>2019</b> 16:23	<b>60</b> 69:17
<b>\$500,000</b> 22:15,17 25:6	<b>2020</b> 4:5	<b>63G</b> 10:7 13:18 19:4,8
	20th 4:19 50:2 68:9	20:20 21:2,14 41:9,13
(	69:14,20 74:6 77:22 80:22 81:1	63G-4-207 10:8 19:9 20:24 31:6 39:8
<b>(1)(d)</b> 31:9 39:14	<b>220</b> 35:10	<b>64G</b> 21:10
<b>(2)</b> 35:6,19 36:6	<b>230</b> 30:12,13 36:11,19,22	
(2)(b) 10:3 36:4 37:9 38:17	<b>23rd</b> 30:6	8
	3	<b>8:30</b> 32:8
1	J	
<b>1</b> 16:15 19:9 20:24 23:4	<b>3</b> 22:11	9
<b>10</b> 8:19 20:14 24:7,14	<b>31</b> 4:5	<b>9:00</b> 32:9
25:20 34:1 42:19	4	Α
<b>102</b> 35:18 36:2,5,10	<b>40</b> 24:15 61:10	
<b>11</b> 8:19 16:20,24 17:8 20:14 23:21 24:7,14	<b>48</b> 27:15	ability 20:7 26:9 43:14,16 51:5 71:3 81:22
25:21 34:2 35:3 42:10,	40 27.15	absolutely 15:18 44:1
14,19 53:22 54:2 72:1	5	acceptably 71:7
<b>12</b> 16:25	<b>50</b> 14:9 16:17 24:21 25:3	accessing 82:1
<b>138</b> 30:13	33:6	accommodate 27:19
<b>14</b> 36:16,19,20,23 71:17 72:2	50-something 8:18	66:22
<b>15</b> 18:10 75:14	<b>500,000</b> 22:18	accomplish 64:3 72:17
<b>17B</b> 22:4	<b>54</b> 22:4 35:12	81:9
<b>17D</b> 22:4	<b>54-14-303</b> 10:3 35:6 37:3	account 27:24
<b>18</b> 34:24 36:16,18	38:16 53:23	accurate 28:8 43:8 63:2 68:20
<b>19th</b> 16:23	54-14-303(2)(a) 22:24	accurately 5:2
	<b>54-14-303(2)(b)</b> 22:2	acknowledged 61:7
2	50:18 <b>54-18</b> 37:11	acknowledges 20:14
<b>2</b> 19:14 23:5	<b>54-18-102</b> 10:4 23:4	24:8
	31:24 35:15 45:22	acquire 12:18 26:6

Public Hearing March 31, 2020 Index: act..applicant adjudicating 62:22 40:14 52:19 53:20 54:13 act 8:16 21:7,9,11,23 22:1,19,23 30:12 31:6, 58:15 61:4 63:23 adjudicative 10:13,15 23,25 35:17 37:7,8 38:10 11:2,4 19:21,24 20:25 agreed 75:12 49:20 51:11 53:12 66:11 adjusted 9:16 agreement 11:15 14:23 acting 18:10 15:3,6 administrative 21:8,11 action 50:3 54:25 57:16, 31:5 33:19 66:2,6 agreements 16:1 24 68:18 admit 67:22 ahead 9:10,16,21 25:1 active 41:21 26:15 29:22 47:13 55:3, admits 20:13 actual 37:18 42:23 48:15, 5,8 67:4 71:11 78:6 adopt 67:9 21 51:22 59:4 60:3 **aired** 14:2 advance 62:14 73:21 add 12:23 34:14,16 70:9 aligned 42:21 advantage 71:19 added 12:19 allowing 11:5 13:21 advise 8:9 16:7 addition 24:7,14 31:7,22 19:25 32:15 53:1 32:22 49:10 61:3 advisement 9:4 49:24 alluding 69:13 50:4 51:3 57:6,23 additional 12:1,23 17:11 Almondon 17:3 18:5 24:15 27:2 40:21 **advocacy** 17:20 alternative 32:12 49:9 59:2 61:16 64:5 aesthetic 11:24 76:14 amalgamation 36:1 **affect** 43:17 **Additionally** 22:19 25:3 amend 58:20 81:3 affected 8:16,20,24 10:4, address 4:14 17:5 41:15, amendment 60:8 13,18 11:2 13:17 14:10 17 47:22 48:2 51:11,24, analysis 17:15 15:20 16:9 17:7,9,13,16, 25 52:10 54:19 58:3,16 25 18:1,7,14 19:3,18,20 59:12 60:24 62:5 63:11 anchor 75:24 20:11,16,18 21:22 22:1,9 77:7 angle 39:24 23:4,5 24:13,18 25:15 addressed 50:24 60:23 31:24 35:20,22,24 36:4, answering 26:17 44:19 64:14 76:3 7,10 37:11,17 42:11 answers 49:12 52:3 43:24 45:2,4,9,20,21 addressing 57:9 59:1 51:7 54:7 61:7,11 anticipate 28:4 63:22 66:6 affecting 44:23 **APA** 21:12 adequate 12:25 47:10 affidavits 33:6 apologize 46:4 47:25 adequately 27:24 33:24, 25 34:5 afield 62:21 apparent 8:23 adjacent 24:17,22 agencies 21:14 appearances 4:11 5:6 adjudicate 26:8,23 27:12 agency 20:25 21:1 31:10 append 21:13 40:7,16 43:22 52:7 59:5 32:3 34:9 appendices 78:16 62:19 agenda 65:25 applicant 37:25 adjudicated 40:1 43:15 agree 18:2,12 39:12

	Public Hearing March 31, 2020	Index: applicationboa
application 33:2 38:1	assume 6:13 57:24	26:5 52:2 62:17 63:12
applies 21:2,14 31:25	assuming 68:5 74:13	72:7
32:18 39:11,12	attached 16:15 79:7	<b>bases</b> 9:25
apply 21:11 39:9	Attachment 16:15	basically 33:10 66:14
appraisal 16:21	attempting 34:4	basis 62:25
appraised 40:20	attendant 68:23	begin 4:25 19:8 46:16
appraiser 25:17	attention 48:12	beginning 50:1 57:21
appropriately 38:3 78:12	attorney 5:9 13:8 56:5	79:10
approve 52:20 55:9	58:25 59:8	begins 54:21
67:13 68:14,18 approved 73:12,14	attorneys 6:4 31:1 33:20 74:4,18	<b>behalf</b> 5:25 6:7,23 8:16 9:1,24 15:4 16:13 18:10 19:6 21:5,18 23:2 24:5
approves 66:17	audio 43:7 68:4 70:8	27:4 35:8 48:8 58:2
approving 68:15	71:7 73:9 74:8 77:23	believes 45:12
April 4:19 13:13 27:7	authority 22:5 40:19	beta 70:6 73:4 74:23
50:2 63:1 67:25 68:9 69:14,20 74:6 80:22	authorize 64:19	<b>bids</b> 13:3,5,7,9
arguably 17:14	authorized 8:16 22:20	biggest 33:23 80:12
argue 41:7 48:22	authorizing 63:19 64:23	binders 75:4,8,13 76:8
•	automatic 34:23 53:23	78:24
arguing 43:21 argument 17:20 38:20,21	54:3,5 automatically 37:23	binding 33:13,17
41:6 48:2,11	avoid 64:24	<b>bit</b> 23:25 36:17 44:4,9
arguments 8:25 9:17,22	avoid 64.24 aware 82:21	52:8,9 69:24 73:22 80:12
48:10		<b>board</b> 4:4,8,16 6:13,17 7:13,24 8:9 9:3,12,19
arise 54:16	awkward 46:21 67:6	10:1 11:9 14:2,17 18:18
arranging 75:1	В	21:1,7,8,15,23 23:17
articulate 50:16		25:1,9 26:8,11,22 27:3,6 9,11 28:4,25 29:17,21
articulated 59:3 62:15 65:4	baby 46:1 back 37:8 41:6,9 44:19	30:2 31:12,20,23 32:21 34:10,21 37:5 39:15,22
ascertain 35:21 48:15,20	45:25 47:1,20 52:11 76:12	40:1,16,19 41:5,8,25 42:3 43:12,15,22 44:2
ascertaining 42:23 60:3	background 42:7 44:12,	46:16 47:2,3,15,23 48:6,
assertion 14:20	15 46:7 77:10	15 49:19 50:1,5,9 51:10
assist 12:4	base 81:17	52:6,17 53:19,20,24 54:1,19,23,25 55:15
assistant 8:3	based 16:16 17:14 25:14	56:4,21 57:24 58:16,23 59:11 62:7 63:4,10,14

	Public Hearing March 31, 2020
65:24 66:1,6,8,12,17,19 67:10 68:14,17 69:24	49:9 61:9 62:25 63:5 77:25 81:23
70:1,13,16,21 73:3 74:21,24 75:13,19,22,24	calling 60:23 61:4
76:12,14 79:12,18,20	calls 62:12
80:1,2,8	Candidly 7:8
<b>board's</b> 34:23 41:11 48:12 50:25 58:25	capability 72:16
Bodenstiener 17:3	care 67:22
boiling 60:16	carry 35:1
boils 60:14	<b>case</b> 25:19 32:3,10,14, 17,20 38:9,20 41:3
boundaries 34:3 37:6	case-by-case 62:25
<b>break</b> 46:18,20,24 47:3, 7,10	cases 12:10 32:15
	caveat 63:8
Brereton 5:22,25 6:11,21 8:1 14:7 16:12 17:23	certification 57:12
20:13 21:5,24 22:17,19	Chair 4:3 5:13,18 6:2
23:19 24:25 25:3 26:2	7:16 9:8 14:13 16:2
Bret 5:8 58:7	17:18 18:20,21 23:13,16 28:12,13,18 29:16 34:15,
briefing 8:4 14:11	19 36:12 38:11,23 39:4,
briefly 31:3 60:24	18,20 43:1,3 44:10 45:23
bring 32:11 42:16	46:15 47:5,8,12,20 49:15,17 50:12 52:15
broad 41:12	53:17 55:4,7,11,14,18,
broader 18:4 50:22	20,23,25 56:11,14,16,18,
brought 41:2	20,25 57:8,14,21 58:3,8, 14,19 59:6,17,23 60:12
build 40:6	61:18 63:2,13,16,23
bulletin 66:19,21 68:16	65:2,8,12,16,18,20,22 67:3,7,17 68:3,12,22,25
burden 12:23 20:1,6 22:9	69:4,6,8,10 71:8 72:4,24
Burke 17:4	74:9,18 75:16 76:12,17, 18 77:11,18 78:4,6,22
business 82:20	79:16,23 80:11,20,21
buttons 76:25	81:2,12 82:6,10,13,15, 17,19
C	Chair's 74:22
<b>call</b> 4:10 20:7 25:11 47:1	<b>Chairman</b> 5:21 58:6 62:9

Index: board's..clarification challenges 76:2,8 80:16 challenging 5:4 chance 7:14 change 70:23 chapter 34:24 36:15,16, 18,19,20,22 chapters 36:15 characteristics 61:17 charge 12:22 33:11 charging 12:1 **chase** 50:15 chicken-and-the-egg 52:9 **child** 44:13 circling 52:11 circumstances 81:5 circus 49:8 51:16 citation 19:4 **cited** 32:9,20 citizens 11:12,21 29:1 37:16 **city** 4:6 5:14,15 11:12 15:3,8 16:7,22 17:13 23:7 27:8 28:19 29:1,17, 22 30:22 31:2 32:3 33:19,25 34:3 37:23 41:23 42:22 48:14,16 59:25 63:20 64:20 70:22 74:10 81:6 city's 16:11 22:21 31:14 34:7 48:19 49:3 claim 8:15 25:12,15 claims 8:20 9:6 12:6 clarification 26:17 30:5 53:4 57:2 58:12,14 64:12

# clarifications 65:6

## clarified 58:22

**clarify** 26:14 30:14 43:20 58:21 60:13 68:13 77:12 78:8

## clarifying 64:11

clarity 60:22

Clark 4:8 16:3,5 17:18 18:16,18 38:25 39:2 47:22,24 48:7 49:13,15, 16 53:2,17 55:1,6,7,9,16, 17 56:11,13 63:16 64:11, 16 65:9,13,15 67:2,4,5 68:14,21,22 69:2,3 82:10,12

**Clark's** 58:23 64:9 65:5, 11 67:16

classification 30:18

clean 65:4

cleanest 64:24

**clear** 34:4 40:18 47:25 57:1 58:9,15 59:24 65:7 79:25

**close** 53:20 69:16

closing 71:15

Club 32:18 Club's 32:9

colleague 20:13

collect 14:9

**collected** 22:13 25:5 **collection** 11:21 12:11 **collections** 12:4

colloquial 45:2

color 23:25

comfortable 53:1 70:21 71:6 82:1

comment 37:22 53:18 64:8 66:21 68:17,19 69:23 72:25 74:5 75:17 80:11

commenters 37:18 38:4

**comments** 52:18 70:14 78:25 82:5

commission 8:4 14:12 16:22 56:3,6 66:8,16 70:4 72:15 73:2 75:19 78:10 81:19

Commission's 78:20,21

Commissioner 43:3 54:11

communicating 15:16 community 24:2 compensated 28:2 45:8 completely 73:24 complexity 33:8

complications 34:9

70:11

comply 15:10

concept 41:13

concern 8:23 62:16,20 74:22 76:16 77:8 78:23

concerned 11:19 12:6

**concerns** 11:22 13:10 76:3

concluded 68:19

concludes 18:19 82:20

conclusion 35:1 36:9

condemnation 40:8

Index: clarifications..Corbin

condition 22:11 conditional-use 12:16 15:7,24 22:21 30:17,19, 23 32:4 37:17

conditions 12:16 15:8

**conduct** 4:19 10:14 11:4 13:19 19:24 20:3 21:9 46:8 80:1

conducted 51:14

conducting 72:8

conference 78:1 81:18

conferencing 70:5

confined 63:19

confirm 57:17

confirmed 4:9

Confirming 57:20

confusing 35:23

considered 57:5

connect 19:1

consistent 56:7

constraints 53:11

constricted 7:10

construct 12:8 26:25

construction 18:2 22:6,7 25:7

**context** 21:12 36:14,15, 16 73:16

continue 44:15

continues 46:10

contributed 25:4

coordinating 80:17

**copies** 13:5

**Corbin** 5:16 28:23 29:13

74:12 76:15,19	cri
core 63:21	cre
correct 10:24 37:24	6
38:22 57:7 63:7 68:9,11	cro 6
correctly 59:7,14	cro
<b>corridor</b> 13:15 18:11 20:17 23:8,22 24:9,16,22	3
27:15 36:11 37:6	cro
cost 12:25 27:24 41:22	cre
costs 22:13,14,22 25:6	cry
34:5 42:23,24 48:15,21 60:3	cry
council 37:23 70:22	cu
71:13 82:25	cu
counsel 13:22 16:6	cu
47:24 53:4 57:17	cu
Counsel's 17:20	cu
counter-logical 36:17	
counterpetition 31:15	
48:14,19 49:3 52:25 60:11	da
county 11:13,18 23:7	Da
24:10 71:13,18 81:7	Da
82:25	da
couple 4:23 10:23 20:7 30:5 81:24	da
court 5:1,4 7:2 10:17	7
18:17 29:11 32:13,24	de
40:9,10,17 41:2 43:8 44:25 46:18,20 47:9 73:6	de
courthouse 32:15	de
covers 14:8	de
create 22:5 70:12	de 6
Creek 17:3	de
<b>Creeks</b> 17:3	de
VICCNS II.J	ue

criteria 53:4

cross-examination 20:8 60:21 62:13

Public Hearing March 31, 2020

cross-examine 14:1 60:18 62:2

cross-references 22:2 34:24 cross-referencing 36:19 crossing 44:24 crying 46:1 crystal 58:15 cumbersome 73:22

curious 21:2

current 72:11 81:5

**cut** 10:16

cutting 50:14

## D

date 80:2 81:11 Dave 49:16 63:16 67:2 David 4:8 53:2 55:1 day 71:16 days 17:2 69:17 71:17 72:2 deal 15:14 62:3 74:17 debugged 73:18 decide 40:19 decides 74:21 decides 74:21 decision 4:18 49:20 57:5 66:20 decisions 28:5 declarants 16:18 Index: core..disagreement

declarations 8:18 16:14, 17 17:6,16 24:15,21 defeat 54:3 defend 44:25 define 36:8 45:21 68:4 defined 10:4,5 30:11 31:24 34:5 35:25 36:2,5, 8 45:9 defines 23:5 35:19 definition 22:22 23:10 35:24 36:6,20 definitions 23:3 34:24 35:16,21 36:8 deliberation 57:15 demonstrating 31:8 deny 34:10 department 73:12 74:25 80:18 depending 16:9 63:8 **describe** 24:1 25:12 designated 80:2 determine 75:9 determined 31:15 48:25 determines 10:11 19:16 difference 42:11 45:3,11 differently 79:13 difficult 44:14 62:12 70:8 77:6 81:20 diminution 25:13 direct 43:14 56:5 58:17 59:8 79:4 directly 18:5 20:17 24:8 43:17 disagreement 40:5

	Public Hearing March 31, 2020	Index: discouragingevaluation
discouraging 54:9	dollar 28:5	effort 12:4
discourse 78:8	domain 41:3	efforts 34:7 64:21 80:25
discovery 54:16,19 60:15 63:10	donations 12:3,18 dots 19:1	electronic 4:16 66:4,7, 10,15 67:22,25 70:22
discuss 4:17 9:19 50:2 51:20 62:7 63:14 68:5,8	<b>down</b> 10:20,22 24:11 35:23 60:14,16 69:1	75:20,22 76:4 77:12 79:2,19 81:18
69:25 70:13 76:13 82:22	downer 80:13	electronically 76:4 79:9
discussed 64:12 68:6	download 8:12	eliminates 70:12
discussing 26:2 46:16 74:11	draft 56:6 59:8 66:2	Elizabeth 5:22
discussion 40:10 47:3,	drafted 58:24 68:4	email 7:19 8:2,7,11
16 49:19 50:6 52:18	drafting 58:17 67:8	emailed 73:20
54:24 56:7 57:7 65:8,12 66:25 67:17 68:12 69:23	draw 48:12	embedded 35:25
74:3 79:17 82:7	drill 35:23	eminent 41:3
discussions 15:18 45:14	dropped 10:22	empowered 21:8
50:13	due 45:16	encourage 54:7 79:1
dispute 17:14 18:1 20:10		end 69:16
26:3 32:25 41:1,21 44:6 45:1,18	E	endeavor 72:10,14,20 80:3
disputes 54:16,20 63:10	<b>e-mail</b> 8:3	enlightens 74:3
distilled 24:11	earlier 24:9 39:11,23	enormous 24:19
distinct 12:13	49:22 59:3 60:24	entered 11:15
distinction 17:20 36:23,	easement 12:1 17:11	entered 11:15 entire 35:16,18
distinction 17:20 36:23, 24		
distinction 17:20 36:23, 24 distracted 73:17	easement 12:1 17:11 26:5,6,10,25 27:16 33:11	entire 35:16,18
distinction 17:20 36:23, 24 distracted 73:17 distracting 77:2	easement 12:1 17:11 26:5,6,10,25 27:16 33:11 34:2 40:6,24 easements 12:8,21 17:22 27:13,19,21 29:5	entire 35:16,18 entities 22:25
distinction 17:20 36:23, 24 distracted 73:17	easement 12:1 17:11 26:5,6,10,25 27:16 33:11 34:2 40:6,24 easements 12:8,21 17:22 27:13,19,21 29:5 40:2,11,20 45:7 easily 67:19 78:16,20	entire 35:16,18 entities 22:25 entitled 45:5 entitles 45:13
distinction 17:20 36:23, 24 distracted 73:17 distracting 77:2 distributed 7:18 9:11	easement 12:1 17:11 26:5,6,10,25 27:16 33:11 34:2 40:6,24 easements 12:8,21 17:22 27:13,19,21 29:5 40:2,11,20 45:7 easily 67:19 78:16,20 80:9	entire 35:16,18 entities 22:25 entitled 45:5 entitles 45:13 entity 10:5 12:12,13 19:3
distinction 17:20 36:23, 24 distracted 73:17 distracting 77:2 distributed 7:18 9:11 66:14 67:1 79:9 distribution 7:21 district 22:24 40:8,10	<ul> <li>easement 12:1 17:11 26:5,6,10,25 27:16 33:11 34:2 40:6,24</li> <li>easements 12:8,21 17:22 27:13,19,21 29:5 40:2,11,20 45:7</li> <li>easily 67:19 78:16,20 80:9</li> <li>easy 71:1</li> </ul>	entire 35:16,18 entities 22:25 entitled 45:5 entitles 45:13 entity 10:5 12:12,13 19:3 21:22 22:1,4,20 23:5
distinction 17:20 36:23, 24 distracted 73:17 distracting 77:2 distributed 7:18 9:11 66:14 67:1 79:9 distribution 7:21 district 22:24 40:8,10 41:2	<ul> <li>easement 12:1 17:11 26:5,6,10,25 27:16 33:11 34:2 40:6,24</li> <li>easements 12:8,21 17:22 27:13,19,21 29:5 40:2,11,20 45:7</li> <li>easily 67:19 78:16,20 80:9</li> <li>easy 71:1</li> <li>echo 53:7 82:5</li> </ul>	entire 35:16,18 entities 22:25 entitled 45:5 entitles 45:13 entity 10:5 12:12,13 19:3 21:22 22:1,4,20 23:5 36:4 37:25
distinction 17:20 36:23, 24 distracted 73:17 distracting 77:2 distributed 7:18 9:11 66:14 67:1 79:9 distribution 7:21 district 22:24 40:8,10 41:2 districts 22:3,6	<ul> <li>easement 12:1 17:11 26:5,6,10,25 27:16 33:11 34:2 40:6,24</li> <li>easements 12:8,21 17:22 27:13,19,21 29:5 40:2,11,20 45:7</li> <li>easily 67:19 78:16,20 80:9</li> <li>easy 71:1</li> <li>echo 53:7 82:5</li> <li>economic 12:23</li> </ul>	entire 35:16,18 entities 22:25 entitled 45:5 entitles 45:13 entity 10:5 12:12,13 19:3 21:22 22:1,4,20 23:5 36:4 37:25 equipment 73:14
distinction 17:20 36:23, 24 distracted 73:17 distracting 77:2 distributed 7:18 9:11 66:14 67:1 79:9 distribution 7:21 district 22:24 40:8,10 41:2 districts 22:3,6 docket 4:5 7:20 9:13	<ul> <li>easement 12:1 17:11 26:5,6,10,25 27:16 33:11 34:2 40:6,24</li> <li>easements 12:8,21 17:22 27:13,19,21 29:5 40:2,11,20 45:7</li> <li>easily 67:19 78:16,20 80:9</li> <li>easy 71:1</li> <li>echo 53:7 82:5</li> <li>economic 12:23</li> <li>effect 61:13</li> </ul>	entire 35:16,18 entities 22:25 entitled 45:5 entitles 45:13 entity 10:5 12:12,13 19:3 21:22 22:1,4,20 23:5 36:4 37:25 equipment 73:14 essential 81:7
distinction 17:20 36:23, 24 distracted 73:17 distracting 77:2 distributed 7:18 9:11 66:14 67:1 79:9 distribution 7:21 district 22:24 40:8,10 41:2 districts 22:3,6	<ul> <li>easement 12:1 17:11 26:5,6,10,25 27:16 33:11 34:2 40:6,24</li> <li>easements 12:8,21 17:22 27:13,19,21 29:5 40:2,11,20 45:7</li> <li>easily 67:19 78:16,20 80:9</li> <li>easy 71:1</li> <li>echo 53:7 82:5</li> <li>economic 12:23</li> </ul>	entire 35:16,18 entities 22:25 entitled 45:5 entitles 45:13 entity 10:5 12:12,13 19:3 21:22 22:1,4,20 23:5 36:4 37:25 equipment 73:14 essential 81:7 essentially 12:7 27:17

evening 57:13 evidence 13:12,24 14:2 48:24 61:12 evident 33:5 evidentiary 63:9 64:24 70:10 73:5,16 exception 53:21 excess 22:12,14,22 25:6 34:5 exclusion 15:14 **Excuse** 20:22 22:15 35:13 74:19 **executive** 66:4,7,23 **Exhibit** 75:14 78:15 exhibits 73:19 75:5,7,11 78:10,19 79:6 80:6 exist 27:20 81:25 existence 27:12,17,18 existing 26:5,9,25 27:15 expand 17:11 60:5 expanded 45:7 expanding 64:6 expect 13:23 expectation 80:15 **expense** 12:19 33:4 experience 70:18 experts 29:6 **expires** 66:24 explain 19:2 explained 66:3 explanation 25:10 explore 72:10

Public Hearing March 31, 2020 express 50:6 expressing 63:18 78:23 **expressly** 49:2,14 extent 12:15 42:19 44:22 45:15 80:8 F Fabian 5:12 facilitate 11:25 12:19 facilities 23:24 facility 4:4 21:7 26:5 31:23 34:22 41:10,11 42:3 51:10 54:1 fact 12:13,21 31:13 32:13 factor 27:2 33:23 factors 32:21,23 33:1 facts 31:7 failed 27:24 28:7 39:13 48:3.5 fails 72:8 failure 61:13 **fairly** 14:2 fall 12:15 fashion 78:10 fatal 31:4,17,21 32:22 favor 55:17,21 56:13,17 64:17 67:19 fear 49:7 70:9 feedback 44:9 feel 20:19 29:2 50:3 53:8 54:23 58:18 60:15 79:21 feeling 80:12 81:13 **Fellow** 17:2

Index: evening..follow

fight 15:13

figure 40:9

file 7:11 8:6,10 9:6 10:9 19:10,13 78:11,19 80:6

filed 6:24 7:8,14,17 8:10, 18 14:6 24:15,21 28:21 30:6 32:8 33:6,9 35:5,8 49:21 57:4,12,23 80:7

filing 4:15 8:22

filings 33:16 75:20,21 79:1,8

final 13:3,7 25:25 69:12

finally 32:19 34:8

finance 22:6

financially 12:4

fine 74:8,13

finer 26:21

firm's 74:25

firms 80:19

fit 23:9 32:15

Fitzgerald 4:8 18:22,24 20:21,22 21:20,23 23:11, 13 39:5,6,16 52:22 55:18,19 56:14,15 65:10, 16,17 67:18 68:10 69:4, 5,13 70:16,20 81:12 82:4,13,14

five-minute 47:9

flaw 31:4,17,21 32:22 flaws 33:15 flexibility 59:1 72:9 focus 73:16,17 folks 23:21 81:7 follow 25:9

	Marc
follow-up 17:19 18:17 36:13 38:13	goal 80:22
forced 8:22 9:6	<b>good</b> 5:8,2 75:1 79:19
forgot 42:17	<b>Gordon</b> 5:
formal 10:13 11:2 19:21 20:25	28:20,23 2 34:15,17 3 38:22 40:4
format 67:25 70:7,22 71:5 73:5,6 74:5 77:12	42:17,18 74:12 76: <sup>2</sup>
formed 11:11 12:11 22:3	governme
forward 9:20 14:15 21:10 59:2,13 68:2 76:6	governme 37:25
framework 48:4	governme
free 58:18 79:22	governor
free-for-all 13:23 front 7:23,25 10:8 50:7	<b>governor's</b> 72:12 81:
63:25 64:7	grant 10:1
fully 31:15	26:11 27:3 52:12 53:2
function 22:11	58:22 61:2
funding 25:6	granted 14
future 66:19	granting 1
fuzzy 52:8	graphical
G	great 47:1
	greater 12
gatekeeper 32:14	guess 9:2
gave 12:17	39:7 40:3, 50:14,24 {
general 22:8 54:12 64:6 74:5	60:8 64:16 78:8 79:24
generally 75:17 76:14	guessing
geographic 37:6	guinea 74
<b>give</b> 9:21 23:25 38:4 40:12 43:16 44:1,5 46:18,19 69:24 70:2	
<b>Glenn</b> 4:9 46:13 52:19 71:10 82:24	half 46:19

ublic Hearing rch 31, 2020 22 ,21 29:7 58:14 handled 72:6 19 82:2 5:11.16 13:8 29:12,13,14,24 35:11,13 37:1 :4,13 41:19 44:3,20,21 6:15,19 ent 81:22 ental 32:3 ents 22:5 66:5 81:23.24 **'s** 66:7,23 :5 :1,10 19:15 :7 38:19 50:15 3:25 54:12,15 :24 14:21 29:10 60:9 12:15 71:21 11 78:3 2:9 30:13 2 26:21 36:2 3.23 41:13 44:4 52:11 58:20 16,25 72:19 77:8 24 76:22 4:22 н

Index: follow-up..Herbert

handle 78:9

happening 77:9

happy 8:25 34:17 49:1,8 50:13 53:25 61:1,15 65:3,4 70:21 74:20 80:24 81:3,10

hard 7:1 13:5 14:9

hate 73:17

head 39:25

hear 9:18 41:25 58:10 74:1

heard 41:3 62:6

hearing 4:3,13,18,22 5:2 7:1 9:13,14 13:12 14:3 27:7,23 29:21 37:25 44:15 45:25 46:3,8,21 50:2 53:15 54:17,20 56:23 57:22 60:17 62:4 63:1,6 64:3 68:6,9 69:14, 17,20 70:10,14 73:5,8, 16,21 74:2,6,23 75:5 76:1,13 77:13,21 79:3,6, 10,16 80:1,8 81:10

hearings 31:1 70:5

heart 63:17

heavily 33:2

heavy 81:8

**Heber** 11:16

**Heidi** 5:11 34:14,17 35:11,13 37:1 38:22 40:13 41:19 42:17,18 44:3,20,21

helpful 25:10,25 28:11, 24 48:1 51:8 52:23

Herbert 66:5

	Public Hearing March 31, 2020	Index: highinvolv
high 14:5 30:1,11	impaired 11:5 13:20	interest 10:12 13:19
high-level 9:22	19:25 20:4	15:15 23:6 24:3 25:13,15 33:24 34:1 42:20 45:13
high-voltage 11:14	implement 66:9	64:5
30:11,12 31:25 32:1	impose 22:8 33:13	interested 15:11,12
35:17 37:7,11 38:10	impossible 81:9	24:13 77:24
higher 12:8 36:11	improvement 22:3,6,23	interests 8:24 10:14
highlight 6:17	in-person 69:20	11:3,18 19:17,20,23
Historically 11:11	inclined 60:20 79:21	20:2,11,15 24:1 41:8 42:21,22 51:15
hold 76:1 77:13,22	include 15:19 58:21,25	internal 80:16
holding 32:9 66:4	61:13	interpretation 34:22
home 77:3	included 15:9,23 16:20	36:17
hope 26:10 27:2 42:7	58:13	interrupt 44:11 45:24
57:22	includes 22:23,25 54:5 67:25	interrupting 44:18
hopes 26:7	including 8:19 21:15	intervene 4:15 6:9 10:6,
hour 46:19	increased 33:4,8	10 11:9 13:2 28:22 32:25
hung 44:4 hypothetical 14:24	incurred 12:20	33:3,5 37:12 60:10 interveners 51:22
	independent 9:25	intervening 52:6
	individual 13:14 35:2,4	intervention 4:21 9:4
	41:24	10:2 11:6 14:22 15:1
idea 78:9	individuals 13:17	18:9 19:15,25 26:11
ideal 15:22 79:7	inefficient 62:22	29:10 31:4 34:23 35:5,9
ideally 15:5	information 8:12 13:1	36:24 38:17,19 41:11,12 42:16 47:4 48:4 49:21
identified 4:14 17:1,8,24	28:8,9	50:7,15,18 51:12 52:13,
18:7 25:18 49:11 51:7 61:6,14	infrastructure 22:7 81:25	21,24 53:1,3,23,25 54:3,
identify 4:25 6:6 31:18	initial 13:4 26:1	6,8,12,16 55:10,22 56:6 58:11,18 59:9,11 60:20
39:14 48:5 79:4	initially 19:12 62:17	61:22,24 63:4,19 64:19,
identifying 31:20 32:22	initiative 67:8	20,22
immediately 24:17	intend 60:22 79:6	intervention-of-rights 50:20
impact 11:22 13:13 18:3	intended 77:16	interventions 36:21
33:17	intending 11:14	introduce 70:10
impacted 16:24 17:1	intent 26:7,22 33:10	
25:22 29:2,8	<b>intent</b> 20.7,22 55.10	involved 68:23 72:1

<b>issue</b> 4:21 6:8 8:5 15:18 17:22 46:17 49:5 50:24 61:12 62:8 64:1 68:5,8 69:12,23 70:15 74:5,11	K kids 77:3	<b>legal</b> 10:12 12:13 19:17, 20 20:11,15 26:4,8,23,24 31:8 33:13 40:11 41:17 59:4 68:23 80:18
77:18 79:17 81:13 issued 66:5	kilovolts 30:12,13,14 kind 14:23 31:3 32:6	legally 9:15 12:12 27:12 45:12
<b>issues</b> 4:14 6:17 29:5 40:12 43:17 44:2 53:14 59:12 60:17 62:21 64:14	35:23 40:12 41:9,10 45:2 50:14 72:22 80:12 kindly 11:24	letters 33:9,12 Levar 4:3,7 5:13,18 6:2 7:16 9:8 14:13,14 16:2,3
65:25 73:11 80:4,25 items 56:23 59:3	kv 27:15 35:10 36:11	17:18 18:20,21 23:13 28:12,13,18 29:16 34:15, 19 36:12 38:11,12,23
J	L	39:4,18,20 43:1,3 44:10
Jerry 25:19	Lake 81:6	45:23 46:15 47:5,8,12,20 49:15,17 50:12 52:15
Jewkes 5:17 28:20	land 40:20,21	53:17,18 55:4,7,11,14, 18,20,23,25 56:11,14,16,
Johnson 17:3	landowner 10:4 17:7 18:7 23:5 35:3,20,22,24	18,20,25 57:8,14,21 58:3,8,14,19 59:6,17,23
join 49:14 53:25 54:8	36:7,10 37:12 45:9,20,22	60:12 61:18,19 62:9
joining 54:4	61:8	63:2,13,16,23 65:2,8,12,
joins 12:24 28:6 59:24 Jordan 4:8 39:22 41:5 42:1 47:5 50:12 55:12 56:9,25 58:19 59:20 62:10 65:2 67:3,15 71:8 72:4 78:5,7 79:15,24 81:2 Joshua 5:16 judicial 32:16,17 jump 9:9 16:13 21:6,25 29:18 44:11 61:18 70:17 72:25 79:13 jurisdiction 41:25 51:1	<ul> <li>landowners 8:17,18,19, 24 12:14 13:14,17 14:10 16:9 17:9,13,17,25 18:5, 10,14 22:9 27:16 28:3 31:24 35:5 54:7 61:11,13</li> <li>lane 40:10</li> <li>language 19:9 66:15,18 67:1 68:8</li> <li>large 5:19 6:10 8:6,14</li> <li>late 7:17 32:8 49:22 57:23</li> <li>law 27:19 32:14 44:25 80:18,19</li> </ul>	16,18,20,22 67:3,17 68:3,12,13,22,25 69:4,6, 8,10 71:8 72:4,24 74:9, 18 75:16 76:12,18 77:11, 18 78:4,6,22 79:16,23 80:11,20,21 81:2,12 82:6,10,13,15,17,19 level 14:5 37:15 51:21 70:25 lie 24:16 lies 17:21 lieutenant 81:23 lift 81:8
62:18 63:12	learned 11:13 77:20	light 11:16 62:6 81:5
justice 10:14 11:3 13:19 19:23 20:2	leave 60:10 81:10 leaves 80:14 left 60:15	limit 49:1 52:5 53:5 60:6, 21 61:4,15,22 62:1 63:4 64:19
		limitation 63:18 64:4

Index: limitations..miles

limitations 73:1 81:15 limited 27:19 36:18,21 42:9 59:9 62:18.19 63:12 64:14 80:4 limiting 52:24 54:14 58:11 **limits** 16:8,11 61:24 **lines** 5:20 6:10 11:14,22 12:20 13:13 24:19 25:23 28:9 32:1 36:19 44:23 link 8:5 list 7:19,21 16:24 17:2 23:20 35:3 listed 29:6 listen 76:23 77:5,15,25 listening 43:5 44:17 46:4.6 literally 12:10 live 81:14 live-streamed 77:24 Liz 5:23,25 8:1 14:4,7 16:12 21:5,24 24:25 **local** 22:3,5 located 23:7 location 16:10 75:24 81:17 locations 75:25 76:9 **logical** 36:22 logistical 76:2,7 80:25 logistically 49:25 78:24 long 70:10 longer 57:25 lot 33:15.16 35:25 44:16 46:4 70:3

## Μ

made 12:7 14:20 15:7 18:18 36:23 48:10 57:5

**make** 10:23 15:14 21:9 34:25 36:16 37:20,22 42:11 49:7,19 54:21,24 56:2,4 62:12,24 66:20 71:25 75:3 76:16 77:4,23 79:21,24 80:24

makes 30:23 37:9,13 77:5 79:14

**making** 9:7 12:3,7 28:5 44:14 46:7 48:12

manage 82:2

March 4:4 30:6

Mark 5:22 15:4 48:8

marked 80:9

materially 11:5 13:20 19:25 20:4

materials 9:5,11

matter 42:2,6,8,15 54:6

matters 54:20

means 8:12 68:15

meant 35:21

Medallion 17:2

**meet** 20:20 39:13 45:21 50:22 75:19

meeting 37:22 66:10 70:22 71:16,17 79:19

meetings 4:16 50:1 66:4, 7,11,15 67:22 70:3,19 72:1,8 meets 50:17 67:10

member 7:24 18:18

23:17 25:1,9 37:21 39:22 41:5 52:17 58:16,23 63:14 70:16

**members** 4:8 6:13,18 7:13,24 9:12 14:9,17 15:10,15,19 16:7,17 17:9,12 20:15 23:9 24:1, 2,10,12 25:3 29:17,22 30:2 31:12 34:21 41:15 42:15,20 47:2 49:19 50:5,10 53:22 54:2,5 55:15 56:21 58:10 62:7 65:24 66:1 75:25 76:14 79:12 80:8

members' 19:19 20:11

membership 16:6 41:24 42:9 51:22

memorandum 6:24 7:8, 11,15,17 9:2 36:1 57:12

mentioned 30:19 39:10

mentioning 30:23

merits 9:14 53:15

**met** 13:6,16

Midway 4:6 5:14,15 11:12,20,24 12:15,24 13:8,14,25 14:22 15:3,7, 13,17,23 16:7,10,18,22 17:5,13 18:14 22:21 24:12 25:18 27:8 28:6,19 29:1,17,22 30:22 31:2 32:3 33:19,25 34:3,7 37:23 41:23 42:22 48:14, 16 49:3,11,14 52:25 59:25 60:1,4,11 63:20 64:15,20 74:10 75:10

Midway's 13:10 27:23 mile 11:20

miles 24:23

	Public Hearing March 31, 2020	Index: millionobligations
million 22:14	18,24,25 64:6,15 65:9,	negotiate 40:24
mind 38:13 42:7,8 52:9	11,22 67:16 68:14,21,25 69:2,10 79:18,20,21,24,	negotiations 45:6
54:21	25 80:11,14 82:7,9,11	neighborhood 24:20
mindful 53:13	Mountain 4:5 5:7,9,10,12	nervous 73:15,25
minimized 34:9	6:14 7:9 8:19,23 9:7	niceties 68:23
minute 37:15	11:13 12:6,25 13:1,3,9 14:21,22,25 15:3,13,17	night 6:24 32:8 70:23,24
<b>minutes</b> 6:16 47:15,16 48:9	16:21 17:8,15 18:6 20:2, 12 24:8 26:4,24 27:24,25	noise 42:7 44:13,15 45:24 46:7,11 77:10
misplaced 32:10	28:7 29:23 30:18,22 32:4	nonbinding 33:9
missed 10:23	34:13 35:14 39:1,8 40:2,	•
misunderstanding 38:15	3 41:23 42:6,8 43:10,13 44:6 45:1,6,11,14 48:3,	noncorridor 25:11
modification 42:4	10 49:5,10 58:7 61:6,7,	nonlawyer 43:12
modified 63:25	10 74:4 75:6 80:18	nonprofit 12:12
modify 51:11	Mountain's 8:15 13:25	normal 7:20
moment 4:12	20:9 27:8 61:13	note 67:5
	<b>move</b> 6:18 9:18 30:2 34:20 47:15 49:18 53:19	noted 17:5
money 12:19 25:5	55:9 56:22 65:25 67:9,13	notice 66:1,3 67:1
month 13:12	69:12 76:6	noticed 56:23
months 12:5	moves 59:13	notices 4:13
morning 5:8,21 8:3 46:5 51:5 52:4	<b>moving</b> 47:3 68:2 75:18, 20	November 16:23
<b>Morris</b> 5:21,22 6:11,20,	20 multiple 71:1	number 18:8 21:14 33:18,23 34:8
22,23 7:2,4,7 8:8 9:23,24 10:20,25 15:4 19:6 21:13,17 22:15,16,18	<b>mute</b> 4:23 42:18 43:7 44:8,12 46:3,12,25 71:3	numbers 13:4
23:1 24:5 25:16 26:1,13, 16,19 27:4 30:10 39:23	76:25	0
48:7,8 50:23 51:13 57:19	N	object 28:23 30:18 47:2
58:1,2,22 59:21,24 60:25 61:1,23 62:6,15 64:12	names 17:2	objection 46:23 47:6 57:16 59:14,17 68:7
74:19 76:11 78:9 Morris's 25:10 78:25	nature 8:22	objections 27:8 62:14 63:1 75:9
motion 15:1 29:25 32:25	navigate 78:16	
47:16 49:21 50:7 54:11,	needed 40:21	objects 47:12
25 55:13,16,25 56:2,5,8, 10,12 58:16,17,21 59:7,	negative 20:6	obligation 20:5 33:13
18 61:20 62:6 63:3,15,	negotiable 51:17	obligations 15:9

Index: obtain..personal

**obtain** 17:10 offered 11:24 53:5 office 73:3 81:7 officer 10:10,11 19:15,16 42:5 62:24 official 70:19 one-mile 24:11 open 33:20 50:5 66:11 72:18 80:14 opening 26:1 operates 32:14 operating 73:1 **opined** 25:20 opinion 40:12 43:12,15, 25 44:1.5 opinions 43:16 **Opportunities** 73:4 **opportunity** 9:5 12:18 54:18 67:11 77:4 **opposed** 7:9 13:1 73:24 opposite 39:7 **opposition** 5:19 6:10,14 9:7 13:25 29:25 30:6 option 69:20 78:24 options 62:2 80:3 order 12:8 20:1 28:9 35:21 56:6 57:10 58:13, 18,24 59:8 61:24 66:5,7, 23 72:13 81:6 orderly 10:14 11:3 13:19, 24 19:23 20:3 75:6 orders 71:15 organization 35:7 54:4 organize 79:1 81:18

organized 76:5 organizing 35:6 original 4:21 24:9 64:1 originally 11:17 63:24 outlined 31:22 32:24 overhead 12:21 13:6 18:3 25:23 27:25 28:9 overly 80:23 **owner** 23:6 owners 16:18 17:4,21 18:13 23:20 24:4 25:11 33:10,14 34:1,6 40:5,25 41:18 42:10,14 43:17,24 44:22 51:6 owners' 33:25 Ρ paid 28:2 papers 48:1 paperwork 14:6 paragraph 31:14 48:13, 18 58:11 59:10 60:2 64:13 parcel 23:24 24:4 42:10 parcels 17:1,10 23:22 pardon 24:14 paries 6:19 part 15:6 23:23,24 27:22, 23 46:5 58:24 participant 77:14 participants 6:5 14:18 47:23 57:2 70:14 73:8

participate 11:10 13:21, 24 20:8

participated 30:25 33:18, 21 38:2,3 participating 15:12

29:10 46:2 74:2

participation 37:16

particularity 41:7

parties 8:11 9:19 18:12 29:8 37:17,19,24 38:7,8 47:23 52:6 61:3 69:22 70:1 75:8,12 78:11,19 79:1,9 80:5

party 10:6,9 11:9 15:7,25 19:10 30:16,20,24 33:24 37:4,24 38:5

passed 71:14

passes 56:1 65:23 69:11

past 66:13

path 9:19

pay 22:12,22,23

payment 22:23 42:23 45:16

pending 50:7 61:20 62:5 63:3

**people** 8:20 12:11 20:15 25:21 44:16 46:4,25 73:7

people's 12:10

perfectly 59:16,19

perform 26:25

period 66:21 68:17,19

permit 11:9 12:16 15:7, 24 22:22 30:17,19,23 32:5 37:19,24 38:5,6 64:18

person 10:9 19:10 37:21

personal 67:7 73:23

Public Hearing March 31, 2020	Index: personallyprocedure
19 30:8 31:11 40:4 43:10	precise 17:19 51:15
	preference 49:23
53:9 60:20 62:1 64:2	preliminary 13:4
	preparing 5:5
	prescriptive 27:16
•	present 13:11 31:1 33:20
	48:24 60:17 61:12
•	presentation 13:24 49:23
•	presentations 71:21
	presented 16:21 31:2
•	48:2
	presenters 71:20
	presiding 10:10,11
portion 22:12	19:14,16 42:5 62:24
position 7:10 14:20	presume 8:11 57:14 67:8
15:23 17:23 22:10 27:10, 11,14 28:20,22 29:24	pretty 40:18 44:14 53:19
31:4,17 34:25 35:2 38:14	69:16 71:19 72:2 75:1
	prevailing 53:24
•	prevent 54:10 80:5
possibly 7:18	prevented 77:19
posted 7:19	previous 52:20
potential 15:2 25:13,19	Price 17:2
	primarily 8:14
	primary 48:11
	prior 79:9
7:9 11:13,16 12:7 14:21,	private 22:20,25
22,25 15:3 17:8 18:7	problem 29:9 46:6
	problems 70:12
37:7,11 39:1 40:3 41:23	procedural 41:14
43:10,13 44:6 45:1,6,12,	procedurally 27:12
<b>Power's</b> 6:14 16:21 17:15 40:2 42:6,8 80:18	procedure 31:6 70:7
	March 31, 2020 19 30:8 31:11 40:4 43:10 44:18 46:17 47:10 49:18 50:11 51:20,24 52:10,18 53:9 60:20 62:1 64:2 66:17 72:23 74:2 76:13 81:13 pointed 20:13 pointing 23:19 points 30:1,5 poles 27:20 policy 54:6 pool 61:15 populus 22:8 poring 16:14 portion 22:12 position 7:10 14:20 15:23 17:23 22:10 27:10, 11,14 28:20,22 29:24 31:4,17 34:25 35:2 38:14 45:21 57:25 74:11 positions 31:16 possibly 7:18 posted 7:19 potential 15:2 25:13,19 40:10 63:9 potentially 10:3 31:23 51:21 57:1 72:9 power 4:5 5:7,9,10,12 7:9 11:13,16 12:7 14:21, 22,25 15:3 17:8 18:7 26:4,24 29:23 30:12,18, 22 32:4 34:13 35:17 37:7,11 39:1 40:3 41:23 43:10,13 44:6 45:1,6,12, 14 48:3 49:10 58:7 74:4 Power's 6:14 16:21

Public Hearing March 31, 2020 procedures 21:9,11,12 protectable 45:12 proceed 8:9,25 28:9 prove 20:6 72:14 40:22 74:20 75:6 77:6 provide 13:5 28:8 31:19 79:20 52:17 proceeded 12:14 provided 8:6 12:25 13:3, proceeding 10:6,13 11:3 9 35:4 36:1 66:2 19:18,21 20:25 26:11 providing 67:8 30:20,21,24,25 32:2 33:7 provision 34:23 52:13 59:12 60:15 64:2 54:13 proceedings 10:15 11:4, **provisions** 38:9 42:3 10 13:20 19:24 20:4,12 66:10 21:3,9 33:19,22 36:21 39:9 72:6 77:15 78:11 **PSC** 59:8 process 12:3 24:11 29:3 **public** 37:21,22 38:4 37:17,24 56:3,5 66:11,16,21 68:17,19 70:4 73:1 75:18 product 71:18 76:23 77:4 project 27:1 34:3 40:7,22 publication 66:22 68:16 45:17 publish 4:16 **prompt** 10:14 11:4 13:19 19:24 20:3 published 66:18 68:17 **proof** 27:22,23 **pull** 78:21 properly 28:1 40:17,22 purpose 40:1 properties 11:23 16:25 purposes 17:23 18:9 24:16 34:2 42:19 pursuant 22:21 66:4 property 12:2 15:19 pursue 80:3 16:10,18 17:4,5,10,21 18:3,13 20:17 23:6,7,20 put 12:16 21:10 26:21 24:17 25:13,20 33:10,13, 44:8,12 46:3,11 65:5 25 34:1,6 40:5,25 41:18 74:14 42:14 43:17,24 44:22,24 puts 20:1 71:22 45:13 51:6 putting 76:21 propose 58:17 75:7,11 proposed 11:20 23:8 Q 24:19 25:23 28:10 37:6 67:9,14,20 68:8 qualifies 11:7 19:3 21:22 proposing 29:5 qualify 48:3 50:21 53:23 54:2 prospect 16:1

Index: procedures..realize

qualities 19:4

Questar 32:19

**question** 14:16,19 16:5 17:19 18:15,18 20:23 21:21 23:18 25:25 26:18, 23 27:6 34:20 39:21,23 40:3,15 41:17 43:11,20, 24 44:4,19 45:8,19 47:22,24 49:12 50:24 51:23 57:19 58:3,6,15,23 63:17 64:9,11 72:18 76:20

questioning 45:24

**questions** 6:18 9:18 14:17 16:4 18:19,22 23:12,14 28:12,15,17 29:17,19,21 30:2 34:13, 16,18 38:24,25 39:2,5, 17,19 43:1,9 46:14 52:3 59:2 64:24

quickly 70:23

## R

raise 76:16 77:8 raised 14:25 49:6 64:1 Rand 47:9 rapidly 67:21 rarely 67:11 rate 41:21 re-call 46:10 read 6:13 29:25 34:22 35:20 36:3 reading 36:7,9 ready 50:3 54:24 realize 46:20 73:19

	Public Hearing March 31, 2020	Index: reasonrespondents
<b>reason</b> 8:14,21 15:23 27:16 37:13 39:10	<b>Reich</b> 5:8,9 29:23 30:3 37:14 39:10 40:4 43:19	represented 11:18 13:22 30:7,16 33:21 34:6
reasonable 62:11,15 65:6 80:22	48:18 58:6,7,9 74:7 77:17 78:2	representing 5:10 8:2 17:12
reasons 37:4,14 50:16	Reich's 41:6	represents 17:16 18:13
receive 75:13	rejecting 33:2	25:22 33:24,25
received 6:12 7:17,20	related 36:20	request 26:8,22 30:21
8:3,4,11	relates 16:5 48:14	34:11 58:1 59:22 60:8 82:23
receiving 75:21	relevance 62:12,23,25	requested 63:20
recent 72:7	relevant 38:18 52:5	requesting 31:18 48:15
recently 66:5 70:18	54:22 59:12	require 66:11 71:24
recess 47:15,19	reliance 32:10,18	required 22:12,21 69:17
recognize 67:10	relied 31:5	requirement 19:12,17,22
recognized 12:12,21	relief 28:6 31:9,16,18,20 39:14 48:5,16,20,25	39:13
recognizing 12:24	49:1,3,13,14 50:25 52:25 53:5,10 58:22 59:25	requirements 13:5,16 50:18
recommended 66:8	60:1,4,7,10 63:20 64:20	requires 31:7,19
reconvene 47:7 54:19	remainder 42:14	rescinded 66:24
reconvening 46:24	remaining 41:1 57:9	reserve 51:10,20 52:4
record 30:15 47:21	remedy 32:23	72:22
records 23:7	remind 28:25 43:5	reserves 48:24 63:10
refer 36:5,6 37:8 75:14 80:9	reminder 6:3	residents 16:18 77:24
reference 12:17 20:24	reminders 4:23	resolution 32:16 41:8
31:23 80:9	repeat 6:15	resolve 27:2 41:15
referenced 22:24	reply 6:24 7:8,11,14,17	resolved 41:22
referred 30:10 79:5	9:2 16:15 32:7 48:9 57:4,	respect 15:2 16:10 40:1
referring 57:11 76:6	11	41:15 51:2,6,15,19 52:6
refers 35:12,15,18	report 16:21	53:5,10 57:3 59:3
refined 65:9	reporter 5:1,4 7:1,2,5 10:16,17,22 18:17 21:16,	respective 15:9
reflected 23:6	19 29:11,15 43:8 46:18,	respond 9:6 31:13 49:6 59:22
reflects 5:2	20 47:9,11,18 73:6	responded 9:1
regard 41:22	represent 8:24 12:13,14 18:4 43:18	respondents 75:10

	Public Hearing March 31, 2020	Index: responsesite
response 14:25 58:23	rulemaking 67:12	45:2 79:14
rest 36:7	rules 21:9	sentences 49:6
restart 47:17	running 12:9 24:19 77:3	separate 12:12 42:13 78:19
restates 59:19	S	served 8:10
restating 59:7,14		serves 22:11
result 45:16	safe 6:13 7:23 69:19	service 7:19 56:3,6 66:16
retained 25:17	<b>Salt</b> 81:6	70:4 73:2 75:19
retains 59:11	satisfy 8:23	services 25:17 73:13
review 4:4 7:14 9:5 14:5,	scenario 37:10	set 13:18 20:20 44:14
10 16:16 21:7 31:23 34:23 37:5,10 51:5 54:1	schedule 9:15 57:9	49:2 71:25 75:7
reviewing 29:4 38:6	scheduled 4:4,19,22	setting 67:24
right-of-way 23:23 43:25	9:14 50:1 54:17 69:14 74:6	<b>settlement</b> 14:23 15:2,6, 18 16:1
rights 15:20 17:11 26:8	scheduling 57:10	share 71:20 74:21
28:1 40:2,6,11,24 41:17 44:24 51:10 59:4	schemes 11:8	shares 13:10 75:5
rights-of-way 48:16,21	scope 26:10 40:6,19 42:4	shed 25:14,16
60:3	45:15 51:11,21 52:5,24 53:13 54:14,22 59:2,10,	short 7:22 47:2,19
Rocky 4:5 5:7,9,10,12	12 62:18 63:11	show 20:2 27:23 61:12
6:14 7:9 8:15,19,22 9:7	screens 71:20	71:20 75:12
11:13 12:6,25 13:1,2,9, 25 14:21,22,25 15:3,13,	seconds 29:20	<b>shown</b> 28:1
17 16:21 17:8,14 18:6	section 10:2,5,7,8 13:18	shows 33:7 48:13
20:2,9,12 24:8 26:4,24	20:20 21:3,14 23:4 31:6,	<b>side</b> 15:14
27:7,23,25 28:7 29:23 30:17,21 32:3 34:13	8,9,24 35:5,12,15,16,18 36:5 37:12 38:17 39:13	Sierra 32:9,18
35:13 38:25 39:8 40:2,3	50:19	signed 10:9 19:10 27:17
41:22 42:6,8 43:10,12 44:6 45:1,6,11,14 48:3,	seek 31:16 37:5 48:5	significantly 33:7 43:7
10 49:5,10 58:7 61:6,7,	50:25 60:5,10,11	silent 29:19
10,12 74:4 75:6 80:17	seeking 31:21 32:4,23	similar 46:1
<b>role</b> 15:2	39:15 49:3 59:25 60:2	
room 79:3 80:13	64:20	similarly 53:8
rule 4:15 66:2,6,9,12,14,	seeks 31:10 48:20 49:14 64:20	simple 79:4
15,18,23,25 67:9,13,20 68:1,4,7,15	send 75:7	simply 20:7 64:18 76:3 77:21

	Public Hearing March 31, 2020	Index: sitingsummarizing
siting 31:25 35:17 37:7,	staffing 56:4 72:12 73:2	stream 73:7,9 77:14
10 38:9,10 51:11	77:18 80:4	streaming 46:4
sitting 67:22	staffing-wise 72:17	stretch 24:12
situation 38:18 72:12	stage 64:18	strongly 29:2
<b>slow</b> 10:20	standard 13:18 21:10	struggling 40:15
slowly 5:3	standards 20:20	<b>sua</b> 59:2
solely 60:6	standing 15:25 32:11,12,	subject 21:12
solve 70:11 78:2	14 38:4	submit 11:7
someone's 42:7	standpoint 41:14 62:23	submitted 17:6
sort 15:14 36:1	stands 37:21	submitting 48:14
sought 37:10 52:25 53:5	start 4:20,25 6:11,20 9:14 10:17 26:17 30:4	subparagraph 35:19
sounds 23:20 46:1	50:13 54:17 69:14,17	36:6
62:11,15 70:17	started 69:13	subpart 37:3
<b>speak</b> 5:3,23 6:3,5 7:3 9:12 47:13 50:9 58:18	starting 66:17	subsection 19:9,14,22 20:24 23:4,5 35:6 38:17,
speaking 4:24,25 5:1 6:6	state 66:18,21 68:16 71:15 73:12,14 81:21,25	20.24 23.4,5 55.6 58.17, 20
15:16 21:16 43:6 75:18 special 38:9	statement 26:1 31:7,9,20	substantial 8:21 9:5 11:22
specific 24:3 26:23 31:15	52:20,23	substantially 10:12,18
50:19 51:6 58:21 62:13	statements 32:7 33:16	11:2 19:18,20 20:11,16
68:6 75:23	states 10:3,8 19:9	25:22
<b>specifically</b> 12:17 18:12	stating 8:3 17:6	substitute 65:3,5 81:3
21:21 31:6,19 34:1 35:12,15,19 36:4 41:17	statue 56:3	success 72:6
42:11 48:2	status 16:9	successfully 72:21
specifies 51:16 60:2	statute 11:1 31:7,19	sufficiently 50:23 57:5
spell 49:13	35:9,11 42:3 45:10,20 50:20 53:11 69:18	suggest 67:23 72:5,7,20
spent 16:14	statutorily 10:1	suggesting 20:7
<b>spoke</b> 13:8	statutory 11:8 13:16 23:3	suggestion 68:2 75:3
sponte 59:2	41:12 54:22 69:15	<b>suit</b> 32:11
stab 21:6	stay 29:19 68:1	suited 13:11
stable 71:6	stipulate 49:8	summarize 9:17 29:24
staff 70:24 72:16 81:19	stood 31:2	30:1 31:3
82:2	stop 44:18	summarizing 9:2 59:15

summary 9:22 32:6 68:20 Summit 71:18 82:25 support 6:25 8:17 13:25 48:9 73:3 supporting 54:11 64:12 supportive 74:7 supports 31:14 48:19 suppose 64:7 supreme 32:13,24 surprise 30:7 surprised 7:9 system 74:23

## Т

tab 75:15 tabbed 75:4 76:4 table 16:20 29:8 69:21 taking 46:24 47:2 talked 58:10 talking 37:5,14 38:9 talks 32:11 targeted 22:9 tax 22:8 23:7 technically 72:16 technological 80:4 technology 70:5,18 73:11,13,18 76:24 80:13, 17 telephone 77:15 telephonic 46:21 47:8 70:3 71:16 81:10,15 82:3

telephonically 77:22 80:1 television 44:14 teleworking 73:4 ten 17:25 18:13 61:6,14 ten-minute 46:24 term 22:1 36:8 45:21 terms 17:12 35:25 36:2 52:5 59:1,10 60:21,22 63:4 69:15 test 32:12 72:13 73:5 tested 70:4 73:18 74:24 testimony 53:13 79:7 80:6 testing 70:6 **Thad** 4:7 7:16 9:8 14:13 16:3 28:13 29:16 34:15, 19 36:12 38:12 44:10 45:23 52:15 53:18 57:8 60:12 61:18 68:3,13 72:24 75:16 77:11 78:22 79:23 thing 29:7 40:24 44:8 things 11:25 63:9 70:8 75:1 thinking 69:25 76:7 78:18 thoughts 50:4,6 76:14 78:4 79:11,12 threshold 50:22 throw 34:20 ties 21:3 tight 51:17 time 7:1 10:19 33:4 44:2 46:16 47:1,6 50:4 53:11

Public Hearing March 31, 2020

Index: summary..typical

timeframe 7:10 9:12 62:19 69:15 72:10

timeline 51:17 66:22

timeliness 32:24

timely 33:1

80:7 81:9

title 22:4

today 4:4,14 6:5,9 33:5 49:20 50:1,3 51:24 54:16 56:7,24 57:4,17 63:6 65:25 71:3,7 73:10 76:21 77:9,16,19 82:20

today's 4:13 5:2 77:20

tomorrow 70:23,24

towering 11:14

towers 12:9 24:19

traditional 32:12

transcript 5:1,5 43:8

transmission 5:20 6:10 18:11 20:17 32:1 44:23 45:3,4

trouble 80:21

**Troy** 4:8 18:24 20:21,22 21:23 23:11 39:6,16 52:22 65:10 67:18 68:10 70:20 82:4

true 38:6

tune 70:23

**Twin** 17:3

type 32:2 42:4

types 41:13

typical 41:2 78:10

60:15 63:1 66:23 72:13

Index: UAPA..White

	20:5,14 21:6,18,22	<b>virus</b> 72:12
U	22:10,12,13,20,25 23:2,	
	9,15 24:1,6,10,12 25:5,	visual 68:5 71:21 74:8
<b>UAPA</b> 48:4 50:22 52:13	18,21 26:7,12,22 27:5,9	visuals 73:20
53:3,25 54:12	28:6 30:7,16,19,23 31:5,	voice 29:3
ultimately 62:24 64:14 72:11	12,14 35:4,7 39:13 41:15,20,23 42:15,21	voltage 12:9 30:11 36:23
unanswered 51:23	43:14,23 47:25 48:8,19, 20,22,23 49:7,21 50:17	volts 36:22
underground 11:25	51:15,23 53:22 54:2	volume 10:22
12:20 13:6 15:8 18:2	55:10,22 57:12,15,17	vote 50:15 52:12,20 53:3,
22:7 25:7 33:11	58:2 59:24 60:4,6,9 61:2,	19,20,25 55:16,17,21,25
understand 24:3 25:4	4 63:5 74:18,20 75:10	56:11,13,15,17,20 58:9,
34:25 43:19 63:17 80:3	78:15	21 65:12,14,15,22 67:17,
81:15	V.o.l.t.'s 15:1,22 17:12,	19 69:1,2,3,10 82:11,19
understanding 13:2	15 20:10 27:14 28:22	W
38:14,15 81:4	52:12	V
undisputed 23:21	valley 11:15	wanted 14:19 30:8,14
unique 41:20	Valley-wide 5:19 6:9	49:6 58:12
unmute 4:24	valuations 40:11	Wasatch 11:13,18 24:10
up 5:23 7:3 25:10 31:2	values 24:18 25:20	watch 73:8
33:21 37:21 44:4 46:5	Vancott 5:12	watching 71:3
47:13 50:5 56:23 58:18 65:5 71:25 72:14 78:21	verbally 9:17	Webber 25:19
	versus 4:6 26:5,9 40:10,	website 78:13,21
upgrade 26:4,9 27:1 40:22	16 45:8 68:4	week 13:7 30:8
uploading 8:5	viable 71:6	weeks 9:15 53:15 54:17
	video 68:1 70:5 71:16,17	64:3 71:13 81:24
Utah 21:7 32:13,14	72:5 74:14,23 75:4 80:3, 13 82:25	weigh 33:2
<b>Utility</b> 4:4 21:23	videoconference 72:8	Wells 17:2
V	80:2 81:4	White 4:9 23:14,16,17
		24:7,24 25:1,2,8,9,24
<b>V.O.L.T.</b> 4:15 6:1,23 8:2,	videoconferencing 70:9 81:16	26:14,20 28:11,14 39:19,
15,23 9:1,24 11:7,11,17,		20,22 41:4,5 42:1,25
19,21 12:5,17,24 13:10,	view 8:13 15:1 16:8	43:4 47:5 50:12 52:16
11,17,21,22 14:8,16,21	25:14,16 53:24 54:2	53:7,21 54:12 55:2,6,12,
15:5,6,9,11,12,15,16,19,	61:21 62:4 78:20	20,21 56:9,16,17,25 57:11 58:4,5,19 59:16,
24,25 16:4,6,13 17:16,24	viewpoint 54:10	19,20 62:5,9,10 63:3,7,
18:4,9,13,23 19:2,4,7,19		23 64:8,10 65:2,18,19

	Public Hearing March 31, 2020	Index: White'sZoom
67:3,15 69:6,7 71:8,9,11	54:18 57:24	
72:4 78:5,7 79:14,15,23, 24 80:20 81:2 82:15,16	yield 55:6	
White's 52:23 82:7	<b>Youtube</b> 73:9 77:14,24, 25	
withdraw 58:1		
witnesses 20:8,9 49:9,10	Z	
60:16 61:3,5,16,25 63:5 64:4,5	<b>Zoom</b> 71:18,25 72:1	
word 51:13	81:23	
words 10:23 20:1 42:13 57:4 64:13		
work 71:25 72:2 75:1 80:15,25		
worked 14:8 71:7		
works 71:5,18		
worries 73:23		
worry 70:5,11 80:14		
wrap 39:25		
Wright 4:9 28:15,17 43:9, 11,21 45:24 46:13 52:19 55:23,24 56:18,19 65:20, 21 69:8,9 71:10,11,12 81:12,14 82:5,8,17,18, 23,24		
writing 6:16		
written 9:11 10:9 19:11 35:12		
wrong 27:10 59:15		
Y		
yards 12:10		
<b>yea</b> 69:3		
years 11:11 12:5 15:17		
yesterday 7:12,14,18 9:6,15 14:6 16:14 49:22		