#### STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

## PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

SCS Carbon Transport LLC
Midwest Carbon Express CO2 Pipeline
Project Siting Application

Case No. PU-22-391

# TRANSCRIPT OF FORMAL HEARING

December 21, 2023

### Bismarck, North Dakota

#### APPEARANCES

Commissioners Randy Christmann, Sheri Haugen-Hoffart, and Substitute Decisionmaker Timothy J. Dawson

LAWRENCE BENDER and BRET DUBLINSKE, Fredrikson & Byron, P.A., on behalf of Applicant SCS Carbon Transport LLC

RANDALL J. BAKKE, Bakke Grinolds Wiederholt, on behalf of Intervenor John H. Warford as Trustee of the John H. Warford, Jr. Revocable Trust and Chad Moldenhauer and Chad Wachter

STEVE J. LEIBEL, Knoll Leibel LLP, on behalf of Intervenors/Landowners

KEVIN PRANIS, on behalf of Intervenor Laborers District Council of Minnesota and North Dakota (LIUNA)

JULIE LAWYER, Burleigh County State's Attorney, on behalf of Burleigh County

DERRICK BRAATEN, Braaten Law Firm, on behalf of Emmons County

ZACHARY PELHAM, Special Assistant Attorney General Advisory Counsel to the Public Service Commission

# CONTENTS

Argument	bу	MR.	DUBLINSK	Ε					9
Argument	bу	MR.	BRAATEN						19
Argument	bу	MS.	LAWYER						33
Argument	bу	MR.	BAKKE .						4 5
Argument	bу	MR.	LEIBEL						56
Argument	bу	MR.	PRANIS						64
Rehuttal	hv	MR	DUBLINSK	F.					7 4

-----

COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Good afternoon, everyone. This is a formal hearing on the Summit Carbon pipeline case. And I'm Randy Christmann, chair of the Commission, joined by Commissioner Sheri Haugen-Hoffart and independent decisionmaker and judge Tim Dawson.

Just a couple comments I want to make before we get started because there are some distinctions between what you've seen in the past in this case and today.

But even before that I want to point out, as I have in some past cases, that this Commission has a proud history of running our hearings and meetings in an orderly manner. And I know the era in which we live, a lot of meetings are marked by hissing and booing or clapping and yelling and waving signs and stuff. We've never done that. And I would ask respectfully for you all to help us to maintain that tradition of having a respectful debate and allowing everyone to speak in their turn. Everyone will be allotted equal time by the judge and run a mature, responsible hearing here.

The other thing that I wanted to point out that is a distinction, the previous cases that I see some familiar faces and I know some of you have attended have been evidentiary hearings. And while people speak to us and they're under oath, there's a mix of, like, legal facts as well as opinions in there. You know, you can

give your opinion about the value of this area versus 1 2 the value of that area. 3 This is different. This is not an evidentiary hearing but a formal hearing to take legal oral 4 arguments on one specific topic. We are here today to 5 talk about whether permits issued by this Commission for 6 7 liquid or gas transmission facilities, whether those 8 permits supersede and preempt local land use or zoning 9 regulations or do they not supersede. That is the 10 question before us. 11 And so opinions, like even our own opinions of whether it should or not, are really beside the point. 12 13 It's what does the law say. And so that's what we're 14 going to have, oral arguments. All sides will get a 15 fair chance to speak and deliver their legal arguments and we will take them under advisement and make a 16 decision. 17 18 With that, I have no other comments. Commissioner Haugen-Hoffart, do you? 19 20 COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: No, I do not. 21 Thank you. COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: And Judge Dawson. 22 23 SUBSTITUTE DECISIONMAKER DAWSON: No comment. COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Thank you. 24 25 Our administrative law judge, Hope Hogan, will

be running the hearing.

I thank you for being here, Judge Hogan, and I'll turn it over to you.

ALJ HOGAN: Thank you, Commissioner.

For our record, let it reflect that it's

December 21st, 2023, at 2 p.m. This is the time and

date and place set by the notice of hearing on a motion

issued by the North Dakota Public Service Commission in

Case No. PU-22-391. This hearing is being held today at
the Pioneer Room at the State Capitol in Bismarck, North

Dakota.

As Commissioner Christmann indicated, my name is Hope Hogan and I am the administrative law judge that's been designated at the request of the Public Service Commission to serve as a procedural hearing officer in this matter, which means I'm not a decisionmaker, but I'm merely directing these proceedings in an orderly manner.

I'd ask everybody at this time to check their cell phones to make sure your cell phone is either silenced or turned off so that we don't have cell phone interruptions during our hearing today.

SCS Carbon Transport LLC has filed a renewed motion to declare Burleigh and Emmons County ordinances superseded and preempted in this proceeding. On October

```
5th, 2023, the group of intervenors represented by the
1
2
     Knoll Leibel LLC law firm filed a request for hearing.
3
     And on November 28th, 2023, the Public Service
     Commission issued a notice of hearing on the motion
4
     setting the hearing for today's date to hear oral
5
6
     arguments on the motion.
7
             I'm now going to ask the parties to state their
8
     appearance for the record.
9
             Mr. Bender or Mr. Dublinske, can you please
10
     state your appearance for the record today and indicate
11
     who you represent in this matter?
12
             MR. BENDER: Thank you, Your Honor and
13
     commissioners. Lawrence Bender, PO Box 1855, Bismarck,
14
     appearing on behalf of the Applicant.
15
             MR. DUBLINSKE:
                             Thank you, Your Honor.
16
     Dublinske, also with Fredrikson & Byron, on behalf of
17
     the Applicant.
18
             ALJ HOGAN: And it's my understanding, Mr.
19
     Dublinske, you're going to be arguing today?
20
             MR. DUBLINSKE: That is correct, Your Honor.
21
             ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you.
22
             Mr. Pelham, would you like to state your
23
     appearance for the record?
24
             MR. PELHAM: Good afternoon. Special Assistant
25
     Attorney General Zachary Pelham on behalf of the
```

```
Commission. To my left is Public Utilities Director
1
2
     Victor Schock. Thank you.
3
             ALJ HOGAN: Mr. Bakke.
             MR. BAKKE: Good afternoon. Randall Bakke on
4
     behalf of what we're referring to as the Bismarck
5
6
     intervenors, which is Chad Wachter, John Warford, and
7
     Chad Moldenhauer.
8
             ALJ HOGAN: Thank you.
             Mr. Leibel.
9
             MR. LEIBEL: Steve Leibel of the Bismarck law
10
11
     firm of Knoll Leibel, and I'm here on behalf of the
     landowner intervenors, which, as the Commission knows,
12
13
     they're throughout the state.
14
             ALJ HOGAN: Ms. Lawyer.
15
             MS. LAWYER: Julie Lawyer on behalf of Burleigh
16
     County.
             ALJ HOGAN: And Mr. Braaten.
17
18
             MR. BRAATEN: Derrick Braaten with Braaten Law
19
     Firm on behalf of Emmons County. And I have sitting
20
     next to me Erin Magrum, chair of the Emmons County
21
     Commission.
22
             ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you.
23
             A procedure for this hearing was set and
24
     provided to the parties prior to today's hearing.
25
     just to summarize, each party will be given 20 minutes
```

to present oral argument with SCS Carbon Transport going first, followed by Emmons County, Burleigh County, the Bismarck intervenors, landowner intervenors, and Laborers Union.

And I apologize, Mr. Pranis, I didn't mean to diminish your appearance. You weren't on my list for some reason. So you will go last, but can you please state your appearance for the record?

MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Your Honor,

Commissioners. Kevin Pranis on behalf of LIUNA

Minnesota, North Dakota, otherwise known as Laborers

District Council.

ALJ HOGAN: Thank you.

Following the 20-minute arguments by each party, I will allow Summit to provide a 10-minute reply argument if they wish to do that. I will be keeping time during each party's argument and I'll let you know when you've reached your allotted time and ask that you please wrap up your presentations. I will allow the commissioners to ask questions after each party's presentation and I will not count those questions or replies against your allotted time.

Are there any other preliminary matters we need to discuss before we get started?

Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Just a message I received from upstairs was that some of the attorneys were hard to hear in this room. These mics, you have to be pretty close to the mic so...

ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you.

So then I'll turn to you, Mr. Dublinske, you can start us off.

MR. DUBLINSKE: Thank you, Your Honor, and good afternoon. May it please the Commission, colleagues.

As I mentioned, I'm Bret Dublinske of Fredrikson & Byron for SCS Carbon Transport who I'll refer to as "Summit" this afternoon for short. Good to see you all again.

North Dakota as a matter of state policy is a leader in the promotion of carbon capture and sequestration. The State has invested significant resources in being the first state to establish primacy over Class VI carbon dioxide injection and storage systems, but that policy is for naught if transmission systems cannot be built to get the CO2 to where it will be sequestered.

As in many other states, the responsibilities for decisions regarding pipeline permitting are granted first and foremost to the expert administrative agency, the Public Service Commission. The Commission is in the best position to take a statewide view to apply its

unique and specific expertise regarding pipelines and pipeline law and to render a decision.

As the Commission is aware, two counties have, in the last year, passed ordinances that they seek to apply to the Summit pipeline project. These counties have adopted standards and procedures that are different from the State, different from the Federal Government, and even different from each other, creating a burdensome patchwork of various and overlapping standards. This is not an efficient or an effective way to promote state policy.

Summit, however, believes that the plain language of the North Dakota Century Code provides a clear solution. Summit brought this renewed motion regarding preemption because we believe that addressing, and hopefully resolving, this issue upfront will make the remainder of the proceeding more efficient as it will either remove an evidentiary issue that would otherwise require additional materials in the record or it will guide what needs to be presented. But either way, a ruling now helps avoid wasted efforts.

That said, as I will explain momentarily, while Summit does seek a ruling confirming its understanding of this issue, Summit actually believes that the statute makes preemption automatic. Overwhelmingly, the

briefing back and forth on this issue has appropriately been a debate about the statutory interpretation of the words of 49-22.1-13(2). Some of that debate has involved questions of intent by taking isolated comments from a handful of legislators and committee witnesses, but at the end of the day, the best indicator of legislative intent and what binds the Commission is the language that was actually passed by majority vote and signed into law.

Looked at carefully, 49-22.1-13(2) is actually pretty clear. Indeed it reads very much like a flowchart for a decision. Summit would suggest that the first three paragraphs, (a), (b), and (c), provide substantive categories in how those are treated. And if you look carefully at the language, they all have important distinctions.

So section 2, paragraph -- or subsection 2, paragraph (a) pertains specifically to conversion facilities, and it says that the commission's certificate may not preempt a wide list of local regulations including zoning. Paragraph (b), on the other hand, pertains only to transmission facilities and says that the commission's permit automatically preempts a narrower list that includes land use and zoning ordinances. Then there's a middle category in (c) where

the commission has discretion. It applies to transmission facilities and it says that a commission permit may preempt or may require the applicant to comply with, and I'll quote paragraph (c) here, "the road use agreements" subject to certain showings in that paragraph.

After those three categories, paragraphs (d) and (e) are simply implementation, not new, substantive categories. (D), again regarding transmission facilities, requires that localities have to file local requirements -- doesn't use the term "ordinance" -- ten days in advance or they are preempted. And then paragraph (e) says that the applicant must abide by the local requirements that are not otherwise superseded by the steps above. That is, they aren't automatically superseded by paragraph (b) or they aren't discretionarily superseded by a decision in paragraph (c).

This, as near as I can tell, is the only way to read the statute that gives effect to all of the separate paragraphs.

Arguments from some of the parties appear to start at the bottom of the list and work backwards and say that paragraph (e) says that a transmission facility must abide by local requirements, but that would read

paragraph (b), the transmission permits preempt, out of the statute entirely, which is an impermissible interpretation. Similarly, arguments that all preemption requires an affirmative decision of the Commission based on the factors in paragraph (c) not only reads paragraph (b) out but also ignores the express limitation in paragraph (c) to road use agreements.

Summit's approach that paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) set forth three substantive categories and their status, not preempted, always preempted, sometimes preempted, and that (d) and (e) are about implementation makes logical sense of the whole of section -- subsection 2 read together.

And that structure makes logical sense as well because conversion facilities, a gas plant, for example, is at a single site that is usually in one county where it has impacts, but linear infrastructure like a pipeline is often in multiple counties and it needs to be viewed as a whole across the entire route. They are different projects of a different nature, and it makes sense that the Legislature would treat them differently as the language of paragraphs (a) and (b) do.

Because the words on the page are clear and there is no ambiguity, diving into the legislative

history is not needed or appropriate. And in any event, you can find isolated snippets on either side. But the one thing that I would say about legislative history that I think is clear is that the legislators were told most bluntly by then Representative Keiser that the amendments could be interpreted just as Summit suggests and the Legislature passed that language knowing it. Read into that what you will.

In the alternative, however, even the parties that disagree with the automatic preemption interpretation all appear to argue that, at worst for Summit, the Commission may preempt by applying the factors in paragraph (c). And we disagree with that.

Let me run through that analysis as well. The standards in paragraph (c) include whether the regulations are, quote, "unreasonably restrictive" and whether they, quote, "conflict with state or federal law." Much of the resistance here is boiled down to a claim that Summit hadn't entered enough evidence on those factors.

Summit has two responses to that. First,

Summit's primary position remains that the plain

legislative language makes the preemption automatic with

regard to transmission facilities and zoning ordinances,

but the point of filing the motion now is that if the

Commission disagrees, that helps steer the hearing and the evidentiary issue can be wrapped into the rest of the case and the evidence presented on reconsideration. Second, that said, even applying the factors, Summit believes the board can rule now on that basis.

The unreasonableness is clear on the face of the ordinances as is the conflict with federal law. In Emmons County, for example, they adopted a nearly 8,000-foot setback from occupied structures compared to 500 feet as a state standard, 16 times larger. Summit believes that the Commission can find that unreasonably restrictive on its face.

Burleigh County is even more extreme; two miles from an occupied structure, approximately 20 times the state standard. And Burleigh also has a setback, interestingly enough, of 10 miles from any electric transmission line. Setbacks of that length are, on their face, an unreasonable restriction and obviously block out huge amounts of the county.

And there are other setbacks beyond just those one or two that are equally excessive and they all combine to have a cumulative impact. The maps in our briefs merely demonstrate that fact. And the fact that those ordinances were adopted well after Summit's project was underway, changing the rules well into

design and engineering, only adds to the unreasonable burden.

Paragraph 49-22.1-13(2)(c) also makes clear that conflict with other laws is a basis for preemption.

Burleigh County's ordinance, for example, repeatedly and several times in the Purposes section alone states its purpose as being safety. It talks about blast zones or fatality zones which, again, makes clear its purpose is to engage in safety regulation which, by express language in federal law and also controlling Eighth Circuit precedent, is preempted. The Burleigh ordinance establishes its own definition of "high consequence area," a term of art in federal PHMSA regulations that has a different definition there. At Section 7.2 it even purports to regulate the spacing on shut-off valves and fracture arresters which are subjects of specific and explicit PHMSA regulations.

But the setbacks, especially ones the unusual length of those in Emmons and Burleigh ordinances, also serve no purpose other than to regulate safety and/or to block the project. In the supplemental authority case that Summit filed from a federal court in Iowa, that judge, implementing a series of Eighth Circuit precedence, found that setbacks much smaller than those at issue here were a proxy for safety regulations and

found them preempted by federal law.

Moreover, to the extent those setbacks serve, or as the quotes from local officials that we included in our reply brief show, are intended to prevent the project, that also conflicts with state law and state policy which is designed to balance the interests the State has in infrastructure investments with other concerns. That is, the state law is intended to allow, subject to reasonable regulations, not to prohibit, pipelines, including carbon dioxide pipelines. To the extent that local ordinance have the intent or the effect of prohibiting carbon dioxide pipelines in that county, that also is conflict with state law.

Your Honor, Summit has a good route in North
Dakota that has now reached 80 percent voluntary
easements and climbing. Summit has heard and responded
to concerns about the proximity to Bismarck. And this
Commission should not allow a handful of opponents in
local governments to undermine the state policy or to
serve as a veto on a project that landowners on the
route, agricultural interests and others, support and
which will provide investment and jobs for the state.

Century Code 49-22.1-13(2) provides a clear path for the expert Public Service Commission to manage siting of transmission projects like pipelines and to

avoid the kind of jigsaw puzzle approach of different 1 2 rules and processes for different parts of the single 3 pipeline. Again, the recent federal decision from Iowa, 4 5 the court discusses the policy reasons for statewide 6 rather than county-by-county siting. And while it's not 7 directly applying North Dakota law, it does support the 8 sort of distinction that the language in the legislation used, language that clearly provides that a permit for a 9 10 liquid transmission facility preempts local land use 11 regulations. 12 Summit respectfully asks the Commission to find 13 the Burleigh and Emmons County ordinances preempted or 14 that they will be preempted by a permit if this 15 Commission grants one as the -- to the extent that they 16 purport to apply to this project and to treat this 17 multi-county pipeline as a unified, uniform state issue. 18 Thank you. I'd be happy to answer any 19 questions. 20 ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you. 21 Are there any questions from commissioners or 22 Mr. Dawson? 23 All right. No questions. 24 All right. Then the next party on my list is 25 Emmons County. So you may proceed, Mr. Braaten.

MR. BRAATEN: Thank you, Judge Hogan.

I'd like to start by talking a little bit about the Emmons County ordinance specifically, and I also intend to spend some time discussing this issue of statutory interpretation and spending a little time with the statute itself.

But I want to first talk about the Emmons County ordinance, because when we're talking about supersession and preemption, and specifically if we're going to talk about conflict of laws, that is something that can only be analyzed with respect to the actual language of the actual local ordinance at issue. And a lot of the arguments that have been made by Summit tend to attempt to sweep up the Emmons County ordinance along with numerous comments about other ordinances.

And so I want to take a little time to point out the unique nature of the Emmons County ordinance as well as the fact that it's an ordinance that's been on the books in Emmons County since the 1980s. And this is particularly important because, as the Commission saw, Summit filed a federal court decision out of Iowa and that decision relates to conflict of laws.

And I want to talk a little bit about the PHMSA guidance letter that was sent out that contradicts some of what was in that opinion, but, more importantly, that

opinion is really specific to and the analysis is based upon what happened in that particular county in Iowa.

And that is a different analysis than what happened in Emmons County, North Dakota.

So the Emmons County ordinance regulates land uses in the county and it was amended after the siting application, but one of the things that I handed out to folks is just a couple pages out of the prior Emmons County ordinance. And this is Article VI, subdivision B, and you can look down to (2)(a) and (2)(b) and that governs. And the amendment that was made in the Emmons County ordinance was made to specifically an existing provision at B(2)(b)(i). And there were setbacks.

And what I want to point out specifically and importantly is that at the top of this page, prior to Emmons County amending its ordinance to bring CO2 companies within its purview, it already regulated pipelines. And it regulated electric transmission facilities as well as transmission pipelines for water, gas, oil, or coal slurry.

And so this wasn't a situation where Emmons

County developed a new ordinance specifically related to

pipelines as a land use in their county. They simply,

for the first time ever, saw a pipeline coming through

that was going to ship CO2. That's not something that

we had seen before. Just like at some point in this country no one had heard about the idea of a coal slurry pipeline, but once we heard about the idea of coal slurry pipelines, local governments added those to the other pipelines they regulate.

Similarly, when Emmons County found out that there was going to be a CO2 pipeline coming through, they thought it prudent to regulate that the way they regulate other pipelines. They didn't know the route. What they did is look at their ordinance, what already existed on the books there to regulate that land use, and they added a new land use being developed into the existing land uses being regulated for that purpose.

Significantly, what they amended is in

Article VI. Article VI regulates four different land
uses. One of them is the pipelines and transmission
facilities I mentioned. And you don't have this in
front of you, but the other land uses regulated in

Article VI are commercial recreation parks, tourist and
trailer camps, salvage and junkyards, and subsurface
mining and surface extraction.

And my point with that is simply that this is merely one of four different land uses being regulated under the Emmons County ordinance since the 1980s. And so the idea that this was some sort of a safety

regulation passed and targeted at Summit is simply wrong. This has been on the books. And they are still regulating oil and gas lines and transmission lines the same way Summit's being regulated.

The other thing I want to say about the Emmons

County ordinance is that they have a process set up

where you can get waivers. And so Summit could go to

anyone who is within that -- that established residence

setback and ask for a waiver. And if they have setbacks

that are preventing them from going down the current

route, they could simply ask for setbacks to that.

And Commissioner Magrum is here and he can testify. He obviously doesn't know everything that happens in his county, but he hasn't heard of Summit asking for any setbacks in that county -- or setback waivers.

But my point is that there is a process even if one of these setbacks poses a problem for the current route. There's actually a process where they can go out and attempt to work with those landowners to get through. And we're not aware of them having even attempted to do that.

The other thing I want to point out is that it was filed with the Commission that there was a letter that was sent out by PHMSA that talked about local

government and local control, and it specifically referred to local governments have implemented authorities and they've seen localities consider various measures. One of them is restricting land use and development along pipeline rights of way through zoning setbacks and similar measures. That's PHMSA saying that they recognize that local governments exercise that jurisdiction. And that's precisely what Emmons County did here.

PHMSA's letter to Summit also states "Local governments have traditionally exercised broad powers to regulate land use, including setback distances and property development that includes development in the vicinity of pipelines. Nothing in the federal pipeline safety law impinges on these traditional prerogatives of local or state government, so long as officials do not attempt to regulate the field of pipeline safety preempted by federal law."

There's nothing about regulating pipeline safety in the Emmons County ordinance. And if you go through the briefing, what you'll see is all the comments about that refer to Burleigh County and then attempt to simply sweep up Emmons County with it. The Emmons County ordinance doesn't regulate safety. It is a land use regulation which even PHMSA has recognized is

specifically the prerogative of local governments.

The other issue I want to talk a little bit about is the statutory interpretation. And I think you probably have several copies at this point, but because we are talking about a fairly wordy and verbose statute, I thought it would be helpful to have the language in front of you as I refer to it. But what I want to do is walk briefly through some of that language and explain why we disagree with the statutory interpretation and a plain language reading of the statute itself.

And so there was an argument from Summit in which it said that the word "requirements" in subsection 2(c) of 49-22.1-13 is a reference to the road use agreements and that's the argument they're making.

And so if you look at the language in subdivision 2(c), in the second sentence it says "A permit may supersede and preempt the requirements of a political subdivision." And their claim is that that refers to the prior sentence where it says "road use agreements." That's wrong.

If you read the rest of that sentence, it says
"A permit may supersede and preempt the requirements of
a political subdivision if the applicant shows by a
preponderance of the evidence the regulations and
ordinances are unreasonably restrictive."

My point is that "requirements" is synonymous with regulations and ordinances. They are in the same sentence and they are referring to the same thing.

"Requirements" does not refer to road use agreements.

It refers to regulations and ordinances. What regulations? The zoning regulations referred to in subdivision b.

Summit says that if there is no automatic preemption, then subdivision b is superfluous. Again, that's wrong by its plain language.

When you look at subdivision b, it starts with the words "Except as provided in this section."

"Section" refers to 49-22.1-13 of the Century Code.

That subdivision b is literally referring to the remainder of the section, indicating that you have to look elsewhere in that section to fully understand what that subdivision means because it's saying it may be superseded except as provided in this section.

"As provided in this section" refers to the language in subdivision c that then explains how, why, and when a local regulation or ordinance can be superseded. Again, regulation or ordinance does not refer to a road use agreement. That very clearly refers to local zoning regulations and ordinances. And so they do need to make a showing by a preponderance of the

evidence.

Now, moving on, the other language in (d) and (d) -- (d) and (e) further supports this. And specifically if you look at subdivision (d), the last two sentences, it says "Upon notification, a political subdivision shall provide a listing to the commission of all local requirements identified under this subsection."

Again, requirements are the local zoning ordinance, not the road use agreement. So they provide their local requirements.

And it states "The requirements must be filed at least ten days before the hearing or the requirements are superseded and preempted." Well, if they're automatically superseded and preempted under subdivision b, then why are they being automatically superseded and preempted if you don't file them ten days before the hearing? That, again, would be superfluous.

The answer is that subdivision b doesn't create an automatic preemption, because that would make subdivision d absurd. That would mean the only reason these local governments are filing their ordinances is to make sure we all know exactly what's being superseded. What possible incentive would they have to be filing them if the only effect of filing them is to

make explicit that they're having their ordinance superseded? That doesn't make any sense. It doesn't make sense that you would say that they are automatically superseded and preempted if you don't get them filed if they're automatically superseded and preempted anyway. That's not how statutory interpretation works.

So the arguments made by Summit with respect to the plain language, I do agree that the legislative history is, at best, ambiguous and supports what both sides are saying depending on which part of it you want to quote. And that is often the case with legislative history. But we don't need to look at the legislative history. We have the language of the statute and we can interpret. And the canons' interpretation say that we give the words their plain and ordinary meaning. We have to interpret these provisions together so that they make sense together.

And we have to interpret them to avoid an absurdity. It would be indeed absurd to require local governments to file ordinances that are automatically superseded by a permit. And it would also be absurd to say that if you don't get them filed by ten days before the hearing, we're going to automatically supersede them even though we already automatically supersede them.

That simply doesn't make sense.

The bottom line here as well is that, thus far, Summit has not produced or proffered or submitted the evidence required for the PSC to make a finding on this issue. They have an evidentiary burden of proof. They have to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that it's unreasonably restrictive. They have to show there's a conflict. They have to show one of these things and that has to be in the findings of the Commission. And if it's not, then the Commission's order would be reversible.

Without an evidentiary hearing and without a significant amount of evidence that is right now lacking in the record, the Commission simply doesn't have the evidence necessary in order to make a finding to supersede a local ordinance. And it specifically doesn't have any evidence in the record to supersede the Emmons County ordinance.

And as I have shown and explained, there's no conflict between the Emmons County ordinance and any state or federal law. So, with that, we would ask for the Commission to require Summit, in any event, to put on evidence first if it wants ordinance superseded.

Now we're not going to agree that our ordinance is unreasonably restrictive. Summit has submitted a map

with no foundation indicating that it can't get through. 1 2 Number one, we don't agree with everything that appears 3 to be on that map and there's no foundation as to how that map was created and that's not competent evidence. 4 Even if that map were accurate, which, again, we don't 5 6 agree it is, even if it were, they haven't attempted to 7 get any waivers to get through, which is a way they can 8 get through. So, again, it's not stopping them. They're simply not trying to get through. 9 10 So, with that, the Emmons County ordinance is a 11 unique ordinance that has not been analyzed. Summit has 12 not proffered evidence. There's not evidence in the 13 record sufficient for the finding required in order to 14 supersede the local ordinance. And so we would ask you 15 to deny Summit's motion on this issue. 16 With that, I would stand for any questions. 17 Thank you. 18 Thank you. ALJ HOGAN: 19 Are there any questions from the commissioners 20 or Mr. Dawson? 21 COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Yes, Your Honor. 22 I've seen this one page before that you handed 23 out just earlier. So am I understanding you right, the 24 previous ordinance from the '80s having to do with 25 pipelines had a 200-foot setback from occupied

structures and then was the -- the previous attorney correct when he said that it's currently gone from 200 feet to 8,000 feet?

MR. BRAATEN: It went from 200 feet for a building -- and the current actually splits that out. So there are established residences that have a setback, corporate boundaries of organized city, and then it's 500 feet for any other building or surface water body.

So that 200 for any building was split up further and the more significant setback is for an established residence, but then for simply a building, which is what the prior ordinance said was 200 feet, that was increased to 500 feet.

COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. And then -- I'm not quoting you, but I understood you to say that the way Summit is arguing, there would be no logic to the requirement that the local government turn in their ordinances ten days in advance if things are automatically superseded.

But would it be illogical to read that to mean that they need to be turned in ten days in advance so that the commission could determine if, among those ordinances, there are road use agreements and then whether those are or not unreasonably restrictive because of section c?

MR. BRAATEN: I won't say that I think that would be illogical. I think that it would be contrary to the plain language of the statute if you read it together, and particularly when they use "requirements," they use that synonymously with words like "regulations or ordinances."

There's only one place in this entire statute that refers to road use agreements. And what I would say is that that makes it clear that the Legislature knows very well how to refer to road use agreements, and if that's what they meant, they would have just said road use agreements. When they're talking about ordinances and regulations, I think it's clear from the language what they're referring to is zoning ordinances and zoning regulations.

And, therefore, I don't -- again, I'm not saying what you stated, Commissioner Christmann, was illogical, but I don't think it complies with the canons of interpretation and I don't think that it's a fair reading of the plain language of this statute.

COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. And my last question, how do you explain -- and correct me if I'm wrong here, but my understanding of this whole section of law is that sections b and c, until, I think, 2019, give or take one session, were actually one section with

some language that's been removed, some new language added in, but previously the whole thing was combined and it said that the commission's permit may supersede or preempt.

What's your theory on why did the Legislature change that to say that we preempt and supersede on part of it and then create another section about road use agreements and there say that we may if they're unreasonably restrictive?

MR. BRAATEN: Thank you, Commissioner Christmann.

And what I would say is I don't think that subsection c is a subsection just on road agreements. I think it refers to road agreements.

With respect to the fact that the Legislature went through a legislative process and made those changes, I have two answers. The short, flippant answer is that it's a sausage factory.

Putting that aside, my serious answer about it, however, is that if you look at that legislative history, what you see is that there was an intent to try and change the statute and there were also a lot of legislators who said that "We believe local control is critical and extremely important." And this is the language we ended up with when those two forces met and

when those different sides started arguing at the 1 2 Legislature. 3 And as attorneys and as a body here, our obligation is not to speculate about why they would have 4 5 done that or didn't do it. Our obligation is to look at 6 the language in the statute and interpret it. 7 And so my argument and my point is that, putting aside why the Legislature did what they did, I think 8 9 that's the danger in looking at legislative history when 10 the language itself is not ambiguous. And so that's why 11 I agree with Summit that we don't want to be looking at 12 that legislative history because I think that both sides 13 can make some pretty good arguments from various 14 comments they find in that legislative history, but, 15 ultimately, what a court is going to do and what our 16 obligation is, is to interpret the language in front of 17 us. 18 COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Thank you. No other 19 questions. 20 COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: No questions. 21 ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you. The next party on my list is Burleigh County so 22 23 you can proceed, Ms. Lawyer. 24 MS. LAWYER: Thank you, Judge Hogan, 25 Commissioners. I'm Julie Lawyer, representing Burleigh

County.

We're talking about two different ordinances in Burleigh County that were brought up in the original motion by Summit when they talked about superseding the Burleigh County ordinances. The first ordinance, which they identify as the March 6th ordinance, was a countywide ordinance adopted under the county's Home Rule Charter, and that ordinance dealt with basically sharing of information from a pipeline company to provide safety information to the county so that the county would be able to train and have first responders able to take care of any emergency that arose.

That ordinance, again, doesn't regulate the safety of the pipeline or the company, but what it does is it actually puts forth for them to share with the county an emergency action plan, an emergency response and hazard mitigation plan, and safety procedures and protocol of the pipeline company so that our first responders would have that information, our emergency management department would have that information, so if an emergency did occur, again, we would have the proper training and planning to be able to handle that emergency. That is a countywide ordinance, again, under the Home Rule Charter and would apply throughout the entire county.

The second ordinance that they reference would be the one that they designate, I believe, as the March 30th ordinance. That one is a zoning ordinance within Burleigh County.

Burleigh County does not have zoning authority through every township within the county. Some townships retain their own zoning ordinance authority. And so there was a map that was attached to our petition to intervene as Exhibit 2 which shows which townships are subject to the Burleigh County zoning authority.

So with that zoning ordinance that was passed in Burleigh County, there are multiple townships where that zoning ordinance does not apply. They would have to adopt their own. So there is still a pathway through Burleigh County outside of the Burleigh County zoning ordinance where Summit could reroute their pipeline.

When we're talking about 49-22.1-13 of the North Dakota Century Code and talking about superseding and preempting local zoning ordinances, it's important to note that that statute talks about issuance of a certificate and issuance of a permit. Those are two different things. And those are defined in the beginning of the statute as well under 49-22.1-01.

A "certificate" means a certificate of site compatibility or the certificate of corridor

compatibility issued under this chapter. A permit is different. The permit, under subsection 8, is a permit for construction of the gas or liquid transmission facility within the designated corridor.

So we're talking about two things. The certificate basically approves of the location of the pipeline. The permit allows them to build then the pipeline at that location that was approved.

So when you're looking, again, at 49-22.1-13, under subsection 2, 2(b) indicates "Except as provided in this section, a permit for the construction of a gas or liquid transmission facility within a designated corridor supersedes and preempts any local land use or zoning regulations."

We're getting ahead of ourselves there because we're not talking about a permit to construct the pipeline at this point. We're talking about designating that corridor or giving that site compatibility certificate to give them the location that they can build it.

So we have to look at where we're issuing a certificate, and that would be under 2(d). "When the application for a certificate for a gas or liquid transmission facility is filed, the commission shall notify the townships with retained zoning authority,

cities, and counties in which part of the proposed corridor is located."

And it's at that point that those governmental agencies are required to file, ten days before the hearing, their requirements, which are their ordinances or their zoning regulations. And it's at that point that, if they don't file it within the timeline, then those zoning regulations are superseded or preempted automatically for the certificate for site compatibility, or the corridor in this case.

We're not -- then when we look at subsection e,

"An applicant shall comply with the local requirements

provided to the commission pursuant to subdivision d,

which are not otherwise superseded by the commission."

That seems to imply that once those regulations or ordinances are submitted to the commission when considering that corridor, then the commission can determine whether or not those -- those ordinances can be superseded. There isn't really a guideline as to how or when they can be superseded.

2(c) deals again where it does talk about that the applicant has to show by a preponderance of the evidence how the regulations and ordinances are unreasonably restrictive. But, again, 2(c) is talking about, before the facility is approved, the commission

shall require the applicant to comply with the road use agreements of the impacted political subdivision. And then a permit may supersede and permit the requirements of the political subdivision if the applicant shows by the preponderance of the evidence that the regulations are unreasonably restrictive, the cost factors, and all those other things.

Again, we're talking about the permit for construction there. We're not talking about site compatibility.

In this situation, too, the county -- when we adopted our zoning ordinance, that was after the application was submitted to the Commission. However, the zoning ordinance that we have applies to all hazardous liquid pipelines. There's nothing specific regarding carbon dioxide pipelines within that zoning ordinance. So that zoning ordinance is not meant to restrict just carbon dioxide pipelines. It's all hazardous liquid pipelines.

There's nothing in the first ordinance regarding the sharing of information so that the county has those hazard mitigation plans, the safety procedures and protocols, and the emergency action plan that actually regulates the safety of a pipeline.

I know that Summit has been arguing that the

setbacks that are imposed by the Burleigh County zoning ordinance relates to the safety of the pipeline, but that's not the case.

If you look at the -- especially the letter that was sent out by PHMSA, the Pipeline and Hazardous

Materials Safety Administration, they specifically indicate that their authority, their federal regulations, their authority, is for the safety and construction of the pipeline. They don't deal with zoning regulations. They don't deal with setbacks.

That's left up to the individual local authorities.

The only thing within the Burleigh County zoning ordinance that could be -- that could maybe be construed as being or falling within the parameters of PHMSA would be on the March 30th -- or March 30th ordinance, which is the zoning ordinance, under section 8 subsection 5, where it talks about the valves and the placement of the valves and the spacing in between those. That may fall or may be deemed to fall within the parameters of PHMSA, but the remaining ordinance is all within the zoning authority of the Burleigh County Commission.

And even if this Commission would deem that that subsection does fall within the federal regulations and it's incompatible with the federal regulations of PHMSA, the remaining portions of the ordinance are still within

the zoning authority of the Burleigh County Commission 1 2 and don't need to be superseded. 3 Because we're talking about a site compatibility application at this time and not a permit to build, 4 there is no automatic superseding of the land use or 5 zoning regulations of the local entities until we get to 6 7 that point. 8 It's Burleigh County's position that this Commission needs to be looking at the local ordinances 9 10 and the zoning ordinances and issuing a permit for site 11 compatibility or site corridor based upon those local 12 zoning regulations and take those into consideration when deciding whether or not this site is the 13 14 appropriate site for this pipeline. 15 And that's my argument, unless there are any questions. 16 17 ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you. 18 Are there any questions from the commissioners 19 or Mr. Dawson? 20 Go ahead. 21 COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Ms. Lawyer, the ordinance that I have -- I don't know which of the two 22 23 it is -- is as you referred to them. It says Ordinance 24 23-003. It was -- it was in our Docket No. 206.

But I thought you just said that it is not about

25

safety, but I see safety mentioned in here several times. So how do you bring that together?

MS. LAWYER: It doesn't regulate the safety of the pipeline. It doesn't say how they have to build the pipeline to keep it safe. It does deal with the safety of the community. We want to be able to respond to any emergency that happens. And so we want to know what their safety plan is, their protocol, so that we can prepare for that. That's all that that ordinance is.

And that's the one that's referred to by Summit as the March 6th ordinance. And so that would be the countywide ordinance under Home Rule Charter. And that is regarding the safety of the community, but just so that we can respond to any emergency requirements. It doesn't require Summit to do anything with their pipeline or build it in any particular place. It just requires them to share that information with the county so that we can be prepared in the event of an emergency.

COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. And did you get a chance to see the Summit -- the Story County judge's decision that was docketed in this case a couple days ago?

MS. LAWYER: I did, Your Honor.

COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. And I think I just heard you say that PHMSA said that they don't deal

with setbacks, but how do I merge that with the judge's statement that state authority may not adopt safety standards for pipeline facilities?

MS. LAWYER: The setbacks, I don't believe those are safety standards for the actual facility. There are two different things we're talking about here. One is how the building is built to make sure that it is safe and the operation of whatever facility it is is operating safely. The setbacks are basically for the community to make sure that, if anything does happen with the safety of that building, which is what PHMSA is responsible for, doesn't affect the community.

COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: And then same question. Because two pages later the judge said that setbacks are unenforceable as they create dual safety regulations and compete with the Secretary of Transportation's spectrum of duties.

MS. LAWYER: That's what that judge said in that opinion.

COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. Now in your ordinance specifically, one thing that I've been wanting to ask for a long time. So there's some townships that you said are covered and some are not. And so like on the -- what's your setback from residences, the distance? I can't remember.

MS. LAWYER: I believe it's ten miles -- no. 1 2 COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: That's from cities. 3 MS. LAWYER: Ten miles from transmission -- let me look real quick. 4 COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: I have it here too 5 6 somewhere. Two miles. 7 So if a resident that is opposed to this 8 project, let's say they live right inside the section 9 line of one of the townships that are covered and this 10 pipeline is proposed to be just in the next township. 11 Does that mean that your ordinance does not cover it 12 because the pipeline is out? Or do you cover two miles 13 from everyone in one of your townships that your 14 ordinance covers? 15 MS. LAWYER: So the ordinance would cover up to that township line. That would be the border for it. 16 17 So in a case like that where it's just over the township 18 section, it would cover the two miles that are within 19 the township that's covered by the zoning ordinance, but 20 it would only cover to the township boundary for the 21 next township that it does not apply to. 22 COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: If you live near the 23 edge of that township, you might have two miles of coverage on one side and 50 feet on the other? 24 25 MS. LAWYER: Correct.

```
1
             COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. And you made a
2
     filing at one point in late August that was Docket 380.
3
     Do you happen to have that with you?
             MS. LAWYER: I'll pull it up.
4
5
             COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: No. I gave you the
6
     wrong number. That was Emmons County's. Yours was 378.
7
             MS. LAWYER: And what was the number again?
8
     apologize.
9
             COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: The docket number?
10
             MS. LAWYER: Yes.
11
             COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN:
                                       378.
             MS. LAWYER: Thank you.
12
13
                              (Pause)
14
             MS. LAWYER: Okay, I apologize for the delay. I
15
     have that up now.
16
             COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. Would you go to
17
     the second page please and then to paragraph 3?
18
             MS. LAWYER: Yes.
19
             COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: So you start out, the
20
     first little over four lines and -- is legal language
21
     and you cite the section. It's subsection a. And then
22
     starting from there, the next several lines, you have
23
     cited as 49-22.1-01(7)(a) and it doesn't read the way my
24
     copy of that section reads.
25
             MS. LAWYER: Yes. I cited the wrong number.
                                                            Ιt
```

```
should have been -- let's see. I put "Gas or liquid
1
2
     energy conversion facility" and it should have been "Gas
3
     or liquid transmission facility."
             COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Correct. And that was
4
5
     my concern. This is out there that -- a quote from the
6
     law that a gas or liquid energy conversion facility
7
     includes, and on the way through it. And that's an
8
     error; correct?
9
             MS. LAWYER: Does not. It's transmission
10
     facility. That was an error, yes.
11
             COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. Thank you.
                                                           Ι
12
     have no other questions.
13
             MS. LAWYER: Thank you.
14
             ALJ HOGAN: Mr. Dawson? I can't see you way
15
     down there. No questions?
16
             SUBSTITUTE DECISIONMAKER DAWSON: No questions.
17
             ALJ HOGAN: All right.
18
             MS. LAWYER: Thank you.
19
             ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you, Ms. Lawyer.
20
             All right. The next party on my list is
21
     Bismarck intervenors so Mr. Bakke.
22
             MR. BAKKE: Thank you, Judge.
23
             Good afternoon, Commissioners.
24
             I think Emmons County and Burleigh County's
25
     attorneys have done a good job of establishing the first
```

point that we raised in our arguments which is that this request is premature. It's not timely. And I'll explain in a moment the reasons, but I think one of the primary reasons that Ms. Lawyer just hit on is that, to our knowledge, there is no request for a construction permit by Summit at this point for a pipeline. They have simply applied for a certificate of site compatibility.

So the whole provision that they rely on in trying to argue to the Commission that there should be no local ordinances or requirements is not on point. They rely on subsection 2(b) only and they say -- which clearly provides that it deals with, quote, "a permit for the construction," unquote. And that's not what is before this Commission at this point. This is a request at this point for a site compatibility certificate and nothing more. And so Mr. Braaten and Ms. Lawyer are absolutely correct that for a number of reasons those local requirements are in place and very much alive in the other provisions of subsection 2 of 49-22.1-13.

So there's a number of threshold issues before this Commission that the Commission articulated at its August 4 decision in this case that it said Summit had not met. And just to briefly review, the commissioners said that Summit failed to meet its burden of proof to

show the location will produce minimal adverse impacts and effects on the environment and the welfare of the citizens of North Dakota and they failed to meet their burden to show the project will minimize adverse human and environmental impact.

And since that decision they have brought forward nothing to this Commission to address those issues. And that's really the first step. And that's why all of this is premature. So that's the issue which, of course, the Commission is going to have to address, is: Is the proposed pipeline reroute which they have now submitted to the Commission in a location that will produce minimal adverse impacts on the environment and the welfare of the citizens?

Now we've provided to the Commission today two maps, and that is Exhibits 200 and 201, Warford 200 and Warford 201. And Warford 200 shows the reroute that they have provided. And it's kind of interesting to note that all they have presented this Commission with in terms of the reroute is what's in Docket 386 submitted in September, which really provides little meaning -- little meaningful information to the Commission about their reroute and in some respects is inaccurate.

So if we look at the earlier version of what

they submitted on their original application, that's Warford 201. And what you can see is that on the eastern side of the pipeline reroute, contrary to what Summit has been publicizing in the media and elsewhere, is they did not move that eastern route that they previously requested to any extent to the east. They kept it in the same footprint. In fact, you'll see -- and these are based on GIS data by Burleigh County showing the reroute location and also showing the original route location. In some small areas they actually are proposing on their reroute to move the pipeline closer to the city of Bismarck. That's what the GIS data shows, is that they're trying to move it. And that's in particular in relation to Silver Ranch, is the area that would be impacted.

Now there's some other law that has to be read in conjunction with North Dakota Century Code 22-13.1, and that is 49-22.1-02, which is the statement of policies that also applies. And what that policy said -- because all these statutes have to be read together. What NDCC 49-22.1-02 says is "The policy of this state is to site energy conversion facilities and to route transmission facilities in an orderly manner compatible with environmental preservation and the efficient use of resources. Sites and routes must be selected to

minimize adverse human and environmental impact."

So regardless of the application of 49-22.1-13, they would still have to meet that criteria. And so until they select a route that meets that statement of policy and meets that criteria, it would be premature to issue a certificate.

The other thing -- and Ms. Lawyer talked about the statute and that's the March 6th statute that they -- that Burleigh County adopted and what that statute dealt with -- and that is previously Warford 114. What that statute dealt with was dealing with the issue of providing safety procedures and protocols upon request to landowners within the site boundaries and to interested persons.

And we've marked as Exhibits Warford 202 and Warford 203 what Summit has done since the PSC's initial decision on August 4. You can see Exhibit 202 is dated August 28, 2023, from Summit. And it's a draft emergency response plan, which clearly says on it "draft" and just contains generic information. Nothing specific to Burleigh County at all.

And Warford Exhibit 203 is their initial response tactic provided to Burleigh County, and that's blank. It's just a template with no information on it. Where it says "Response Strategy," it doesn't even have

the latitude or longitude, the location, distance from release sources. It's empty. They've done nothing to comply with that aspect which the Commission said was deficient.

And if we look back at the ordinance from

Burleigh County, they're supposed to provide safety

procedures and protocols upon request, not only to

Burleigh County but to landowners within the site

boundaries and to interested persons. That has not been done.

And then another factor that needs to be considered here, because they talk about -- Summit talks about state statutes from Iowa and other locations, but it's important to recognize that in North Dakota, under the Century Code, North Dakota Century Code 11-33-01 gives statutory power to the counties to regulate properties.

And that's why the reading that Ms. Lawyer gave and Mr. Braaten gave, 49-22.1-13, is directly on point. Because if this was interpreted in the way that Summit says it should be interpreted, it would contradict North Dakota Century Code 11-33-01 giving statutory power to the counties to regulate properties.

And, in fact, there's a Supreme Court decision directly on point, which is the Shaw v. Burleigh County

case, and the citation for that is 286 N.W.2d 792, and not coincidentally, it involves Burleigh County and what it did in that case involving a special use permit.

And that's another thing that Summit has failed to comply. That's why this is premature. They have the -- they have the cart before the horse. And this is another reason why, is because they've never applied for a special use permit with Burleigh County. What the special use permit says is they should apply for that first, and then their first right of appeal is to this commission. They've never applied for a special use permit. That is the first thing they must do. And then there's also a variance procedure available to them under the Burleigh County ordinance.

And that's exactly what the Shaw v. Burleigh

County case addressed, is a special use permit, in that

case for a mobile home that someone wanted to place in a

residential area, and if Burleigh County does not allow

that, it's a standard of arbitrary and capricious. In

other words, it has to be determined that the county's

actions were not justifiable. And they haven't applied

for that special use permit, and that would be step one

that they would have to do.

And so the statute -- or the ordinances by Burleigh County, both the one -- both of which deal with

safety and both of which deal, to some extent, with land use, cover both bases. They cover not only the zoning requirements and the land use requirements. They also address the public safety issues.

So let's take an example of zoning. Nobody is telling in a traditional sense to Summit "You can't put your pipeline in a certain location in Burleigh County." You know, zoning is for commercial land. What can you do in a commercial area, what can you put in a residential area.

They can put this in many locations throughout Burleigh County. And the current map, Exhibit 200, shows, when you look at the white townships there, there are many routes through different townships, both to the east of Bismarck and to the north of Bismarck, where they could go where these Burleigh County ordinances do not apply. There are no ordinances, to our knowledge, in those townships that say you can't put a pipeline, a CO2 pipeline, in a more remote location further away from the city of Bismarck for the safety of the citizens. Burleigh County has not taken the position that it can't go anywhere in Burleigh County. Clearly, there is a route.

So when they say there is no route in Burleigh County, that's clearly wrong. There are only

approximately 25 percent of the townships which are governed by or who are part of what have been adopted under these two ordinances. So there's many locations where they can go.

And they also claim, well, this is contrary to state law, which they say -- they say the Burleigh County and Emmons County ordinances conflict with state law promoting a policy of carbon sequestration. That's false.

If you look at North Dakota Century Code

38-22-01, that statute merely makes a broad policy
statement that says, quote, "It is in the public
interest to promote the geological storage of carbon
dioxide." Doesn't say anything about where the
transmission lines can go. Doesn't say anything about
they can be put within a certain distance of a city. It
doesn't say anything to suggest that the state
supercedes or preempts the county in regulating land
use, as Summit is arguing. The statute says nothing
about CO2 pipelines or where they can be located. So
these county ordinances do not contradict state law.

And then the other thing is the PHMSA. And,

Commissioner Christmann, I agree with you that federal

court decision in Iowa says what it says. However, what

it doesn't say is that this federal court judge in Iowa,

applying Iowa law, Iowa setbacks, can preempt what PHMSA says on pipelines.

And that's why we attached Attachment A to our brief, which is the PHMSA letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, dated September 15, 2023. And Mr. Braaten read to you part of that. He read part of what PHMSA said in that regard saying that it's up to the counties and the local jurisdictions and the state to determine where CO2 pipelines can go.

That judge has no basis to say PHMSA can't decide. In fact, she did say PHMSA can decide where pipelines are to be sited. And they have said that is up to the state, that is up to the county, that is up to the local jurisdiction, not the Federal Government.

In fact, on the first page of that letter to
Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, Mr. Mayberry, who is the
associate administrator for safety, says, in the third
paragraph, "While the Federal Energy Regulatory
Commission has exclusive authority to regulate the
siting of interstate gas transmission pipelines, there
is no equivalent federal agency that determines siting
of all other pipelines, such as carbon dioxide
pipelines. Therefore, the responsibility for siting new
carbon dioxide pipelines rests largely with the
individual states and counties through which the

pipelines will operate and is governed by state and local law."

And what a federal judge says or how a judge interprets what PHMSA -- what that judge thinks PHMSA can do does not trump or overrule what PHMSA itself has recently said.

This letter was provided to Summit just 12 days before they filed this motion for preemption. They knew that PHMSA had said specifically that it was up to the state governments, it was up to the counties, to determine where these pipeline -- where CO2 pipelines go and that PHMSA doesn't have jurisdiction over that issue and, in fact, said it's specifically left with the counties.

And so for all those reasons, this is premature and what we're requesting to happen here is that the Commission proceed with an additional hearing date or dates and determine that subsection 49-22.1-13 subpart b has no application at this point because it's a request for a permit for construction, which is not before the Commission.

So unless the commissioners have any questions for me which I'd be happy to respond to, I appreciate your -- the opportunity to speak.

ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you.

Are there any questions from commissioners or 1 2 Mr. Dawson? 3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do not. 4 ALJ HOGAN: All right. Well, thank you, Mr. Bakke. 5 6 All right. Next on my list is the landowners --7 landowner intervenors. So, Mr. Leibel, you can go 8 ahead. MR. LEIBEL: May it please the Commission. 9 10 provided to you, each of the commissioners with copies 11 to all the counsel, a little blue packet that includes 12 where I printed out the statutes that are at issue because I'm a visual. That's kind of how I work. 13 14 And I would direct the Commission to the first 15 tab, which is the statute we're talking about here 16 today. And one of the things that I think that I wanted 17 to share with the Commission and help the Commission, at 18 least from my perspective, how I see this, I think 19 beginning with the first sentence of the statute, it 20 talks about "The issuance of a certificate of site 21 compatibility or a route permit is," and, you know, it's 22 the sole site or route approval. 23 Now, in determining what -- how to interpret the 24 statute, I've included under tab 2 which is another 25 statute. This is in the -- also from the Century Code

and it talks about how the Legislature wants their statute construed. And in the second sentence from that very brief statute it says "Technical words and phrases and such others as have acquired a peculiar and appropriate meaning in law, or as are defined by statute, must be construed according to such peculiar and appropriate meaning or definition."

And I point that out because in this case we do have definitions, a definition section. Under the third tab of this packet I've included a printout of 49-22.1-01, and that's our definitions section that governs this area.

And as you can see, the very first entry under the definitions section is for a "certificate." And that means a certificate of site compatibility or a certificate of corridor compatibility. Both of those words are also defined. A "corridor" means an area of land where a designated route may be established. A "site" means the location of a gas or energy conversion facility.

I also printed -- under tab 4 is a printout of 49-22.1-06. And this is the specific statute in North Dakota that governs certificates. And, you know, the -- if you can skip down to the very bottom of this statute, No. 5, as a certificate and when a certificate is

applied for, "The commission may designate a site or corridor for a proposed facility following the study and hearings provided for in this chapter."

And I'm going to skip to the very last sentence of this subpart 5. "Upon designation of a site or corridor, the commission shall issue a certificate of site compatibility." So a certificate is -- the intention is to designate a site or corridor.

If you flip to tab 5, I've printed out for you the very next statute. This is an application for a permit. And "An application for a permit for a gas or liquid transmission facility within a designated corridor --" there's the magic language from the prior statute "-- must be filed no later than two years after the issuance of the certificate."

And, you know, again, the last subpart, subpart 5, talks about a permit includes the commission designating a specific route.

One of the things, there's been a lot of discussion of legislative history. And I share -- the same warnings you've heard before is that it's difficult to read too much into specific words or terms that are used, but there are a couple things I think that are established clearly. One of those things is that the Legislature, when they were evaluating this -- and I

would say there's two things, I guess, to be specific.

The first is the amendments we're looking at is a response to DAPL, what happened with DAPL. This is a 2017 statute. The other thing that the legislative history is very clear about is that this is a two-step process. It was envisioned to be a two-step process and under the statute it's a two-step process.

Now the statute was also amended at this exact same time to allow parties to apply for both at the same time. And so Mr. Bakke had said earlier a certificate was applied to. My understanding is it was a joint application for both a certificate and a permit, but this is a two-step process even if it's only accomplished with one hearing.

And what I would point the Court -- or the Commission to is under subpart 6 is the legislative history that I previously filed with the Commission, but if you will jump to page 23 of that legislative history, there's a discussion between the energy industry's lobbyist where they are talking about this two-step process, how it works.

And about midpoint through the testimony of Mr. Kranda, which is the third paragraph from the bottom on page 23, he's talking about what he gets as a handout from the PSC. And it says "If you look at my handout is

a certification by the PSC, deals with DAPL corridor findings and certification letter. The certification letter says, and the PSC has this for each applicant, says, 'Company agrees to comply with all rules and regulations of other agencies having jurisdiction, including all city, township, and county zoning regulations.'" And the lobbyist says, "So the PSC is the one telling us you must comply and the locals aren't losing any control. We're not trying to take away from what they do and what we have to comply with."

Now, the following paragraph, the representative, Mr. Heinert, says, Well, wait a minute. "It says that they must preempt any local land use or zoning regulations. So if a local county or local city has a zoning ordinance, the pipeline is going through there, they have to change their zoning ordinance."

And this is the part where Chairman Porter brings up the issue that I'm taking away from this and I think is supported by all the statutes. It's a two-step process. And he says, "Mr. Kranda, I think it would be helpful, because this sub 2 is broken into two things, I think it would be helpful if you broke it down into step one, certificate of site capability which may not supersede or preempt, and then step two, the permit for construction which has to because all the other stuff

has been looked at during the certification process. I think, so we keep it straight, what we're performing in each of the processes, even inside of this amendment may not be correct. Each of these need to be broken down into A, B, C."

And then Mr. Kranda says, "I think that helps.

I didn't see that. Yeah, the first sentence, you don't because site compatibility, the certificate for site compatibility may not supersede."

And I provided that so you can see it. But flipping back to tab 1, which is our statute, that provides -- Chairman Christmann had asked a question about not knowing how to read subpart 2(b); it didn't seem to make sense. They were not consistent unless you read it the way Summit had suggested.

And the response to that, and I'm going to skip over subpart 2(a) because, you know, as the Commission pointed out, that deals with a conversion facility, which is also a defined term that wouldn't include this pipeline. But jumping to subpart b, it says "Except as provided in this section, a permit for the construction of a gas or liquid transmission facility within a designated corridor supersedes and preempts any local land use or zoning regulations."

My understanding from reading the legislative

history is that one of the big concerns with DAPL, and some of you may have been on the Commission at that time, is a permit had been issued and subsequently there were all kinds of problems where there was a conflict and local jurisdictions were refusing to allow this.

And my understanding of subpart b is that once a permit is issued, so we already have gone through and got the certificate, once the permit is issued, that is the law of the land. There is no more local -- the locals don't have the ability at that time to influence or affect or otherwise interfere with the authority that's been granted by a permit.

And so when I read that, that's all I see, is that's just saying that once you have a permit, you -- any local ordinance or regulation is superseded and preempted. And my understanding is that's a direct response to what happened with DAPL.

So moving to subpart 2(c), I agree with Summit's attorney in evaluating this. I believe that that first sentence deals with road use agreements, which, again, if you flip to your handy-dandy definition section under tab 3, we have a definition for "road use agreement" and that road use agreement includes permits required for extraordinary road use, road access points, approach or road crossings, public right of way setbacks, building

rules, physical addressing, dust control measures, or road maintenance. And my reading of that section of the statute is that language that follows, again consistent with this two-step process, the language that follows modifies road use agreements.

Finally, when we get to (d), this is the first place we talk about a certificate, is under (d). In (a) we have a certificate for a conversion facility. In (d) we talk about, finally, a certificate for a gas or liquid transmission facility. Under subpart (d), it's superseded if it's not provided within the appropriate time by the local counties. And so my interpretation of this statute is that the certificate process requires the locals to have their say, at least the way this is written.

And I understand that Summit -- you know, frankly, Summit does make a policy argument for why that should be expanded, but it's not in the statute, at least as I see it. The statute is very clear, once you -- once you accept that there are two parts to the process, I don't think that you can use a permit to preempt a certificate when a permit is expressly said it's subject to a designated corridor. And in that designated corridor, the local ordinances and rules are part of the deal.

And if anyone has any questions for me, I'd be 1 2 happy to answer them. 3 ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you. Are there any questions for Mr. Leibel? 4 COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: I do not. 5 COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: I do not. 6 7 ALJ HOGAN: No questions. All right. Thank 8 you, Mr. Leibel. All right. Next party is Laborers Union, 9 10 Mr. Pranis. 11 MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Judge Hogan and Commissioners. I'm a member of the Laborers Union. 12 13 We like to keep things simple so I'll try to 14 keep this simple and brief. The question that we 15 understand is before us today is who has the authority to decide where a pipeline can or can't be located in 16 the state of North Dakota. 17 18 We're not here today because we necessarily support Summit's project. As the commissioners are 19 20 aware, we've expressed support for the goals but have 21 also expressed concerns and are still evaluating changes 22 that Summit has made to its application. 23 What we are here for today is to support the 24 consistent application of state law and rule regarding 25 the routing of linear infrastructure which is

foundational for the development of the critical infrastructure in North Dakota and across the country.

We believe the question that will be decided here, hopefully today and certainly in this proceeding, is more important than the question of whether to issue Summit a permit to build the proposed project. In our view as someone who represents workers who build this kind of infrastructure, preserving the integrity of the state-permitting process for linear infrastructure, specifically pipelines and transmission lines, is absolutely vital to maintaining reliable systems and orderly development of energy resources, and we believe that's why that responsibility is vested solely with the Public Service Commission and not with local governments in the case of linear infrastructure.

Our reading of the law is clear. The

Legislature distinguishes very clearly between

non-linear or point facilities such as a gas processing

plant and a linear facility such as a pipeline. The

Commission, according to the law, may not issue a

certificate of site compatibility or designate a site

that is contrary to the local rules when we're talking

about a fixed point facility. On the other hand, the

law makes clear that the Commission may issue a permit

that supersedes and preempts local land use and zoning

regulations provided that the Commission makes a finding that those regulations are unduly burdensome.

The Legislature makes a similar distinction with respect to electric power infrastructure in almost identical language. The siting of a conversion facility such as a wind farm must conform to local land use requirements. The routing of a transmission line does not if the Commission finds the local land use requirement is unduly restrictive.

It's pretty clear here there's only two possibilities. One is that local jurisdictions have the ability to veto a proposed location and the other is that the Commission ultimately decides with input from local governments, with consideration to local concerns and to the local land use ordinances, but ultimately it's a decision by the Commission.

So why the difference? The North Dakota Code recognizes that to advance the purposes of the State, the Commission needs the clear authority to establish corridors and routes for linear infrastructure. There are many potentially suitable sites for point infrastructure like a wind farm or a gas processing plant. There are very few to get between point A and point B.

We know this because we've spent years with this

commission, with the commission in Minnesota, trying to find routes for critical pipeline projects, right, that, frankly, have turned into political footballs in many cases because of local opposition, some of that local opposition that we sympathize with and understand but, fundamentally, makes it very, very difficult to site linear infrastructure. We believe that's why there's a very clear difference in the law that directs the Commission to take responsibility for this siting and that ultimately puts local governments in an advisory role.

So what does the law provide for with respect to transmission? When the law requires that or permits, rather, local governments to file their local zoning ordinances and requirements, that's an opportunity to inform the Commission, like any other facts that are part of the process, that's information that should be weighed by the Commission in designating, first, a corridor and, second, designating the final route for a route permit.

And so it is appropriate for the Commission to consider those ordinances, the reasons behind them, what those local priorities are, what those concerns are, no different than considering testimony that might be provided by local governments or letters or testimony by

others or other evidence in the proceeding.

It is evidence that does not make it binding law on the Commission. And, in fact, it's clear that the — it's stated differently in the two different sections, but within the pipeline statute it's simply a preponderance of the evidence, which is a very low threshold. In other words, there is not a burden on the applicant to prove beyond a reasonable doubt or beyond any particular measure that there's a burden. All they have to do is show that there's more evidence that it's unduly burdensome than not. And that's enough for the Commission to decide. Effectively, this is putting it clearly within the Commission's purview to make that decision.

And what does that mean in terms of protecting the concerns of local residents? It means that the Commission has to take those concerns on. And that's what the criteria that are laid out allow the Commission and instruct the Commission to do, is to consider all of those local impacts: Environmental impacts, human impacts, socioeconomic impacts, impacts on the shippers. Those are the things the Commission is asked to balance.

And we would like to point out that we think the Commission -- this Commission has a track record not only of clearly considering even the smallest local

concerns that are brought to them by landowners in multiple cases, in both a siting case and a routing case, and local governments, but actively, you know, being willing to require -- to encourage applicants to address those issues.

And, finally, the Commission has not been a rubber stamp on infrastructure. While most projects are eventually approved because the applicants do the things needed to conform, right, not every project is approved. And so we think the Commission has not only the authority but has shown that it has the interest of local -- of local residents at heart and is the best way to do this.

The concern that we have, if we go a different direction -- I actually think that the map that Mr. Bakke provides, W201, is a great example of the slippery slope that we go down when we move from a state-based permitting system to allowing local governments to effectively veto routing for not only pipelines but potentially transmission lines because it's not clear what the legal distinction would be in a transmission line case.

Now if we look at the map here, there's one potential path that's not -- that's marked in white through Trygg Township. Now if Trygg were to implement

-- were to suddenly adopt prior to the next hearing their own ordinance similar to the Burleigh County ordinance, it's possible that there would be no pathway anymore through Burleigh County, right. If we accept the idea that each township and each county should be able to establish any of its own ordinances at any time within ten days prior to the hearing, then effectively we've created something where it's impossible to engineer any route with any certainty that that route can get through. So now we're looking at -- we're going into Kidder County because we can't get through Burleigh County potentially.

And so I think when we're thinking about what's unduly -- what's unduly burdensome, we believe that the evidence already in the record shows it's unduly burdensome and that the test is, if this same policy were applied to each jurisdiction, would it be reasonable to site a pipeline? Because it's not reasonable to say that Burleigh County should be allowed to have extremely restrictive policies and Emmons County, but the county next door isn't allowed to have similarly restrictive policies or that those individual townships that set their own rules, or cities, can have those same restrictive policies.

And you can imagine that, with the kinds of

miles-long setbacks that are established, you start applying that and assume that every local jurisdiction should at least be allowed to implement equally rigorous requirements, and there's nowhere left to site a pipeline. And then we end up in a place where siting's a political football.

I live and work primarily in Minnesota. We have a nightmare process of trying to get one single pipeline through even with state permitting. We're seeing these sorts of policies being weaponized all over the country in order to prevent development of critical infrastructure.

And so we have confidence in the North Dakota

Commission to take local concerns seriously. We think

that it's not clear how you put the sort of like -- how

you put the worms back in the can if we're going to

allow any jurisdiction to set, you know, extremely broad

policies and then force companies to try to work around

or risk having their pipeline route invalidated at the

end.

Thank you for your time.

ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you, Mr. Pranis.

Any questions from commissioners or Mr. Dawson?

COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: None.

COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: I have a question

just for clarification.

When you were giving the scenario about the

counties, like Trygg County, the map you referred to -
MR. PRANIS: The township?

COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: Yep.

-- all of a sudden doing an ordinance and then

they would be prohibited, wasn't Burleigh County or

they would be prohibited, wasn't Burleigh County or

Emmons County saying that the company can go before them

and ask for a waiver? So what's prohibiting the company

to go before and ask for it?

I mean, I think it -- I understand your intent.

I absolutely do. We want to make this simple. And I thank you for the compliments on the Commission in listening to it. But explain yourself a little bit more on why that would be burdensome if we want some collaboration.

MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Commissioner.

I think the concern -- our concern is twofold.

One, it's fairly clear that in this case these ordinances were established as poison pills; in other words, the timing of the ordinances and the extreme setbacks. And I think if you look at the changes to Emmons County, it's fairly clear that it went from a pretty flexible and permissive policy for looking at all types of pipelines to an extraordinarily restrictive

policy that would make it very difficult to site pipelines.

And it is certainly possible that the company would be able to obtain a waiver. I think our big concern is that is the kind of thing that chills development. Because when any developer looks at this and says, "I think I can build this project, I have to get all of these easements, I have to deal with all of these environmental considerations and a route that is appropriate and that the Commission will find appropriate," if -- if you then say, "Look, I can go and secure all these easements, but at any time before the hearing any local jurisdiction could, out of nowhere, propose a new policy that they might or might not waive for us," I think it makes it incredibly difficult to develop.

And to some degree if -- if basically the only way the policy works is if the company has to be granted a waiver, then it doesn't mean much to begin with. Then I think you've effectively preempted anyway.

So I think it's better for the public to know that they need to go to the Commission and that the Commission is who they need to -- who needs to hear from them rather than believing they could go to a local jurisdiction that has authority.

COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: Thank you.

ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you, Mr. Pranis.

All right. I will return to you, Mr. Dublinske. Would you like to make a reply argument?

MR. DUBLINSKE: I would, Your Honor, and I will try and do this in order and try not to repeat some of the arguments that obviously came up from multiple intervenors and try not to repeat Mr. Pranis either and, hopefully, can get through this promptly.

I would respond to Emmons County's argument by noting that while they talk about the unique ordinance having been in place since 1980, notably, they really try to sweep under the rug and not even directly answer a question about the change from 200 feet to 8,000 feet for residences, which I think is telling for some of the reasons that Mr. Pranis just discussed.

The statutory interpretation argument that

Emmons County advanced essentially is that paragraph (c)

does all the heavy lifting. And as we mentioned in our

initial argument, that renders paragraph (b) largely

superfluous. At that point, there's no reason why they

would be separate paragraphs if (b) simply says, you

know, find everything you need to know about how this

works in (c). That also ignores sort of this unique use

of the term "road use agreements" in (c). If, indeed,

it's covering a broad spectrum of things, that broad spectrum would include road use agreements.

So there are some issues with that statutory interpretation that just don't work well with the actual language and structure of the statute.

Emmons County raised the issue of, well, then why would we be required to submit the ordinances? You know, doesn't that provision get rendered superfluous if preemption is automatic? Chair Christmann noted, "Well, you know, it says 'road use agreements.' Maybe you give them to us so we look for road use agreements."

Obviously, that's logical, but there are other reasons too, right. Seeing what those concerns were that are embodied in local regulations may spur certain questions that the Commission has in making its own determinations that it has to make on the ultimate decision. And sometimes, frankly, it's just good to know what's out there that the law regarding the Commission is, in fact, preempting.

And while it may sound to some like that is not enough left to be reasonable, I will tell you, and I hate to keep bringing Iowa up, but in the Iowa generating certificate statute, it basically does the exact same thing. Counties come forward -- and actually in that case even the applicant has to discuss here are

the local ordinances. And the statute is absolutely crystal clear that once the generating certificate is issued by the state board, that all of those local ordinances are expressly preempted, that those counties and cities have to come to the board, participate in that process, and that is their opportunity. But it's still information that the utilities would want.

So I don't think it's at all unreasonable or even unusual, knowing that there are other states that do the same thing, for your legislation to be structured the same way.

I'm glad that Emmons County brought up the PHMSA letter. I had neglected to address that. But I would encourage you to read that very closely. PHMSA clearly is trying to be as political as possible and offend absolutely nobody, but Summit actually believes that letter is supportive of our position. It is extremely similar, almost verbatim, to a letter that was written to TC Energy that was in front of the federal court judge in Iowa when she made her decision.

And, notably, it says repeatedly that, look,

PHMSA still has sole authority over safety and still has

-- and states and counties still can't conflict with

federal law, but this part that the intervenors hang

their hats on about, well, local governments have

traditionally exercised broad powers to regulate land use, and it goes on to say including setback distances and property development in the vicinity of pipelines. It doesn't say anything about counties having traditional authority to regulate land use for pipelines. It says in the vicinity of pipelines.

And it talks about the county also having a role in protecting safety and how everyone from individuals all the way up has a role. And it gives a list of things that it recognizes local governments have done. And if you look at that list, none of them involve regulating pipelines. All of them involve regulating potential encroachments or potential damages to pipelines.

Finally, and this is an issue that I know

Commissioner Haugen-Hoffart just talked about with

Mr. Pranis, but want to briefly reiterate Summit

believes that waivers and variances can't be the answer,

that a system that relies on additional waivers and

variances is inherently unreasonably restrictive. There

is no way you can plan a long lead time, long-planning

project based on a series of waivers and variances.

Regulatory law has to be knowable and predictable and stable, and we need to be able to go when we start a project and look at what the law is.

And if what we're being told is "Well, you can't rely on what we're putting out there in writing, just come ask us for a variance, ask us for a waiver" -- and by the way, because there's exceptions from ordinances, they are inherently more stringent and harder to get than just your run-of-the-mill permit under the ordinance. So we have a real concern about that being the alleged solution.

Burleigh County, I think, fundamentally sees safety as much narrower than the federal courts and Federal Government. The comment was made, well, it regulates the safety of the community, not the safety of the pipeline.

And I would suggest that PHMSA and federal caselaw clearly suggest that federal law is intended to do both. The *Kinley* court case at the Eighth Circuit, which I believe is cited in our materials and certainly cited in the Judge Rose decision, broadly looks at preemption and safety. And there it was a financial security, not a specific safety standard. And the court says we see this simply as a proxy for safety and found that it was preempted.

The certificate of compatibility issue has come up a couple of times, and let me just sort of address that quickly here. First of all, and I want to jump

ahead to the Bismarck landowners, the suggestion that we've only requested a certificate and not a route permit is just simply incorrect. If you look at the introduction to Docket No. 1, it very clearly says that we are applying for both in a combined hearing as permitted by Section 1-08.

But I think, you know, if you go back and look at 1-06, which is what has to go on an application for a certificate, 1-07, application for a permit, 1-09, criteria that the Commission is to look at for a certificate, those lists are extensive. And it's telling that nowhere in those extensive lists does it list county ordinances as being relevant, does it mention anything in either direction about preemption.

So the only time you find out about the preemptive power or not of a certificate and/or a permit is in 1-13. And for (a) it says on a conversion facility a certificate doesn't preempt and for (b) it says on a transmission facility a permit does. And there is literally nothing anywhere that prohibits a certificate from preempting in any other situation. There's nothing in 1-06, nothing in 1-09. That all comes strictly from 1-13, which we obviously analyzed at length.

You know, I would follow up on Chair

Christmann's questions about so you could have a route where you have two miles clearance on one side and 50 feet on the other. The answer to that, I think, shows just how arbitrary some of these restrictions actually are.

The Bismarck landowners, I've talked a little bit about the combined application, but the prematurity argument I have to admit I just don't understand. The notion that a motion to preempt county processes is premature until we've already gone through those county processes seems fundamentally flawed.

And while it may be true that there's a general allowance in the Century Code for county control of land use, the general rule of statutory construction is that the newer and more specific prevails. Obviously, pipeline regulation is a specific carveout for this Commission and the amendments to the relevant statute are quite specific and quite recent.

With regard to --

ALJ HOGAN: I'll just note, Mr. Dublinske, you're almost at ten minutes.

MR. DUBLINSKE: All right. Let me just make sure there's nothing else in here.

Yeah, just -- the only other thing I wanted to point out is that the argument that the Leibel

```
1
     intervenors made that section (b) somehow applies
2
     post-granting of the permit and section (c) or paragraph
3
     (c) applies to the preceding seems an unnatural reading,
4
     to sort of flip the time order around. (C) appears, a
     better reading, to be a specialized subset of (b).
5
 6
             Your Honor, the most natural reading here is
7
     Summit's reading. The reading that best supports state
     public policy is Summit's reading. This is a legal
8
9
             The Commission can and should address it here
10
     and now at the outset of the reconsideration. And we
11
     would ask you to preempt the unreasonably restrictive
12
     ordinances of Emmons and Burleigh County.
             Thank you.
13
14
             ALJ HOGAN: Thank you.
15
             Are there any other questions from commissioners
     or Mr. Dawson for Mr. Dublinske?
16
17
             COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: I do not.
18
             COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: I do not.
19
             SUBSTITUTE DECISIONMAKER DAWSON: No.
20
             ALJ HOGAN: All right. Well, thank you all.
21
     That will conclude our oral arguments for our hearing
22
     today.
23
             Are there any closing remarks or comments that
24
     the commissioners want to make or Mr. Dawson?
25
             COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: I think only that -- I
```

```
don't know about the other decisionmakers here, but my
1
2
     preference is to take this under advisement and we'll
3
     release a decision once we've reached one.
             ALJ HOGAN: All right. Well, then I will note
4
5
     for the record that it's 3:51 p.m. and that will
     conclude our hearing for today. Thank you.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

#### CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTIONIST

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA ) ss.

I, Lisa A. Hulm, CET-783, a certified electronic transcriber, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter, to the best of my professional skills and abilities. I further state that I was not present during these recorded proceedings, and I am only the transcriber of the recorded proceedings.

I further certify that I am not a relative or employee or attorney or counsel of any of the parties hereto, nor a relative or employee of such attorney or counsel; nor do I have any interest in the outcome or events of the action.

Dated this date of October 13, 2025.

Lisa A. Hulm, CET-783

The foregoing certification of this transcript does not apply to the reproduction of the same by any means, unless under the direct control and/or direction of the certifying transcriber.

•	28 [1] - 49:18 - 286 [1] - 51:1 28th [1] - 6:3	<b>8,000</b> [2] - 30:3, 74:14 <b>8,000-foot</b> [1] - 15:9 <b>80</b> [1] - 17:15	advisement [2] - 4:16, 82:2 advisory [1] - 67:10	20:1, 20:3 analyzed [3] - 19:11, 29:11, 79:23
<b>'80s</b> [1] - 29:24	<b>28th</b> [1] - 0:3	80 [1] - 17:15	affect [2] - 42:12,	answer [8] - 18:18,
Company [1] - 60:4	3	Α	62:10	26:19, 32:17, 32:19
road [1] - 75:10			afternoon [6] - 3:1,	64:2, 74:13, 77:18
	2 ro. 44.17 60.00	abide [2] - 12:13,	6:24, 7:4, 9:9, 9:12,	80:3
1	<b>3</b> [2] - 44:17, 62:22 <b>30th</b> [3] - 35:3, 39:15	12:25	45:23	answers [1] - 32:17
	<b>378</b> [2] - 44:6, 44:11	ability [2] - 62:10,	agencies [2] - 37:4,	anyway [2] - 27:6,
<b>I</b> [2] - 61:11, 79:4	<b>38-22-01</b> [1] - 53:11	66:12	60:5	73:20
<b>I-06</b> [2] <b>-</b> 79:8, 79:22	<b>380</b> [1] - 44:2	able [7] - 34:11, 34:12,	<b>agency</b> [2] - 9:23, 54:21	<b>apologize</b> [3] - 8:5, 44:8, 44:14
I <b>-07</b> [1] - 79:9	<b>386</b> [1] - 47:20	34:22, 41:6, 70:6,	ago [1] - 41:22	appeal [1] - 51:10
<b>-08</b> [1] <b>-</b> 79:6	<b>3:51</b> [1] - 82:5	73:4, 77:24	agree [7] - 27:9,	appear [2] - 12:22,
<b>-09</b> [2] <b>-</b> 79:9, 79:22		<b>absolutely</b> [5] - 46:18,	28:24, 29:2, 29:6,	14:11
<b>-13</b> [2] <b>-</b> 79:17, 79:23	4	65:11, 72:12, 76:1,	33:11, 53:23, 62:18	appearance [5] - 6:8
<b>0</b> [1] - 15:16		76:16	agreement [4] - 25:23,	6:10, 6:23, 8:6, 8:8
<b>0-minute</b> [1] - 8:15	<b>4</b> [3] - 46:23, 49:17,	absurd [3] - 26:21,	26:10, 62:22, 62:23	appearing [1] - 6:14
<b>1-33-01</b> [2] - 50:15,	<b>4</b> [3] - 40.23, 49.17, 57:21	27:20, 27:22	agreements [19] -	applicant [10] - 12:3
50:22	<b>49-22.1-01</b> [2] - 35:23,	absurdity [1] - 27:20	12:5, 13:8, 24:14,	12:13, 24:23, 37:1
<b>14</b> [1] - 49:10 <b>2</b> [1] - 55:7	57:11	accept [2] - 63:20,	24:20, 25:4, 30:23,	37:22, 38:1, 38:4,
<b>2</b> [1] - 55:7   <b>5</b> [1] - 54:5	49-22.1-01(7)(a [1] -	70:4	31:8, 31:10, 31:12,	60:3, 68:8, 75:25
<b>6</b> [1] - 54.5   <b>6</b> [1] - 15:10	44:23	access [1] - 62:24 accomplished [1] -	32:8, 32:13, 32:14,	Applicant [2] - 6:14,
<b>855</b> [1] - 6:13	<b>49-22.1-02</b> [2] - 48:18,	59:14	38:2, 62:20, 63:5,	6:17
1 <b>980</b> [1] - 74:12	48:21	according [2] - 57:6,	74:25, 75:2, 75:10,	applicants [2] - 69:4
1 <b>980s</b> [2] - 19:19,	<b>49-22.1-06</b> [1] - 57:22	65:20	75:11	69:8
21:24	<b>49-22.1-13</b> [8] - 24:13,	accurate [1] - 29:5	agrees [1] - 60:4 agricultural [1] -	application [15] - 20:7, 36:23, 38:13
	25:13, 35:17, 36:9,	acquired [1] - 57:4	17:21	40:4, 48:1, 49:2,
2	46:20, 49:2, 50:19,	action [2] - 34:16,	ahead [5] - 8:25,	55:19, 58:10, 58:1
	55:18	38:23	36:15, 40:20, 56:8,	59:12, 64:22, 64:2
N 5 0 44 47	49-22.1-13(2 [2] -	actions [1] - 51:21	79:1	79:8, 79:9, 80:7
<b>2</b> [9] <b>-</b> 5:6, 11:17,	11:10, 17:23	actively [1] - 69:3	<b>alive</b> [1] - 46:19	applied [7] - 46:7,
13:14, 35:9, 36:10, 46:20, 56:24, 60:21	49-22.1-13(2) [1] -	actual [4] - 19:11,	alleged [1] - 78:7	51:7, 51:11, 51:21
2(a [1] - 61:17	11:3 <b>49-22.1-13(2)(c</b> [1] -	19:12, 42:5, 75:4	allotted [3] - 3:18,	58:1, 59:11, 70:17
<b>2(b</b> [3] - 36:10, 46:12,	16:3	added [3] - 21:4,	8:18, 8:22	applies [5] - 12:1,
61:13	10.5	21:12, 32:2	<b>allow</b> [9] - 8:15, 8:19,	38:14, 48:19, 81:1
<b>2(c</b> [5] - 24:13, 24:16,	5	additional [3] - 10:19,	17:8, 17:18, 51:18,	81:3
37:21, 37:24, 62:18		55:17, 77:19	59:9, 62:5, 68:18,	<b>apply</b> [9] - 9:25, 10:5
<b>2(d)</b> [1] - 36:22		address [7] - 47:7,	71:17	18:16, 34:24, 35:1
<b>2)(a</b> [1] - 20:10	<b>5</b> [5] <b>-</b> 39:16, 57:25,	47:11, 52:4, 69:5, 76:13, 78:24, 81:9	allowance [1] - 80:13	43:21, 51:9, 52:17
<b>2)(b</b> [1] <b>-</b> 20:10	58:5, 58:9, 58:17	addressed [1] - 51:16	allowed [3] - 70:19,	59:9
<b>20</b> [2] - 7:25, 15:14	<b>50</b> [2] - 43:24, 80:3	addressing [2] -	70:21, 71:3	<b>applying</b> [6] - 14:12, 15:4, 18:7, 54:1,
<b>20-minute</b> [1] - 8:14	<b>500</b> [3] - 15:10, 30:8,	10:15, 63:1	<b>allowing</b> [2] - 3:17, 69:18	71:2, 79:5
<b>200</b> [9] <b>-</b> 30:2, 30:4,	30:13 <b>5th</b> [1] - 6:1	adds [1] - 16:1	allows [1] - 36:7	appreciate [1] - 55:2
30:9, 30:12, 47:16,	Stri [1] - O. 1	Administration [1] -	almost [3] - 66:4,	approach [3] - 13:9,
47:17, 52:12, 74:14	6	39:6	76:18, 80:21	18:1, 62:24
200-foot [1] - 29:25	•	administrative [3] -	alone [1] - 16:6	appropriate [8] - 14:
<b>201</b> [3] - 47:16, 47:17, 48:2		4:25, 5:13, 9:23	alternative [1] - 14:9	40:14, 57:5, 57:7,
46.2 <b>2017</b> [1] - 59:4	<b>6</b> [1] <b>-</b> 59:16	administrator [1] -	ambiguity [1] - 13:25	63:11, 67:21, 73:1
<b>2019</b> [1] - 39:4	<b>6th</b> [3] - 34:6, 41:11,	54:17	ambiguous [2] -	73:11
<b>202</b> [2] <b>-</b> 49:15, 49:17	49:8	admit [1] - 80:8	27:10, 33:10	appropriately [1] -
<b>2023</b> [5] <b>-</b> 5:6, 6:1, 6:3,	-	adopt [3] - 35:14,	amended [3] - 20:6,	11:1
49:18, 54:5	7	42:2, 70:1	21:14, 59:8	approval [1] - 56:22
<b>203</b> [2] - 49:16, 49:22		adopted [7] - 10:6,	amending [1] - 20:16	approved [4] - 36:8,
<b>206</b> [1] - 40:24	<b>7.2</b> [1] - 16:14	15:8, 15:24, 34:7,	amendment [2] -	37:25, 69:8, 69:9
21st [1] - 5:6	<b>792</b> [1] - 51:1	38:12, 49:9, 53:2	20:11, 61:3	approves [1] - 36:6
<b>22-13.1</b> [1] - 48:17		advance [4] - 12:12, 30:18, 30:21, 66:18	amendments [3] -	<b>arbitrary</b> [2] - 51:19,
<b>23</b> [2] - 59:18, 59:24	8	advanced [1] - 74:18	14:6, 59:2, 80:17	80:4
<b>23-003</b> [1] - 40:24		adverse [4] - 47:1,	amount [1] - 28:13	area [9] - 4:1, 4:2,
<b>25</b> [1] - 53:1	0 m 26.0 20.40	47:4, 47:13, 49:1	amounts [1] - 15:19	16:13, 48:15, 51:16 52:9, 52:10, 57:12
	<b>8</b> [2] <b>-</b> 36:2, 39:16	, 41.10, 40.1	analysis [3] - 14:14,	JZ.J, JZ.1U, J1.1Z

57:17 areas [1] - 48:10 argue [2] - 14:11, 46:10 arguing [5] - 6:19, 30:16, 33:1, 38:25, 53:19 argument [14] - 8:1, 8:16, 8:17, 24:11, 24:14, 33:7, 40:15, 63:17, 74:4, 74:10, 74:17, 74:20, 80:8, arguments [13] - 4:5, 4:14, 4:15, 6:6, 8:14, 12:22. 13:3. 19:13. 27:8, 33:13, 46:1, 74:7, 81:21 arose [1] - 34:12 arresters [1] - 16:16 art [1] - 16:13 **Article** [4] - 20:9, 21:15, 21:19 articulated [1] - 46:22 aside [2] - 32:19, 33:8 aspect [1] - 50:3 Assistant [1] - 6:24 associate [1] - 54:17 assume [1] - 71:2 attached [2] - 35:8, 54:3 Attachment [1] - 54:3 attempt [4] - 19:13, 22:20, 23:17, 23:22 attempted [2] - 22:22, attended [1] - 3:22 attorney [2] - 30:1, 62:19 Attorney [1] - 6:25 attorneys [3] - 9:2, 33:3, 45:25 August [4] - 44:2, 46:23, 49:17, 49:18 authorities [2] - 23:3, 39:11 authority [18] - 16:21, 35:5, 35:7, 35:10, 36:25, 39:7, 39:8, 39:21, 40:1, 42:2, 54:19, 62:11, 64:15, 66:19, 69:11, 73:25, 76:22, 77:5 automatic [7] - 10:25, 14:10, 14:23, 25:8, 26:20, 40:5, 75:9 automatically [11] -11:23, 12:15, 26:15, 26:16, 27:4, 27:5, 27:21, 27:24, 27:25, 30:19, 37:9 available [1] - 51:13 avoid [3] - 10:21, 18:1,

27:19 aware [3] - 10:3, 22:21, 64:20

**b)** [1] - 81:5

69:16

45:22

68:22

77:22

54:10

56:19

7:19, 8:10

behind [1] - 67:22

76:16, 77:18

**BENDER** [1] - 6:12

beside [1] - 4:12

between [6] - 3:7,

65:17, 66:23

68:8

beyond [3] - 15:20,

big [2] - 62:1, 73:4

**binding** [1] - 68:2

bit [5] - 19:2, 19:23,

24:2, 72:14, 80:7

54:16

16:21

76:5

blast [1] - 16:7

blue [1] - 56:11

**bluntly** [1] - 14:5

board [3] - 15:5, 76:3,

block [2] - 15:19,

binds~[1]-11:7

**BAKKE** [2] - 7:4,

balance [2] - 17:6,

bases [1] - 52:2

begin [1] - 73:19

#### В

body [2] - 30:8, 33:3

**boiled** [1] - 14:18

booing [1] - 3:13

books [3] - 19:19, 21:11, 22:2 border [1] - 43:16 bottom [4] - 12:23, B(2)(b)(i) [1] - 20:13 28:2, 57:24, 59:23 boundaries [3] - 30:7, backwards [1] - 12:23 49:13. 50:9 Bakke [6] - 7:3, 7:4, boundary [1] - 43:20 45:21, 56:5, 59:10, **Box** [1] - 6:13 Braaten [7] - 7:17, 7:18, 18:25, 46:17, 50:19, 54:5 **BRAATEN** [5] - 7:18, 19:1, 30:4, 31:1, based [6] - 13:5, 20:1, 32:10 40:11, 48:8, 69:18, Bret [2] - 6:15, 9:10 brief [4] - 17:4, 54:4, 57:3, 64:14 basis [3] - 15:5, 16:4, briefing [2] - 11:1, 23:21 briefly [3] - 24:8, beginning [2] - 35:23, 46:24, 77:17 briefs [1] - 15:23 behalf [8] - 6:14, 6:16, bring [2] - 20:16, 41:2 6:25, 7:5, 7:11, 7:15, bringing [1] - 75:22 **brings** [1] - 60:18 broad [6] - 23:11, believes [6] - 10:12, 53:11, 71:17, 75:1, 10:24, 15:5, 15:11, 77:1 broadly [1] - 78:18 Bender [2] - 6:9, 6:13 **broke** [1] - 60:22 broken [2] - 60:21, 61:4 best [5] - 9:25, 11:6, brought [5] - 10:14, 27:10, 69:12, 81:7 34:3, 47:6, 69:1, better [2] - 73:21, 81:5 76:12 build [8] - 36:7, 36:20, 28:20, 39:18, 59:19, 40:4, 41:4, 41:16, 65:6, 65:7, 73:7 building [7] - 30:5, 30:8, 30:9, 30:11, 42:7, 42:11, 62:25 built [2] - 9:19, 42:7 burden [6] - 16:2, Bismarck [13] - 5:10, 28:5, 46:25, 47:4, 6:13, 7:5, 7:10, 8:3, 68:7, 68:9 17:17, 45:21, 48:12, burdensome [6] -52:15, 52:20, 79:1, 10:9, 66:2, 68:11, 70:14, 70:16, 72:15 Burleigh [53] - 5:24, 7:15, 8:2, 15:13, blank [3] - 49:24, 54:4, 15:15, 16:5, 16:11, 16:19, 18:13, 23:22, 33:22, 33:25, 34:3,

34:5, 35:4, 35:5,

35:10, 35:12, 35:15,

39:1, 39:12, 39:21,

40:1, 40:8, 45:24,

48:8, 49:9, 49:21,

49:23, 50:6, 50:8,

50:25, 51:2, 51:8, 51:14, 51:15, 51:18, 51:25, 52:7, 52:12, 52:16, 52:21, 52:22, 52:24, 53:6, 70:2, 70:4, 70:11, 70:19, 72:7, 78:9, 81:12 Byron [2] - 6:16, 9:10

**c)** [4] - 12:18, 14:13, 74:24, 74:25 camps [1] - 21:20 cannot [1] - 9:19 canons [1] - 31:18 canons' [1] - 27:15 capability [1] - 60:23 Capitol [1] - 5:10 capricious [1] - 51:19 capture [1] - 9:14 Carbon [4] - 3:2, 5:23, 8:1, 9:11 carbon [10] - 9:14, 9:17, 17:10, 17:12, 38:16, 38:18, 53:8, 53:13, 54:22, 54:24 care [1] - 34:12 carefully [2] - 11:10, 11:15 cart [1] - 51:6 carveout [1] - 80:16 Case [1] - 5:9 case [22] - 3:3, 3:8, 15:3, 16:21, 27:12, 37:10, 39:3, 41:21, 43:17, 46:23, 51:1, 51:3, 51:16, 51:17, 57:8, 65:15, 69:2, 69:3, 69:22, 72:19, 75:25, 78:16 caselaw [1] - 78:15 cases [4] - 3:10, 3:21, 67:4, 69:2 categories [4] - 11:14, 12:7, 12:9, 13:10 category [1] - 11:25 cell [3] - 5:20, 5:21 Century [11] - 10:13, 17:23, 25:13, 35:18, 48:17, 50:15, 50:22, 53:10, 56:25, 80:13 **CEO** [2] - 54:4, 54:16 certain [4] - 12:5, 52:7, 53:16, 75:14 certainly [3] - 65:4, 73:3, 78:17 certainty [1] - 70:9 certificate [42] - 11:20, 35:21, 35:24, 35:25, 36:6, 36:19, 36:22, 36:23, 37:9, 46:7,

46:16, 49:6, 56:20, 57:14, 57:15, 57:16, 57:25, 58:6, 58:7, 58:15, 59:10, 59:12, 60:23, 61:8, 62:8, 63:7, 63:8, 63:9, 63:13, 63:22, 65:21, 75:23, 76:2, 78:23, 79:2, 79:9, 79:11, 79:16, 79:18, 79:21 certificates [1] - 57:23 certification [4] - 60:1, 60:2, 61:1 Chad [2] - 7:6, 7:7 Chair [1] - 79:25 chair [3] - 3:3, 7:20, 75:9 chance [2] - 4:15, 41:20 change [4] - 32:6, 32:22, 60:16, 74:14 changes [3] - 32:17, 64:21, 72:22 **changing** [1] - 15:25 chapter [2] - 36:1, 58:3 Charter [3] - 34:8, 34:24, 41:12 check [1] - 5:19 chills [1] - 73:5 CHRISTMANN [28] -3:1, 4:22, 4:24, 9:1, 29:21, 30:14, 31:21, 33:18, 40:21, 41:19, 41:24, 42:13, 42:20, 43:2, 43:5, 43:22, 44:1, 44:5, 44:9, 44:11, 44:16, 44:19, 45:4, 45:11, 64:5, 71:24, 81:17, 81:25 **Christmann** [7] - 3:3, 5:12, 31:17, 32:11, 53:23, 61:12, 75:9 Christmann's [1] -80:1 Circuit [3] - 16:11, 16:23, 78:16 citation [1] - 51:1 cite [1] - 44:21 cited [4] - 44:23, 44:25, 78:17, 78:18 cities [4] - 37:1, 43:2, 70:23, 76:5 citizens [3] - 47:3, 47:14, 52:21 city [6] - 30:7, 48:12, 52:20, 53:16, 60:6, 60:14 claim [3] - 14:19, 24:18, 53:5

clapping [1] - 3:14

Class [1] - 9:17

clarification [1] - 72:1

clear [23] - 10:14, 11:11, 13:24, 14:4, 15:6, 16:3, 16:8, 17:23, 31:9, 31:13, 59:5, 63:19, 65:16, 65:24, 66:10, 66:19, 67:8, 68:3, 69:21, 71:15, 72:19, 72:23, 76:2 clearance [1] - 80:2 clearly [13] - 18:9, 25:23, 46:13, 49:19, 52:22, 52:25, 58:24, 65:17, 68:13, 68:25, 76:14, 78:15, 79:4 climbing [1] - 17:16 close [1] - 9:4 closely [1] - 76:14 closer [1] - 48:12 closing [1] - 81:23 **CO2** [8] - 9:19, 20:16, 20:25, 21:7, 52:19, 53:20, 54:9, 55:11 coal [3] - 20:20, 21:2, 21:3 Code [12] - 10:13, 17:23, 25:13, 35:18, 48:17, 50:15, 50:22, 53:10, 56:25, 66:17, 80:13 coincidentally [1] -51:2 collaboration [1] -72:16 colleagues [1] - 9:9 combine [1] - 15:22 combined [3] - 32:2, 79:5, 80:7 coming [2] - 20:24, 21:7 comment [2] - 4:23, 78:11 comments [7] - 3:6, 4:18, 11:4, 19:15, 23:21, 33:14, 81:23 commercial [3] -21:19, 52:8, 52:9 commission's [3] -11:19, 11:23, 32:3 Commission's [2] -28:10, 68:13 commissioners [13] -6:13, 8:20, 18:21, 29:19, 40:18, 46:24, 55:22, 56:1, 56:10, 64:19, 71:23, 81:15, 81:24 Commissioners [4] -8:10, 33:25, 45:23, 64:12 committee [1] - 11:5 community [5] - 41:6, 41:13, 42:10, 42:12,

78.12 companies [2] -20:17, 71:18 company [7] - 34:9, 34:14, 34:18, 72:8, 72:9, 73:3, 73:18 compared [1] - 15:9 compatibility [17] -35:25, 36:1, 36:18, 37:10, 38:10, 40:3, 40:11, 46:8, 46:16, 56:21, 57:15, 57:16, 58:7, 61:8, 61:9, 65:21, 78:23 compatible [1] - 48:23 compete [1] - 42:16 competent [1] - 29:4 complies [1] - 31:18 compliments [1] -72:13 comply [8] - 12:4, 37:12, 38:1, 50:3, 51:5, 60:4, 60:8, 60:10 concern [6] - 45:5, 69:14, 72:18, 73:5, concerns [11] - 17:8, 17:17, 62:1, 64:21, 66:14, 67:23, 68:16, 68:17, 69:1, 71:14, 75:13 conclude [2] - 81:21, 82:6 confidence [1] - 71:13 **confirming** [1] - 10:23 conflict [11] - 14:17, 15:7, 16:4, 17:13, 19:10, 19:22, 28:8, 28:20, 53:7, 62:4, 76:23 conflicts [1] - 17:5 conform [2] - 66:6, 69.9 conjunction [1] -48:17 consequence [1] -16:12 consider [3] - 23:3, 67:22, 68:19 consideration [2] -40:12, 66:14 considerations [1] -73:9 considered [1] - 50:12 considering [3] -37:17, 67:24, 68:25 consistent [3] - 61:14, 63:3. 64:24 construct [1] - 36:16 construction [10] -

36:3, 36:11, 38:9,

39:9, 46:5, 46:14,

55:20, 60:25, 61:21, 80.14 construed [3] - 39:13, 57:2, 57:6 contains [1] - 49:20 contradict [2] - 50:21, contradicts [1] - 19:24 contrary [4] - 31:2, 48:3, 53:5, 65:22 control [5] - 23:1, 32:23, 60:9, 63:1, 80:13 controlling [1] - 16:10 conversion [10] -11:18, 13:16, 45:2, 45:6, 48:22, 57:19, 61:18, 63:8, 66:5, 79:17 copies [2] - 24:4, 56:10 copy [1] - 44:24 corporate [1] - 30:7 correct [8] - 6:20, 30:2, 31:22, 43:25, 45:4, 45:8, 46:18, 61.4 corridor [19] - 35:25, 36:4, 36:13, 36:18, 37:2, 37:10, 37:17, 40:11, 57:16, 57:17, 58:2, 58:6, 58:8, 58:13, 60:1, 61:23, 63:23, 63:24, 67:19 **corridors** [1] - 66:20 cost [1] - 38:6 Council [1] - 8:12 counsel [1] - 56:11 count [1] - 8:21 counties [16] - 10:3, 10:5, 13:19, 37:1, 50:16, 50:23, 54:7, 54:25, 55:10, 55:14, 63:12, 72:3, 75:24, 76:4, 76:23, 77:4 country [3] - 21:2, 65:2, 71:10 county [31] - 13:17, 15:19, 17:13, 18:6, 18:17, 20:2, 20:6, 20:23, 22:14, 22:15, 34:10, 34:11, 34:16, 34:25, 35:6, 38:11, 38:21, 41:17, 53:18, 53:21, 54:13, 60:6, 60:14, 70:5, 70:21, 77:7, 79:13, 80:9, 80:10, 80:13 County [84] - 5:24, 7:16, 7:19, 7:20, 8:2, 15:8, 15:13, 18:13, 18:25, 19:3, 19:7, 19:14, 19:17, 19:19,

20:4, 20:5, 20:9, 20:12, 20:16, 20:22, 21:6, 21:24, 22:6, 23:8, 23:20, 23:22, 23:23, 28:18, 28:20, 29:10, 33:22, 34:1, 34:3, 34:5, 35:4, 35:5, 35:10, 35:12, 35:15, 39:1, 39:12, 39:21, 40:1, 41:20, 45:24, 48:8, 49:9, 49:21, 49:23, 50:6, 50:8, 50:25, 51:2, 51:8, 51:14, 51:16, 51:18, 51:25, 52:7, 52:12, 52:16, 52:21, 52:22, 52:25, 53:7, 70:2, 70:4, 70:11, 70:12, 70:19, 70:21, 72:3, 72:7, 72:8, 72:23, 74:18, 75:6, 76:12, 78:9, 81:12 county's [2] - 34:7, 51:20 County's [5] - 16:5, 40:8, 44:6, 45:24, 74:10 county-by-county [1] - 18:6 countywide [3] - 34:7, 34:23, 41:12 couple [5] - 3:6, 20:8, 41:21, 58:23, 78:24 course [1] - 47:10 court [9] - 16:22, 18:5, 19:21, 33:15, 53:24, 53:25, 76:19, 78:16, 78:20 Court [2] - 50:24, 59:15 courts [1] - 78:10 cover [7] - 43:11, 43:12, 43:15, 43:18, 43:20, 52:2 coverage [1] - 43:24 covered [3] - 42:23, 43:9. 43:19 covering [1] - 75:1 covers [1] - 43:14 create [3] - 26:19, 32:7, 42:15 created [2] - 29:4, 70:8 creating [1] - 10:8 criteria [4] - 49:3, 49:5, 68:18, 79:10 critical [4] - 32:24, 65:1, 67:2, 71:11 crossings [1] - 62:25 crystal [1] - 76:2 **cumulative** [1] - 15:22 current [4] - 22:10,

22:18, 30:5, 52:12

55:17 62:20 49:11 82:3 3:5, 5:16

D

d) [1] - 63:7 Dakota [20] - 5:8, 5:11, 8:11, 9:13, 10:13, 17:15, 18:7, 20:4, 35:18, 47:3, 48:17, 50:14, 50:15, 50:22, 53:10, 57:23, 64:17, 65:2, 66:17, 71:13 damages [1] - 77:13 dandy [1] - 62:21 danger [1] - 33:9 **DAPL** [5] - 59:3, 60:1, 62:1, 62:17 data [2] - 48:8, 48:13 date [3] - 5:7, 6:5, dated [2] - 49:17, 54:5 dates [1] - 55:18 **DAWSON** [3] - 4:23, 45:16, 81:19 Dawson [10] - 3:5, 4:22, 18:22, 29:20, 40:19, 45:14, 56:2, 71:23, 81:16, 81:24 days [10] - 12:12, 26:13, 26:17, 27:23, 30:18, 30:21, 37:4, 41:21, 55:7, 70:7 deal [8] - 39:9, 39:10, 41:5, 41:25, 51:25, 52:1, 63:25, 73:8 dealing [1] - 49:11 deals [5] - 37:21, 46:13, 60:1, 61:18, dealt [3] - 34:8, 49:10, debate [3] - 3:17, 11:2, 11:3 **December** [1] - 5:6 decide [4] - 54:11, 64:16, 68:12 decided [1] - 65:3 decides [1] - 66:13 deciding [1] - 40:13 decision [20] - 4:17, 10:2, 11:12, 12:17, 13:4, 18:4, 19:21, 19:22, 41:21, 46:23, 47:6, 49:17, 50:24, 53:24, 66:16, 68:14, 75:17, 76:20, 78:18, decisionmaker [2] decisionmakers [1] -82:1 **decisions** [1] - 9:22 declare [1] - 5:24 deem [1] - 39:22

deemed [1] - 39:19 38:18, 53:14, 54:22, entered [1] - 14:19 49:17, 49:22, 52:12 F 54:24 entire [3] - 13:20, **Exhibits** [2] - 47:16, deficient [1] - 50:4 direct [2] - 56:14, 49:15 defined [4] - 35:22, 31:7, 34:25 easements [3] - 17:16, 62:16 entirely [1] - 13:2 existed [1] - 21:11 57:5, 57:17, 61:19 73:8, 73:12 directing [1] - 5:17 definition [6] - 16:12, entities [1] - 40:6 existing [2] - 20:12, east [2] - 48:6, 52:15 16:14, 57:7, 57:9, direction [2] - 69:15, entry [1] - 57:13 21:13 eastern [2] - 48:3, 62:21, 62:22 79.14 environment [2] expanded [1] - 63:18 48:5 definitions [3] - 57:9, directly [4] - 18:7, 47:2, 47:14 expert [2] - 9:23, edae [1] - 43:23 57:11, 57:14 50:19, 50:25, 74:13 environmental [5] -17:24 effect [3] - 12:20, Director [1] - 7:1 expertise [1] - 10:1 degree [1] - 73:17 47:5, 48:24, 49:1, 17:12. 26:25 delay [1] - 44:14 directs [1] - 67:8 68:20. 73:9 explain [5] - 10:22, **effective** [1] - 10:10 disagree [3] - 14:10, 24:8. 31:22. 46:3. deliver [1] - 4:15 envisioned [1] - 59:6 effectively [4] - 68:12, demonstrate [1] -14:13. 24:9 72:14 equal [1] - 3:18 69:19, 70:7, 73:20 15:23 disagrees [1] - 15:1 equally [2] - 15:21, explained [1] - 28:19 effects [1] - 47:2 deny [1] - 29:15 discretion [1] - 12:1 71:3 explains [1] - 25:20 efficient [3] - 10:10, department [1] - 34:20 discretionarily [1] equivalent [1] - 54:21 explicit [2] - 16:17, 10:17, 48:24 12:17 derrick [1] - 7:18 era [1] - 3:12 27.1 efforts [1] - 10:21 design [1] - 16:1 discuss [2] - 8:24, Erin [1] - 7:20 express [2] - 13:7, Eighth [3] - 16:10, 75:25 16:9 designate [4] - 35:2, error [2] - 45:8, 45:10 16:23, 78:16 discussed [1] - 74:16 expressed [2] - 64:20, 58:1, 58:8, 65:21 especially [2] - 16:18, either [6] - 5:20, discusses [1] - 18:5 designated [8] - 5:14, 39:4 64:21 10:18, 10:20, 14:2, 36:4, 36:12, 57:18, discussing [1] - 19:4 expressly [2] - 63:22, essentially [1] - 74:18 74:8, 79:14 58:12, 61:23, 63:23, discussion [2] establish [3] - 9:16, electric [3] - 15:16, 58:20. 59:19 extensive [2] - 79:11, 63:24 66:19, 70:6 20:18, 66:4 distance [3] - 42:25, 79:12 designating [4] established [7] - 22:8, elsewhere [2] - 25:16, extent [5] - 17:2, 36:17, 58:18, 67:18, 50:1, 53:16 30:6, 30:11, 57:18, 48:4 17:11, 18:15, 48:6, 67:19 distances [2] - 23:12, 58:24, 71:1, 72:20 **embodied** [1] - 75:14 52:1 designation [1] - 58:5 77.2 establishes [1] emergency [11] **distinction** [4] - 3:21, **extraction** [1] - 21:21 designed [1] - 17:6 16:12 34:12, 34:16, 34:19, determinations [1] -18:8, 66:3, 69:21 establishing [1] extraordinarily [1] -34:21, 34:23, 38:23, 75:16 distinctions [2] - 3:7, 72:25 41:7, 41:14, 41:18, determine [5] - 30:22, evaluating [3] - 58:25, extraordinary [1] -11:16 49:19 37:18, 54:8, 55:11, distinguishes [1] -62:24 62:19, 64:21 **Emmons** [40] - 5:24, extreme [2] - 15:13, 55.18 65:17 event [3] - 14:1, 28:22, 7:19. 7:20. 8:2. 15:8. 72:21 determined [1] - 51:20 District [1] - 8:12 41:18 16:19, 18:13, 18:25, determines [1] - 54:21 diving [1] - 13:25 extremely [4] - 32:24, eventually [1] - 69:8 19:3, 19:7, 19:14, determining [1] docket [1] - 44:9 70:20, 71:17, 76:17 evidence [20] - 14:19, 19:17, 19:19, 20:4, 56:23 Docket [4] - 40:24, 15:3, 24:24, 26:1, 20:5, 20:8, 20:11, F develop [1] - 73:16 44:2, 47:20, 79:4 28:4, 28:6, 28:13, 20:16, 20:21, 21:6, developed [2] - 20:22, docketed [1] - 41:21 28:15, 28:17, 28:23, 21:24, 22:5, 23:8, 21:12 done [7] - 3:15, 33:5, 29:4, 29:12, 37:23, face [3] - 15:6, 15:12, 23:20, 23:23, 28:18, developer [1] - 73:6 45:25, 49:16, 50:2, 38:5, 68:1, 68:2, 28:20. 29:10. 44:6. 15:18 50:10, 77:10 68:6, 68:10, 70:15 development [8] -45:24. 53:7. 70:20. faces [1] - 3:22 door [1] - 70:21 evidentiary [6] - 3:23, 23:5, 23:13, 65:1, 72:8, 72:23, 74:10, facilities [13] - 4:7, 4:3, 10:18, 15:2, 65:12, 71:11, 73:6, doubt [1] - 68:8 74:18, 75:6, 76:12, 11:19, 11:22, 12:2, 77:3 down [8] - 14:18, 28:5, 28:12 81:12 12:10, 13:16, 14:24, exact [2] - 59:8, 75:24 difference [2] - 66:17, 20:10, 22:10, 45:15, 20:19, 21:17, 42:3, empty [1] - 50:2 67:8 57:24, 60:22, 61:4, exactly [2] - 26:23, 48:22, 48:23, 65:18 encourage [2] - 69:4, different [21] - 4:3, 69:17 51:15 facility [24] - 12:24, 76:14 10:6, 10:7, 10:8, draft [2] - 49:18, 49:20 example [5] - 13:16, 18:10, 36:4, 36:12, encroachments [1] -13:21, 16:14, 18:1, 15:8, 16:5, 52:5, dual [1] - 42:15 36:24, 37:25, 42:5, 77:13 18:2, 20:3, 21:15, 69:16 **Dublinske** [8] - 6:9, 42:8, 45:2, 45:3, end [3] - 11:6, 71:5, Except [3] - 25:12, 21:23, 33:1, 34:2, 6:16, 6:19, 9:6, 9:10, 45:6, 45:10, 57:20, 71:20 35:22, 36:2, 42:6, 74:3, 80:20, 81:16 36:10, 61:20 58:2, 58:12, 61:18, ended [1] - 32:25 52:14, 67:24, 68:4, except [1] - 25:18 DUBLINSKE [5] -61:22, 63:8, 63:10, Energy [2] - 54:18, 69:14 6:15, 6:20, 9:8, 74:5, **exceptions** [1] - 78:4 65:19, 65:23, 66:5, 76:19 differently [2] - 13:22, excessive [1] - 15:21 79:18, 79:19 energy [6] - 45:2, 68:4 during [3] - 5:22, 8:17, exclusive [1] - 54:19 fact [11] - 15:23, 45:6, 48:22, 57:19, difficult [4] - 58:21, 61:1 exercise [1] - 23:7 19:18, 32:15, 48:7, 59:19, 65:12 67:6, 73:1, 73:15 dust [1] - 63:1 exercised [2] - 23:11, 50:24, 54:11, 54:15, engage [1] - 16:9 diminish [1] - 8:6 duties [1] - 42:17 77:1 55:13, 68:3, 75:19 engineer [1] - 70:9 dioxide [8] - 9:17, Exhibit [4] - 35:9, factor [1] - 50:11 engineering [1] - 16:1 17:10, 17:12, 38:16,

factors [5] - 13:5, fixed [1] - 65:23 governed [2] - 53:2, Hazardous [1] - 39:5 identified [1] - 26:7 14:13, 14:20, 15:4, flawed [1] - 80:11 hazardous [2] - 38:15, identify [1] - 34:6 55:1 38.6 flexible [1] - 72:24 government [3] - 23:1, 38:19 ignores [2] - 13:6, factory [1] - 32:18 23:16, 30:17 hear [3] - 6:5, 9:3, flip [3] - 58:9, 62:21, 74:24 facts [2] - 3:25, 67:16 81.4 Government [3] -73:23 illogical [3] - 30:20, failed [3] - 46:25, 47:3, flippant [1] - 32:17 10:7, 54:14, 78:11 heard [6] - 17:16, 31:2, 31:17 flipping [1] - 61:11 governmental [1] -21:2, 21:3, 22:14, imagine [1] - 70:25 fair [2] - 4:15, 31:19 41:25, 58:21 impact [3] - 15:22, flowchart [1] - 11:12 fairly [3] - 24:5, 72:19, governments [18] hearing [28] - 3:2, folks [1] - 20:8 47:5, 49:1 17:19, 21:4, 23:2, 3:19, 4:4, 5:1, 5:7, 72:23 impacted [2] - 38:2, **follow** [1] - 79:25 fall [3] - 39:18, 39:19, 23:7, 23:11, 24:1, 5:9, 5:15, 5:22, 6:2, 48:15 followed [1] - 8:2 39:23 26:22, 27:21, 55:10, 6:4, 6:5, 7:23, 7:24, impacts [8] - 13:18, following [3] - 8:14, falling [1] - 39:14 65:14, 66:14, 67:10, 15:1, 26:13, 26:18, 47:1, 47:13, 68:20, 58:2, 60:11 67:14, 67:25, 69:3, false [1] - 53:9 27:24, 28:12, 37:5, 68:21 follows [2] - 63:3, 63:4 69:19, 76:25, 77:10 55:17, 59:14, 70:1, familiar [1] - 3:22 football [1] - 71:6 impermissible [1] governs [3] - 20:11, 70:7. 73:13. 79:5. far [1] - 28:2 footballs [1] - 67:3 13:2 81:21, 82:6 57:12, 57:23 impinges [1] - 23:15 farm [2] - 66:6, 66:22 **footprint** [1] - 48:7 granted [3] - 9:22, hearings [3] - 3:11, fatality [1] - 16:8 force [1] - 71:18 implement [2] - 69:25, 62:12, 73:18 3:23, 58:3 71:3 Federal [4] - 10:7, forces [1] - 32:25 heart [1] - 69:12 granting [1] - 81:2 implementation [2] -54:14. 54:18. 78:11 foremost [1] - 9:23 heavy [1] - 74:19 grants [1] - 18:15 12:8, 13:12 federal [23] - 14:17, formal [2] - 3:2, 4:4 great [1] - 69:16 Heinert [1] - 60:12 15:7, 16:10, 16:13, implemented [1] forth [3] - 11:1, 13:10, group [1] - 6:1 held [1] - 5:9 23:2 16:22, 17:1, 18:4, 34.15 guess [1] - 59:1 help [2] - 3:16, 56:17 19:21, 23:14, 23:18, implementing [1] forward [2] - 47:7, helpful [3] - 24:6, 28:21, 39:7, 39:23, guidance [1] - 19:24 16:23 75:24 quide [1] - 10:20 60:21, 60:22 imply [1] - 37:15 39:24, 53:23, 53:25, foundation [2] - 29:1, guideline [1] - 37:19 helps [3] - 10:21, 15:1, 54:21, 55:3, 76:19, important [6] - 11:16, 29:3 76:24, 78:10, 78:14, 61:6 19:20, 32:24, 35:19, foundational [1] high [1] - 16:12 78:15 Н 50:14, 65:5 65:1 hissing [1] - 3:13 feet [11] - 15:10, 30:3, importantly [2] four [3] - 21:15, 21:23, 30:4, 30:8, 30:12, history [15] - 3:11, 19:25, 20:15 44:20 hand [2] - 11:22, 30:13, 43:24, 74:14, 14:1, 14:3, 27:10, imposed [1] - 39:1 fracture [1] - 16:16 65:23 80:3 27:13, 27:14, 32:21, **impossible** [1] - 70:8 frankly [3] - 63:17, handed [2] - 20:7, few [1] - 66:23 33:9, 33:12, 33:14, inaccurate [1] - 47:24 67:3, 75:17 29:22 field [1] - 23:17 58:20, 59:5, 59:17, incentive [1] - 26:24 Fredrikson [2] - 6:16, handful [2] - 11:5, file [6] - 12:10, 26:17, 59:18, 62:1 include [3] - 14:15, 9:10 17:18 27:21, 37:4, 37:7, hit [1] - 46:4 61:19, 75:2 front [4] - 21:18, 24:7, handle [1] - 34:22 Hoffart [3] - 3:4, 4:19, included [3] - 17:3, 33:16, 76:19 handout [2] - 59:24, 77:16 filed [12] - 5:23, 6:2, 56:24, 57:10 fully [1] - 25:16 59:25 **HOFFART** [7] - 4:20, 16:22. 19:21. 22:24. fundamentally [3] includes [6] - 11:24, handy [1] - 62:21 33:20, 64:6, 71:25, 26:12, 27:5, 27:23, 23:13, 45:7, 56:11, 67:6, 78:9, 80:11 handy-dandy [1] -36:24, 55:8, 58:14, 72:5, 74:1, 81:18 58:17, 62:23 62:21 59:17 home [1] - 51:17 including [5] - 11:21, G hang [1] - 76:24 Home [3] - 34:7, filing [5] - 14:25, 17:10, 23:12, 60:6, happy [3] - 18:18, 26:22, 26:25, 44:2 34:24, 41:12 77:2 55:23, 64:2 gas [15] - 4:7, 13:16, Honor [10] - 6:12, final [1] - 67:19 incompatible [1] hard [1] - 9:3 20:20, 22:3, 36:3, finally [4] - 63:6, 63:9, 6:15, 6:20, 8:9, 9:8, 39:24 harder [1] - 78:5 36:11, 36:23, 45:6, 17:14, 29:21, 41:23, 69:6, 77:15 incorrect [1] - 79:3 hate [1] - 75:22 54:20, 57:19, 58:11, 74:5, 81:6 financial [1] - 78:19 increased [1] - 30:13 hats [1] - 76:25 61:22, 63:9, 65:18, findings [2] - 28:9, Hope [2] - 4:25, 5:13 incredibly [1] - 73:15 **HAUGEN** [7] - 4:20, 66:22 60:2 hopefully [3] - 10:16, indeed [3] - 11:11, Gas [2] - 45:1, 45:2 33:20, 64:6, 71:25, firm [2] - 6:2, 7:11 65:4, 74:9 27:20, 74:25 72:5, 74:1, 81:18 general [2] - 80:12, horse [1] - 51:6 Firm [1] - 7:19 independent [1] - 3:5 Haugen [3] - 3:4, 4:19, 80:14 first [28] - 8:2, 9:16, huge [1] - 15:19 indicate [2] - 6:10, 77:16 9:23, 11:13, 14:21, General [1] - 6:25 human [3] - 47:4, 39.7 **HAUGEN-HOFFART** 19:7, 20:24, 28:23, generating [2] - 75:23, 49:1. 68:20 indicated [1] - 5:12 [7] - 4:20, 33:20. 76:2 34:5, 34:11, 34:18, indicates [1] - 36:10 64:6, 71:25, 72:5, generic [1] - 49:20 38:20, 44:20, 45:25, I indicating [2] - 25:15, 74:1, 81:18 geological [1] - 53:13 47:8, 51:10, 51:12, Haugen-Hoffart [3] -54:15, 56:14, 56:19, GIS [2] - 48:8, 48:13 indicator [1] - 11:6 idea [4] - 21:2, 21:3, 3:4, 4:19, 77:16 given [1] - 7:25 57:13, 59:2, 61:7, individual [3] - 39:11, 21:25, 70:5 hazard [2] - 34:17, 62:19, 63:6, 67:18, glad [1] - 76:12 54:25, 70:22 identical [1] - 66:5 38:22 goals [1] - 64:20 78:25

individuals [1] - 77:8 industry's [1] - 59:19 influence [1] - 62:10 inform [1] - 67:16 information [11] -34:9, 34:10, 34:19, 34:20, 38:21, 41:17, 47:22, 49:20, 49:24, 67:17, 76:7 infrastructure [13] -13:18, 17:7, 64:25, 65:2, 65:8, 65:9, 65:15, 66:4, 66:20, 66:22, 67:7, 69:7, 71:12 inherently [2] - 77:20, 78:5 initial [3] - 49:16, 49:22, 74:20 injection [1] - 9:17 **input** [1] - 66:13 inside [2] - 43:8, 61:3 instruct [1] - 68:19 integrity [1] - 65:8 intend [1] - 19:4 intended [3] - 17:4, 17:8, 78:15 intent [5] - 11:4, 11:7, 17:11, 32:21, 72:11 intention [1] - 58:8 interest [2] - 53:13, 69:11 interested [2] - 49:14, 50:9 interesting [1] - 47:18 interestingly [1] -15:16 interests [2] - 17:6, 17:21 interfere [1] - 62:11 interpret [6] - 27:15, 27:17, 27:19, 33:6, 33:16, 56:23 interpretation [12] -11:2, 13:3, 14:11, 19:5, 24:3, 24:9, 27:7, 27:15, 31:19, 63:12, 74:17, 75:4 interpreted [3] - 14:6, 50:20, 50:21 interprets [1] - 55:4 interruptions [1] -5:22 interstate [1] - 54:20 **intervene** [1] - 35:9 **intervenors** [10] - 6:1, 7:6, 7:12, 8:3, 45:21, 56:7, 74:8, 76:24, introduction [1] - 79:4 invalidated [1] - 71:19 invested [1] - 9:15

investment [1] - 17:22 investments [1] - 17:7 involve [2] - 77:11, 77:12 involved [1] - 11:4 involves [1] - 51:2 involving [1] - 51:3 lowa [12] - 16:22, 18:4, 19:21, 20:2, 50:13, 53:24, 53:25, 54:1, 75:22, 76:20 isolated [2] - 11:4, 14:2 issuance [4] - 35:20, 35:21, 56:20, 58:15 issue [26] - 10:16, 10:18, 10:24, 11:1, 15:2, 16:25, 18:17, 19:4, 19:12, 24:2, 28:5, 29:15, 47:9, 49:6, 49:11, 55:12, 56:12, 58:6, 60:18, 65:5, 65:20, 65:24, 75:6, 77:15, 78:23, 81:9 issued [8] - 4:6, 5:8, 6:4, 36:1, 62:3, 62:7, 62:8, 76:3 issues [5] - 46:21, 47:8, 52:4, 69:5, 75:3 issuing [2] - 36:21, 40:10 itself [4] - 19:6, 24:10, 33:10. 55:5

## J

jigsaw [1] - 18:1 job [1] - 45:25 jobs [1] - 17:22 **John** [1] - 7:6 joined [1] - 3:4 joint [1] - 59:11 Judge [7] - 4:22, 5:2, 19:1, 33:24, 45:22, 64:11, 78:18 judge [13] - 3:5, 3:19, 4:25, 5:13, 16:23, 42:14, 42:18, 53:25, 54:10, 55:3, 55:4, 76:20 judge's [2] - 41:20, 42:1 Julie [2] - 7:15, 33:25 jump [2] - 59:18, 78:25 jumping [1] - 61:20 junkyards [1] - 21:20 jurisdiction [9] - 23:8, 54:14, 55:12, 60:5, 70:17, 71:2, 71:17,

73:13, 73:25 jurisdictions [3] -54:8, 62:5, 66:11 justifiable [1] - 51:21

# K

keep [5] - 41:5, 61:2, 64:13, 64:14, 75:22 keeping [1] - 8:16 **Keiser** [1] - 14:5 kept [1] - 48:7 Kevin [1] - 8:10 Kidder [1] - 70:11 kind [5] - 18:1, 47:18, 56:13, 65:8, 73:5 kinds [2] - 62:4, 70:25 Kinley [1] - 78:16 Knoll [2] - 6:2, 7:11 knowable [1] - 77:23 knowing [3] - 14:7, 61:13, 76:9 knowledge [2] - 46:5, 52:17 known [1] - 8:11 knows [2] - 7:12, 31:10 Kranda [3] - 59:23, 60:20, 61:6

#### L

Laborers [4] - 8:4, 8:11, 64:9, 64:12 lacking [1] - 28:13 laid [1] - 68:18 land [31] - 4:8, 11:24, 18:10, 20:5, 20:23, 21:11, 21:12, 21:13, 21:15, 21:18, 21:23, 23:4, 23:12, 23:24, 36:13, 40:5, 52:1, 52:3, 52:8, 53:18, 57:18, 60:13, 61:24, 62:9, 65:25, 66:6, 66:8, 66:15, 77:1, 77:5, 80:13 landowner [3] - 7:12, 8:3, 56:7 landowners [8] -17:20, 22:20, 49:13, 50:8, 56:6, 69:1, 79:1, 80:6 language [34] - 10:13, 11:8, 11:15, 13:23, 14:7, 14:23, 16:10, 18:8, 18:9, 19:11, 24:6, 24:8, 24:10, 24:15, 25:10, 25:20, 26:2, 27:9, 27:14, 31:3, 31:14, 31:20,

32:1, 32:25, 33:6, 33:10, 33:16, 44:20, 58:13, 63:3, 63:4, 66:5, 75:5 largely [2] - 54:24, 74.20 larger [1] - 15:10 last [6] - 8:7, 10:4, 26:4, 31:21, 58:4, 58.16 late [1] - 44:2 latitude [1] - 50:1 Law [1] - 7:18 law [41] - 4:13, 4:25, 5:13, 6:2, 7:10, 10:2, 11:9, 14:18, 15:7, 16:10, 17:1, 17:5, 17:8, 17:13, 18:7, 23:15, 23:18, 28:21, 31:24, 45:6, 48:16, 53:6, 53:8, 53:21, 54:1, 55:2, 57:5, 62:8, 64:24, 65:16, 65:20, 65:24, 67:8, 67:12, 67:13, 68:2, 75:18, 76:24, 77:23, 77:25, 78:15 Lawrence [1] - 6:13 laws [3] - 16:4, 19:10, 19:22 lawyer [7] - 33:23, 40:21, 45:19, 46:4, 46:17, 49:7, 50:18 Lawyer [3] - 7:14, 7:15, 33:25 **LAWYER** [20] - 7:15, 33:24, 41:3, 41:23, 42:4, 42:18, 43:1, 43:3, 43:15, 43:25, 44:4, 44:7, 44:10, 44:12, 44:14, 44:18, 44:25, 45:9, 45:13, 45:18 lead [1] - 77:21 leader [1] - 9:14 least [5] - 26:13, 56:18, 63:14, 63:19, 71:3 left [5] - 7:1, 39:11, 55:13, 71:4, 75:21 legal [6] - 3:24, 4:4, 4:15, 44:20, 69:21, 81:8 legislation [2] - 18:8, 76:10 legislative [17] - 11:7, 13:25, 14:3, 14:23, 27:9, 27:12, 27:13, 32:16, 32:20, 33:9, 33:12, 33:14, 58:20, 59:4, 59:16, 59:18, 61:25

legislators [3] - 11:5,

14:4, 32:23 Legislature [11] -13:22, 14:7, 31:9, 32:5, 32:15, 33:2, 33:8, 57:1, 58:25, 65:17, 66:3 Leibel [8] - 6:2, 7:9, 7:10, 7:11, 56:7, 64:4, 64:8, 80:25 **LEIBEL** [2] - 7:10, 56:9 length [3] - 15:17, 16:19, 79:24 letter [12] - 19:24, 22:24, 23:10, 39:4, 54:4. 54:15. 55:7. 60:2, 60:3, 76:13, 76:17, 76:18 letters [1] - 67:25 lifting [1] - 74:19 limitation [1] - 13:7 line [6] - 15:17, 28:2, 43:9, 43:16, 66:7, 69:22 linear [8] - 13:18, 64:25, 65:9, 65:15, 65:18, 65:19, 66:20, 67:7 lines [7] - 22:3, 44:20, 44:22, 53:15, 65:10, 69:20 liquid [13] - 4:7, 18:10, 36:3. 36:12. 36:23. 38:15. 38:19. 45:1. 45:3, 45:6, 58:12, 61:22, 63:10 list [11] - 8:6, 11:20, 11:24, 12:23, 18:24, 33:22, 45:20, 56:6, 77:9, 77:11, 79:13 listening [1] - 72:14 listing [1] - 26:6 lists [2] - 79:11, 79:12 literally [2] - 25:14, 79:20 **LIUNA**[1] - 8:10 live [4] - 3:12, 43:8, 43:22, 71:7 **LLC** [2] - 5:23, 6:2 lobbyist [2] - 59:20, 60:7 Local [1] - 23:10 local [81] - 4:8, 11:20, 12:10, 12:14, 12:25, 17:3, 17:11, 17:19, 18:10, 19:12, 21:4, 22:25, 23:1, 23:2, 23:7, 23:16, 24:1, 25:21, 25:24, 26:7, 26:9, 26:11, 26:22, 27:20, 28:16, 29:14, 30:17, 32:23, 35:19, 36:13, 37:12, 39:11,

40:6, 40:9, 40:11, 46:11, 46:19, 54:8, 54:14, 55:2, 60:13, 60:14, 61:23, 62:5, 62:9, 62:15, 63:12, 63:24, 65:14, 65:22, 65:25, 66:6, 66:8, 66:11, 66:14, 66:15, 67:4, 67:10, 67:14, 67:23, 67:25, 68:16, 68:20, 68:25, 69:3, 69:12, 69:18, 71:2, 71:14, 73:13, 73:24, 75:14, 76:1, 76:3, 76:25, 77:10 localities [2] - 12:10, 23:3 locals [3] - 60:8, 62:9, 63:14 located [3] - 37:2, 53:20, 64:16 location [12] - 36:6, 36:8, 36:19, 47:1, 47:12, 48:9, 48:10, 50:1, 52:7, 52:19, 57:19. 66:12 locations [3] - 50:13, 52:11, 53:3 logic [1] - 30:16 logical [3] - 13:13, 13:15, 75:12 long-planning [1] -77:21 longitude [1] - 50:1 look [28] - 11:15, 20:10, 21:10, 24:15, 25:11, 25:16, 26:4, 27:13, 32:20, 33:5, 36:21, 37:11, 39:4, 43:4, 47:25, 50:5, 52:13, 53:10, 59:25, 69:23, 72:22, 75:11, 76:21, 77:11, 77:25, 79:3, 79:7, 79:10 Look [1] - 73:11 looked [2] - 11:10, 61.1 **looking** [7] - 33:9, 33:11, 36:9, 40:9, 59:2, 70:10, 72:24 looks [2] - 73:6, 78:18 losing [1] - 60:9 low [1] - 68:6

### M

magic [1] - 58:13 Magrum [2] - 7:20, 22:12 maintain [1] - 3:16 maintaining [1] -65:11

maintenance [1] -63:2 majority [1] - 11:8 manage [1] - 17:24 management [1] -34:20 manner [3] - 3:12, 5:18, 48:23 map [9] - 28:25, 29:3, 29:4, 29:5, 35:8, 52:12, 69:15, 69:23, 72:3 maps [2] - 15:22, 47:16 March [6] - 34:6, 35:3, 39:15, 41:11, 49:8 marked [3] - 3:13, 49:15, 69:24 Materials [1] - 39:6 materials [2] - 10:19, 78:17 matter [3] - 5:16, 6:11, 9:13 matters [1] - 8:23 mature [1] - 3:19 Mayberry [1] - 54:16 mean [7] - 8:5, 26:21, 30:20, 43:11, 68:15, 72:11, 73:19 meaning [4] - 27:16, 47:22, 57:5, 57:7 meaningful [1] - 47:22 means [7] - 5:16, 25:17, 35:24, 57:15, 57:17, 57:19, 68:16 meant [2] - 31:11, 38:17 measure [1] - 68:9 measures [3] - 23:4, 23:6, 63:1 media [1] - 48:4 meet [3] - 46:25, 47:3, 49:3 meetings [2] - 3:11, 3:13 meets [2] - 49:4, 49:5 member [1] - 64:12 mention [1] - 79:14 mentioned [4] - 9:10, 21:17, 41:1, 74:19 merely [4] - 5:17, 15:23, 21:23, 53:11 merge [1] - 42:1 message [1] - 9:1 met [2] - 32:25, 46:24 mic [1] - 9:4 mics [1] - 9:3 middle [1] - 11:25 midpoint [1] - 59:22 might [4] - 43:23, 67:24, 73:14 miles [10] - 15:13,

15:16, 43:1, 43:3, 43:6, 43:12, 43:18, 43:23, 71:1, 80:2 miles-long [1] - 71:1 mill [1] - 78:6 minimal [2] - 47:1, 47:13 minimize [2] - 47:4, 49:1 mining [1] - 21:21 Minnesota [3] - 8:11, 67:1, 71:7 minute [1] - 60:12 minutes [2] - 7:25, 80:21 mitigation [2] - 34:17, 38:22 mix [1] - 3:24 mobile [1] - 51:17 modifies [1] - 63:5 Moldenhauer [1] - 7:7 moment [1] - 46:3 momentarily [1] -10.22 moreover [1] - 17:2 most [3] - 14:5, 69:7, 81.6 motion [10] - 5:7, 5:24, 6:4, 6:6, 10:14, 14:25, 29:15, 34:4, 55:8, 80:9 move [4] - 48:5, 48:11, 48:13, 69:17 moving [2] - 26:2, 62:18 multi [1] - 18:17 multi-county [1] -18:17 multiple [4] - 13:19, 35:12, 69:2, 74:7 must [10] - 12:13, 12:25, 26:12, 48:25, 51:12, 57:6, 58:14, 60:8, 60:13, 66:6

### Ν

N.W.2d [1] - 51:1
name [1] - 5:12
narrower [2] - 11:24,
78:10
natural [1] - 81:6
nature [2] - 13:21,
19:17
naught [1] - 9:18
NDCC [1] - 48:21
near [2] - 12:19, 43:22
nearly [1] - 15:8
necessarily [1] - 64:18
necessary [1] - 28:15
need [10] - 8:23,
25:25, 27:13, 30:21,

40:2, 61:4, 73:22, 73:23, 74:23, 77:24 needed [2] - 14:1, 69:9 needs [6] - 10:20, 13:19, 40:9, 50:11, 66:19, 73:23 neglected [1] - 76:13 never [3] - 3:15, 51:7, 51:11 new [6] - 12:8, 20:22, 21:12, 32:1, 54:23, 73:14 newer [1] - 80:15 next [12] - 7:20, 18:24, 33:22, 43:10, 43:21, 44:22, 45:20, 56:6, 58:10, 64:9, 70:1, 70:21 nightmare [1] - 71:8 **nobody** [2] - 52:5, 76:16 **non** [1] - 65:18 non-linear [1] - 65:18 none [2] - 71:24, 77:11 North [20] - 5:8, 5:10, 8:11, 9:13, 10:13, 17:14, 18:7, 20:4, 35:17, 47:3, 48:17, 50:14, 50:15, 50:21, 53:10, 57:22, 64:17, 65:2, 66:17, 71:13 north [1] - 52:15 notably [2] - 74:12, 76:21 note [4] - 35:20, 47:19, 80:20, 82:4 noted [1] - 75:9 nothing [13] - 23:14, 23:19, 38:15, 38:20, 46:17, 47:7, 49:20, 50:2, 53:19, 79:20, 79:22, 80:23 notice [2] - 5:7, 6:4 notification [1] - 26:5 notify [1] - 36:25 noting [1] - 74:11 **notion** [1] - 80:9 **November** [1] - 6:3 nowhere [3] - 71:4, 73:13, 79:12 number [7] - 29:2, 44:6, 44:7, 44:9, 44:25, 46:18, 46:21 numerous [1] - 19:15

# 0

oath [1] - 3:24 obligation [3] - 33:4, 33:5, 33:16 obtain [1] - 73:4 obviously [6] - 15:18, 22:13, 74:7, 75:12, 79:23, 80:15 occupied [3] - 15:9, 15:14, 29:25 occur[1] - 34:21 October [1] - 5:25 offend [1] - 76:15 officer [1] - 5:15 officials [2] - 17:3, 23:16 often [2] - 13:19, 27:12 oil [2] - 20:20, 22:3 once [9] - 21:3, 37:15, 62:6, 62:8, 62:14, 63:19, 63:20, 76:2, 82:3 one [42] - 4:5, 13:17, 14:3, 15:21, 18:15, 20:7, 21:2, 21:16, 21:23, 22:18, 23:4, 28:8, 29:2, 29:22, 31:7, 31:25, 35:2, 35:3, 41:10, 42:6, 42:21, 43:9, 43:13, 43:24, 44:2, 46:3, 51:22, 51:25, 56:16, 58:19, 58:24, 59:14, 60:8, 60:23, 62:1, 66:11, 69:23, 71:8, 72:19, 80:2, 82:3 ones [1] - 16:18 operate [1] - 55:1 operating [1] - 42:9 operation [1] - 42:8 opinion [4] - 4:1, 19:25, 20:1, 42:19 opinions [3] - 3:25, 4:11 opponents [1] - 17:18 opportunity [3] -55:24, 67:15, 76:6 opposed [1] - 43:7 opposition [2] - 67:4, 67:5 oral [5] - 4:4, 4:14, 6:5, 8:1, 81:21 order [6] - 28:11, 28:15, 29:13, 71:11, 74:6, 81:4 orderly [4] - 3:12, 5:17, 48:23, 65:12 Ordinance [1] - 40:23 ordinance [77] -12:11. 16:5. 16:11. 17:11, 19:3, 19:8, 19:12, 19:14, 19:17, 19:18, 20:5, 20:9, 20:12, 20:16, 20:22, 21:10, 21:24, 22:6,

23:20, 23:24, 25:21,

25:22, 26:10, 27:1, 28:16, 28:18, 28:20, 28:23, 28:24, 29:10, 29:11, 29:14, 29:24, 30:12, 34:5, 34:6, 34:7, 34:8, 34:13, 34:23, 35:1, 35:3, 35:7, 35:11, 35:13, 35:16, 38:12, 38:14, 38:17, 38:20, 39:2, 39:13, 39:15, 39:16, 39:20, 39:25, 40:22, 41:9, 41:11, 41:12, 42:21, 43:11, 43:14, 43:15, 43:19, 50:5, 51:14, 60:15, 60:16, 62:15, 70:2, 70:3, 72:6, 74:11, 78:6 ordinances [49] -5:24, 10:4, 11:25, 14:24, 15:7, 15:24, 16:19, 18:13, 19:15, 24:25, 25:2, 25:5, 25:24, 26:22, 27:21, 30:18, 30:23, 31:6, 31:13, 31:14, 34:2, 34:5, 35:19, 37:5, 37:16, 37:18, 37:23, 40:9, 40:10, 46:11, 51:24, 52:16, 52:17, 53:3, 53:7, 53:21, 63:24, 66:15, 67:15, 67:22, 70:6, 72:20, 72:21, 75:7, 76:1, 76:4, 78:4, 79:13, 81.12 ordinary [1] - 27:16 organized [1] - 30:7 original [3] - 34:3, 48:1, 48:10 otherwise [5] - 8:11, 10:19, 12:14, 37:14, 62:11 ourselves [1] - 36:15 outset [1] - 81:10 outside [1] - 35:15 overlapping [1] - 10:9 overrule [1] - 55:5 overwhelmingly [1] -10:25 own [8] - 4:11, 16:12, 35:7, 35:14, 70:2, 70:6, 70:23, 75:15

#### Ρ

p.m [2] - 5:6, 82:5 packet [2] - 56:11, 57:10 page [7] - 13:24, 20:15, 29:22, 44:17, 54:15, 59:18, 59:24

pages [2] - 20:8, 42:14 paragraph [23] -11:17, 11:18, 11:21, 12:4, 12:6, 12:13, 12:16, 12:18, 12:24, 13:1, 13:5, 13:6, 13:7, 14:13, 14:15, 16:3, 44:17, 54:18, 59:23, 60:11, 74:18, 74:20, 81:2 paragraphs [6] -11:13, 12:7, 12:21, 13:9, 13:23, 74:22 parameters [2] -39:14, 39:19 parks [1] - 21:19 part [10] - 27:11, 32:6, 37:1, 53:2, 54:6, 60:17, 63:25, 67:17, 76:24 participate [1] - 76:5 particular [4] - 20:2, 41:16, 48:14, 68:9 particularly [2] -19:20, 31:4 parties [5] - 6:7, 7:24, 12:22, 14:9, 59:9 parts [2] - 18:2, 63:20 party [6] - 7:25, 8:14, 18:24, 33:22, 45:20, 64:9 party's [2] - 8:17, 8:20 passed [5] - 10:4, 11:8, 14:7, 22:1, 35.11 past [2] - 3:8, 3:10 patchwork [1] - 10:9 path [2] - 17:23, 69:24 pathway [2] - 35:14, 70:3 Pause [1] - 44:13 peculiar [2] - 57:4, 57:6 Pelham [2] - 6:22, 6.25 **PELHAM** [1] - 6:24 **people** [1] - 3:23 percent [2] - 17:15, 53:1 **performing** [1] - 61:2 permissive [1] - 72:24 permit [52] - 11:23, 12:3, 18:9, 18:14, 24:17, 24:22, 27:22, 32:3, 35:21, 36:1, 36:2. 36:7. 36:11. 36:16, 38:3, 38:8, 40:4. 40:10. 46:6. 46:13, 51:3, 51:8,

51:9, 51:12, 51:16,

51:22, 55:20, 56:21,

58:11, 58:17, 59:12,

60:24, 61:21, 62:3,

62:6, 62:8, 62:12, 62:14, 63:21, 63:22, 65:6, 65:24, 67:20, 78:6, 79:3, 79:9, 79:16, 79:19, 81:2 permits [5] - 4:6, 4:8, 13:1, 62:23, 67:13 permitted [1] - 79:6 permitting [4] - 9:22, 65:9, 69:18, 71:9 persons [2] - 49:14, perspective [1] -56:18 pertains [2] - 11:18, 11:22 petition [1] - 35:8 **PHMSA** [27] - 16:13, 16:17, 19:23, 22:25, 23:6, 23:25, 39:5, 39:14, 39:19, 39:24, 41:25, 42:11, 53:22, 54:1, 54:4, 54:6, 54:10, 54:11, 55:4, 55:5, 55:9, 55:12, 76:12, 76:14, 76:22, 78:14 PHMSA's [1] - 23:10 phone [2] - 5:20, 5:21 phones [1] - 5:20 phrases [1] - 57:3 physical [1] - 63:1 pills [1] - 72:20 **Pioneer** [1] - 5:10 Pipeline [1] - 39:5 pipeline [51] - 3:3, 9:22, 10:2, 10:5, 13:19, 18:3, 18:17, 20:24, 21:3, 21:7, 23:5, 23:14, 23:17, 23:19, 34:9, 34:14, 34:18, 35:16, 36:7, 36:8, 36:17, 38:24, 39:2, 39:9, 40:14, 41:4, 41:5, 41:16, 42:3, 43:10, 43:12, 46:6, 47:11, 48:3, 48:12, 52:7, 52:18, 52:19, 55:11, 60:15, 61:20, 64:16, 65:19, 67:2, 68:5, 70:18, 71:5, 71:8, 71:19, 78:13, 80:16 pipelines [37] - 10:1, 17:10, 17:12, 17:25, 20:18, 20:19, 20:23, 21:4, 21:5, 21:9, 21:16, 23:14, 29:25, 38:15, 38:16, 38:18, 38:19, 53:20, 54:2, 54:9, 54:12, 54:20, 54:22, 54:23, 54:24,

55:1, 55:11, 65:10,

81:2

69:20, 72:25, 73:2, 77:3, 77:6, 77:12, 77:14 place [8] - 5:7, 31:7, 41:16, 46:19, 51:17, 63:7, 71:5, 74:12 placement [1] - 39:17 plain [8] - 10:12, 14:22, 24:10, 25:10, 27:9, 27:16, 31:3, 31:20 plan [6] - 34:16, 34:17, 38:23, 41:8, 49:19, 77:21 planning [2] - 34:22, 77:21 plans [1] - 38:22 plant [3] - 13:16, 65:19, 66:23 **PO** [1] - 6:13 point [36] - 3:9, 3:20, 4:12, 14:25, 19:16, 20:14, 21:1, 21:22, 22:17, 22:23, 24:4, 25:1, 33:7, 36:17, 37:3, 37:6, 40:7, 44:2, 46:1, 46:6, 46:11, 46:15, 46:16, 50:19, 50:25, 55:19, 57:8, 59:15, 65:18, 65:23, 66:21, 66:23, 66:24, 68:23, 74:21, 80:25 pointed [1] - 61:18 points [1] - 62:24 poison [1] - 72:20 policies [6] - 48:19, 70:20, 70:22, 70:24, 71:10, 71:18 policy [18] - 9:13, 9:18, 10:11, 17:6, 17:19, 18:5, 48:19, 48:21, 49:5, 53:8, 53:11, 63:17, 70:16, 72:24, 73:1, 73:14, 73:18, 81:8 political [8] - 24:18, 24:23, 26:5, 38:2, 38:4, 67:3, 71:6, 76:15 Porter [1] - 60:17 portions [1] - 39:25 poses [1] - 22:18 position [5] - 9:25, 14:22, 40:8, 52:21, 76:17 possibilities [1] -66:11 possible [4] - 26:24, 70:3, 73:3, 76:15 post [1] - 81:2 post-granting [1] -

potential [3] - 69:24, 77:13 potentially [3] - 66:21, 69:20, 70:12 power [4] - 50:16, 50:22, 66:4, 79:16 powers [2] - 23:11, 77:1 **Pranis** [8] - 8:5, 8:10, 64:10, 71:22, 74:2, 74:8, 74:16, 77:17 PRANIS [4] - 8:9, 64:11, 72:4, 72:17 precedence [1] -16:24 precedent [1] - 16:11 **preceding** [1] - 81:3 precisely [1] - 23:8 predictable [1] - 77:24 preempt [16] - 4:8, 11:20, 12:3, 13:1, 14:12, 24:17, 24:22, 32:4, 32:6, 54:1, 60:13, 60:24, 63:22, 79:18, 80:9, 81:11 preempted [20] - 5:25, 12:12, 13:11, 13:12, 16:11, 17:1, 18:13, 18:14, 23:18, 26:14, 26:15, 26:17, 27:4, 27:6, 37:8, 62:16, 73:20, 76:4, 78:22 preempting [3] -35:19, 75:19, 79:21 preemption [13] -10:15, 10:25, 13:4, 14:10, 14:23, 16:4, 19:9, 25:9, 26:20, 55:8, 75:9, 78:19, 79:14 preemptive [1] - 79:16 preempts [6] - 11:23, 18:10, 36:13, 53:18, 61:23, 65:25 preference [1] - 82:2 preliminary [1] - 8:23 premature [6] - 46:2, 47:9, 49:5, 51:5, 55:15, 80:10 prematurity [1] - 80:7 **prepare** [1] - 41:9 prepared [1] - 41:18 preponderance [6] -24:24, 25:25, 28:6, 37:22, 38:5, 68:6 prerogative [1] - 24:1 prerogatives [1] -23:15 present [1] - 8:1 presentation [1] -8:21 presentations [1] -8:19

presented [3] - 10:20, 77:25 15:3, 47:19 projects [4] - 13:21, preservation [1] -17:25, 67:2, 69:7 48:24 promote [2] - 10:11, preserving [1] - 65:8 53:13 pretty [5] - 9:4, 11:11, promoting [1] - 53:8 33:13, 66:10, 72:24 promotion [1] - 9:14 prevails [1] - 80:15 promptly [1] - 74:9 prevent [2] - 17:4, **proof** [2] - 28:5, 46:25 71:11 proper [1] - 34:21 preventing [1] - 22:10 properties [2] - 50:17, previous [3] - 3:21, 50:23 29:24, 30:1 property [2] - 23:13, previously [4] - 32:2, 77:3 48:6, 49:10, 59:17 propose [1] - 73:14 primacy [1] - 9:16 proposed [6] - 37:1, primarily [1] - 71:7 43:10, 47:11, 58:2, primary [2] - 14:22, 65:6, 66:12 46:4 proposing [1] - 48:11 printed [3] - 56:12, protecting [2] - 68:15, 57:21, 58:9 77:8 printout [2] - 57:10, protocol [2] - 34:18, 57:21 41:8 protocols [3] - 38:23, priorities [1] - 67:23 problem [1] - 22:18 49:12, 50:7 problems [1] - 62:4 proud [1] - 3:10 **prove** [2] - 28:6, 68:8 procedural [1] - 5:15 procedure [2] - 7:23, provide [8] - 8:15, 51:13 11:13, 17:22, 26:6, procedures [5] - 10:6, 26:10, 34:10, 50:6, 34:17, 38:22, 49:12, 67:12 provided [17] - 7:24, 25:12, 25:18, 25:19, proceed [3] - 18:25, 36:10, 37:13, 47:15, 33:23, 55:17 47:18, 49:23, 55:7, proceeding [4] - 5:25, 56:10, 58:3, 61:10, 10:17, 65:4, 68:1 proceedings [1] - 5:17 61:21, 63:11, 66:1, process [18] - 22:6, 67:25 provides [7] - 10:13, 22:17, 22:19, 32:16, 17:23. 18:9. 46:13. 59:6, 59:7, 59:13, 47:21, 61:12, 69:16 59:21, 60:20, 61:1, providing [1] - 49:12 63:4, 63:13, 63:21, provision [3] - 20:13, 65:9, 67:17, 71:8, 46:9. 75:8 76:6 processes [4] - 18:2, provisions [2] - 27:17, 46:20 61:3, 80:9, 80:11 proximity [1] - 17:17 processing [2] proxy [2] - 16:25, 65:18, 66:22 78:21 produce [2] - 47:1, prudent [1] - 21:8 47:13 produced [1] - 28:3 **PSC** [5] - 28:4, 59:25, proffered [2] - 28:3, 60:1, 60:3, 60:7 **PSC's** [1] - 49:16 29:12 PU-22-391 [1] - 5:9 **prohibit** [1] - 17:9 public [5] - 52:4, prohibited [1] - 72:7 53:12, 62:25, 73:21, prohibiting [2] -17:12, 72:9 81:8 prohibits [1] - 79:20 **Public** [7] - 5:8, 5:14, 6:3, 7:1, 9:24, 17:24, project [14] - 10:5, 15:25, 16:21, 17:5, 65:14 17:20, 18:16, 43:8, publicizing [1] - 48:4 pull [1] - 44:4 47:4, 64:19, 65:6, 69:9, 73:7, 77:22, purport [1] - 18:16

purports [1] - 16:15 purpose [4] - 16:7, 16:8, 16:20, 21:13 purposes [1] - 66:18 **Purposes** [1] - 16:6 pursuant [1] - 37:13 purview [2] - 20:17, 68:13 put [9] - 28:22, 45:1, 52:6. 52:9. 52:11. 52:18, 53:16, 71:15, 71:16 puts [2] - 34:15, 67:10 putting [4] - 32:19, 33:7, 68:12, 78:2 puzzle [1] - 18:1

## Q

questions [24] - 8:20, 8:21, 11:4, 18:19, 18:21, 18:23, 29:16, 29:19, 33:19, 33:20, 40:16, 40:18, 45:12, 45:15, 45:16, 55:22, 56:1, 64:1, 64:4, 64:7, 71:23, 75:15, 80:1, 81:15 quick [1] - 43:4 quickly [1] - 78:25 quite [2] - 80:18 quote [7] - 12:4, 14:16, 14:17, 27:12, 45:5, 46:13, 53:12 quotes [1] - 17:3 quoting [1] - 30:15

### R

raised [2] - 46:1, 75:6 Ranch [1] - 48:14 Randall [1] - 7:4 **Randy** [1] - 3:3 rather [3] - 18:6, 67:14, 73:24 reached [3] - 8:18, 17:15, 82:3 read [17] - 12:20, 12:25. 13:14. 14:8. 24:21. 30:20. 31:3. 44:23. 48:16. 48:20. 54:6, 58:22, 61:13, 61:15, 62:13, 76:14 reading [12] - 24:10, 31:20, 50:18, 61:25, 63:2, 65:16, 81:3, 81:5, 81:6, 81:7, 81:8 reads [3] - 11:11, 13:6, 44:24

real [2] - 43:4, 78:7

really [6] - 4:12, 20:1, 37:19, 47:8, 47:21, 74:12 reason [4] - 8:7, 26:21, 51:7, 74:21 reasonable [5] - 17:9, 68:8, 70:18, 70:19, 75:21 reasons [8] - 18:5, 46:3, 46:4, 46:18, 55:15, 67:22, 74:16, 75.13 received [1] - 9:2 recent [2] - 18:4, 80:18 recently [1] - 55:6 recognize [2] - 23:7, 50:14 recognized [1] - 23:25 recognizes [2] -66:18, 77:10 reconsideration [2] -15:3, 81:10 record [12] - 5:5, 6:8, 6:10, 6:23, 8:8, 10:19, 28:14, 28:17, 29:13, 68:24, 70:15, 82.5 recreation [1] - 21:19 refer [6] - 9:11, 23:22, 24:7, 25:4, 25:23, 31.10  $\pmb{\text{reference}}\ [2] - 24:\!13,$ 35:1 referred [5] - 23:2, 25:6, 40:23, 41:10, 72:3 referring [4] - 7:5, 25:3, 25:14, 31:14 refers [7] - 24:19, 25:5, 25:13, 25:19, 25:23, 31:8, 32:14 reflect [1] - 5:5 refusing [1] - 62:5 regard [3] - 14:24, 54:7, 80:19 regarding [9] - 9:22, 10:1, 10:15, 12:9, 38:16, 38:20, 41:13, 64:24, 75:18 regardless [1] - 49:2 regulate [16] - 16:15, 16:20, 21:5, 21:8, 21:9, 21:11, 23:12, 23:17, 23:24, 34:13, 41:3, 50:16, 50:23, 54:19, 77:1, 77:5 regulated [6] - 20:17, 20:18, 21:13, 21:18, 21:23, 22:4 regulates [4] - 20:5,

21:15, 38:24, 78:12

regulating [5] - 22:3,

23:19, 53:18, 77:12 regulation [7] - 16:9, 22:1, 23:25, 25:21, 25:22, 62:15, 80:16 regulations [37] - 4:9, 11:21, 14:16, 16:13, 16:17, 16:25, 17:9, 18:11, 24:24, 25:2, 25:5, 25:6, 25:24, 31:5, 31:13, 31:15, 36:14, 37:6, 37:8, 37:15, 37:23, 38:5, 39:8, 39:10, 39:23, 39:24, 40:6, 40:12, 42:16, 60:5, 60:7, 60:14, 61:24, 66:1, 66:2, 75:14 **Regulatory** [1] - 54:18 regulatory [1] - 77:23 reiterate [1] - 77:17 related [1] - 20:22 relates [2] - 19:22, 39:2 relation [1] - 48:14 release [2] - 50:2, 82:3 relevant [2] - 79:13, 80:17 reliable [1] - 65:11 relies [1] - 77:19 rely [3] - 46:9, 46:12, 78:1 remainder [2] - 10:17, 25:15 remaining [2] - 39:20, 39:25 remains [1] - 14:22 remarks [1] - 81:23 remember [1] - 42:25 remote [1] - 52:19 remove [1] - 10:18 removed [1] - 32:1 render [1] - 10:2 rendered [1] - 75:8 renders [1] - 74:20 renewed [2] - 5:23. 10:14 repeat [2] - 74:6, 74:8 repeatedly [2] - 16:5, 76:21 replies [1] - 8:22 reply [3] - 8:15, 17:4, 74:4 represent [1] - 6:11 representative [1] -60:12 Representative [1] -14:5 represented [1] - 6:1 representing [1] -33:25 represents [1] - 65:7

request [8] - 5:14, 6:2,

46:2, 46:5, 46:15, 49:12, 50:7, 55:19 requested [2] - 48:6, 79:2 requesting [1] - 55:16 require [7] - 10:19, 12:3, 27:20, 28:22, 38:1, 41:15, 69:4 required [5] - 28:4, 29:13, 37:4, 62:23, requirement [2] -30:17, 66:9 requirements 1251 -12:11, 12:14, 12:25, 24:12, 24:17, 24:22, 25:1, 25:4, 26:7, 26:9, 26:11, 26:12, 26:13, 31:4, 37:5, 37:12, 38:3, 41:14, 46:11, 46:19, 52:3, 66:7, 67:15, 71:4 requires [5] - 12:10, 13:4, 41:17, 63:13, 67.13 reroute [8] - 35:16, 47:11, 47:17, 47:20, 47:23, 48:3, 48:9, 48:11 residence [2] - 22:8, 30:11 residences [3] - 30:6, 42:24, 74:15 resident [1] - 43:7 residential [2] - 51:18, 52:10 residents [2] - 68:16, 69.12 resistance [1] - 14:18 resolving [1] - 10:16 resources [3] - 9:16, 48:25, 65:12 respect [5] - 19:11, 27:8, 32:15, 66:4, 67:12 respectful [1] - 3:17 respectfully [2] - 3:15, 18:12 respects [1] - 47:23 respond [4] - 41:6, 41:14, 55:23, 74:10 responded [1] - 17:16 responders [2] -34:11, 34:19 **Response** [1] - 49:25 response [6] - 34:16, 49:19, 49:23, 59:3, 61:16, 62:17 responses [1] - 14:21 responsibilities [1] -9:21 responsibility [3] -54:23, 65:13, 67:9

responsible [2] - 3:19, 42:12 rest [2] - 15:2, 24:21 restrict [1] - 38:18 restricting [1] - 23:4 restriction [1] - 15:18 restrictions [1] - 80:4 restrictive [16] -14:16, 15:12, 24:25, 28:7, 28:25, 30:24, 32:9, 37:24, 38:6, 66:9, 70:20, 70:22, 70:24, 72:25, 77:20, 81.11 rests [1] - 54:24 retain [1] - 35:7 retained [1] - 36:25 return [1] - 74:3 reversible [1] - 28:11 review [1] - 46:24 rights [1] - 23:5 **rigorous** [1] - 71:3 risk [1] - 71:19 road [26] - 12:5, 13:7, 24:13, 24:19, 25:4, 25:23, 26:10, 30:23, 31:8, 31:10, 31:12, 32:7, 32:13, 32:14, 38:1, 62:20, 62:22, 62:23, 62:24, 62:25, 63:2, 63:5, 74:25, 75:2, 75:11 role [3] - 67:11, 77:7, 77:9 **Room** [1] - 5:10 room [1] - 9:3 Rose [1] - 78:18 route [24] - 13:20, 17:14, 17:21, 21:9, 22:11, 22:19, 48:5, 48:10, 48:22, 49:4, 52:23, 52:24, 56:21,

56:22, 57:18, 58:18,

67:19, 67:20, 70:9,

71:19, 73:9, 79:2,

52:14, 66:20, 67:2

routes [4] - 48:25,

routing [4] - 64:25,

66:7, 69:2, 69:19

rule [3] - 15:5, 64:24,

Rule [3] - 34:8, 34:24,

rules [7] - 15:25, 18:2,

60:4, 63:1, 63:24,

65:22, 70:23

ruling [2] - 10:21,

run [3] - 3:19, 14:14,

rubber [1] - 69:7

rug [1] - 74:13

80:14

41.12

10:23

78:6

80:1

38:24, 39:2, 39:8, 41:1, 41:3, 41:5, 41:8, 41:13, 42:2, 42:5, 42:11, 42:15, 49:12, 50:6, 52:1, 52:4, 52:20, 54:17, 76:22, 77:8, 78:10, 78:12, 78:19, 78:20, 78:21 Safety [1] - 39:6 salvage [1] - 21:20 sausage [1] - 32:18 saw [2] - 19:20, 20:24 scenario [1] - 72:2 Schock [1] - 7:2 **SCS**[3] - 5:23, 8:1, 9:11 second [6] - 15:4, 24:16, 35:1, 44:17, 57:2, 67:19 Secretary [1] - 42:16 Section [2] - 16:14, 79:6 section [27] - 11:17, 13:13, 16:6, 25:12, 25:13, 25:15, 25:16, 25:18, 25:19, 30:25, 31:23, 31:25, 32:7, 36:11, 39:16, 43:8, 43:18, 44:21, 44:24, 57:9, 57:11, 57:14, 61:21, 62:21, 63:2, 81:1, 81:2 sections [2] - 31:24, 68:4 secure [1] - 73:12 security [1] - 78:20 see [18] - 3:21, 9:12, 23:21, 32:21, 41:1, 41:20, 45:1, 45:14, 48:2, 48:7, 49:17, 56:18, 57:13, 61:7, 61:10, 62:13, 63:19, 78:21 seeing [2] - 71:9, 75:13 seek [2] - 10:4, 10:23 seem [1] - 61:14 sees [1] - 78:9

run-of-the-mill [1] -

running [2] - 3:11, 5:1

S

safe [2] - 41:5, 42:7

16:9, 16:20, 16:25,

21:25, 23:15, 23:17,

23:19, 23:24, 34:10,

34:14, 34:17, 38:22,

safely [1] - 42:9

safety [40] - 16:7,

78:6

select [1] - 49:4 selected [1] - 48:25 sense [9] - 13:13, 13:15, 13:22, 27:2, 27:3, 27:18, 28:1, 52:6, 61:14 sent [3] - 19:24, 22:25, 39:5 sentence [9] - 24:16, 24:19, 24:21, 25:3, 56:19, 57:2, 58:4, 61:7, 62:20 **sentences** [1] - 26:5 separate [2] - 12:21, 74:22 September [2] - 47:21, 54:5 sequestered [1] - 9:20 sequestration [2] -9:15, 53:8 series [2] - 16:23, 77:22 serious [1] - 32:19 seriously [1] - 71:14 serve [4] - 5:15, 16:20, 17:2, 17:20 **Service** [6] - 5:8, 5:14, 6:3, 9:24, 17:24, 65:14 session [1] - 31:25 set [6] - 5:7, 7:23, 13:10, 22:6, 70:23, 71:17 setback [10] - 15:9, 15:15, 22:9, 22:15, 23:12, 29:25, 30:6, 30:10, 42:24, 77:2 setbacks [21] - 15:17, 15:20, 16:18, 16:24, 17:2, 20:13, 22:9, 22:11, 22:15, 22:18, 23:6, 39:1, 39:10, 42:1, 42:4, 42:9, 42:15, 54:1, 62:25, 71:1, 72:22 setting [1] - 6:5 several [4] - 16:6, 24:4, 41:1, 44:22 **shall** [5] - 26:6, 36:24, 37:12, 38:1, 58:6 share [4] - 34:15, 41:17, 56:17, 58:20 sharing [2] - 34:9, 38:21 Shaw [2] - 50:25, 51:15 **Sheri** [1] - 3:4 **ship** [1] - 20:25 **shippers** [1] - 68:21 **short** [2] - 9:12, 32:17 **show** [7] - 17:4, 28:7, 28:8, 37:22, 47:1, 47:4, 68:10

showing [3] - 25:25, 48:9 **showings** [1] - 12:5 **shown** [2] - 28:19, 69:11 shows [8] - 24:23, 35:9, 38:4, 47:17, 48:13, 52:13, 70:15, 80:4 shut [1] - 16:15 **shut-off** [1] - 16:15 side [4] - 14:2, 43:24, 48:3. 80:2 sides [4] - 4:14, 27:11, 33:1, 33:12 signed [1] - 11:9 significant [3] - 9:15, 28:13, 30:10 significantly [1] -21:14 signs [1] - 3:14 silenced [1] - 5:21 Silver [1] - 48:14 similar [4] - 23:6, 66:3, 70:2, 76:18 **similarly** [3] - 13:3, 21:6, 70:22 **simple** [3] - 64:13, 64:14, 72:12 simply [15] - 12:8, 20:23, 21:22, 22:1, 22:11, 23:22, 28:1, 28:14, 29:9, 30:11, 46:7, 68:5, 74:22, 78:21, 79:3 single [3] - 13:17, 18:2, 71:8 site [32] - 13:17, 35:24. 36:18. 37:9. 38:9. 40:3. 40:10. 40:11, 40:13, 40:14, 46:7, 46:16, 48:22, 49:13, 50:8, 56:20, 56:22, 57:15, 57:19, 58:1, 58:5, 58:7, 58:8, 60:23, 61:8, 65:21, 67:6, 70:18, 71:4, 73:1 sited [1] - 54:12 sites [2] - 48:25, 66:21 siting [9] - 17:25, 18:6, 20:6, 54:20, 54:21, 54:23, 66:5, 67:9, 69:2 siting's [1] - 71:5 sitting [1] - 7:19 **situation** [3] - 20:21, 38:11. 79:21 **skip** [3] - 57:24, 58:4, 61:16 slippery [1] - 69:17 **slope** [1] - 69:17 **slurry** [3] - 20:20,

21:2, 21:4 **small** [1] - 48:10 smaller [1] - 16:24 smallest [1] - 68:25 snippets [1] - 14:2 **so..** [1] - 9:4 socioeconomic [1] -68:21 **sole** [2] - 56:22, 76:22 solely [1] - 65:13 solution [2] - 10:14, 78.8 someone [2] - 51:17, 65:7 sometimes [2] -13:11, 75:17 **somewhere** [1] - 43:6 sort [6] - 18:8, 21:25, 71:15, 74:24, 78:24, 81:4 sorts [1] - 71:10 sound [1] - 75:20 sources [1] - 50:2 spacing [2] - 16:15, 39:18 special [6] - 51:3, 51:8, 51:9, 51:11, 51:16, 51:22 Special [1] - 6:24 specialized [1] - 81:5 specific [14] - 4:5, 10:1, 16:16, 20:1, 38:15, 49:21, 57:22, 58:18, 58:22, 59:1, 78:20, 80:15, 80:16, 80.18 specifically [15] -11:18, 19:3, 19:9, 20:12, 20:14, 20:22, 23:1, 24:1, 26:4, 28:16, 39:6, 42:21, 55:9, 55:13, 65:10 spectrum [3] - 42:17, 75:1, 75:2 **speculate** [1] - 33:4 **spend** [1] - 19:4 **spending** [1] - 19:5 spent [1] - 66:25 **split** [1] - 30:9 **splits** [1] - 30:5 spur [1] - 75:14 stable [1] - 77:24 **stamp** [1] - 69:7 stand [1] - 29:16 standard [4] - 15:10, 15:15, 51:19, 78:20 standards [5] - 10:6, 10:10, 14:15, 42:3, 42:5 start [6] - 9:7, 12:23, 19:2, 44:19, 71:1, 77:25

started [3] - 3:7, 8:24, 33:1 starting [1] - 44:22 starts [1] - 25:11 State [5] - 5:10, 9:15, 10:7, 17:7, 66:18 state [38] - 6:7, 6:10, 6:22, 7:13, 8:8, 9:13, 9:16, 10:11, 14:17, 15:10, 15:15, 17:5, 17:8, 17:13, 17:19, 17:22, 18:17, 23:16, 28:21, 42:2, 48:21, 50:13, 53:6, 53:7, 53:17, 53:21, 54:8, 54:13. 55:1. 55:10. 64:17, 64:24, 65:9, 69:18, 71:9, 76:3, 81.7 state-based [1] -69.18 state-permitting [1] -65:9 statement [4] - 42:2, 48:18, 49:4, 53:12 states [7] - 9:21, 16:6, 23:10, 26:12, 54:25, 76:9, 76:23 statewide [2] - 9:25, 18:5 status [1] - 13:11 statute [45] - 10:24, 12:20. 13:2. 19:6. 24:5. 24:10. 27:14. 31:3, 31:7, 31:20, 32:22, 33:6, 35:20, 35:23, 49:8, 49:9, 49:11, 51:24, 53:11, 53:19, 56:15, 56:19, 56:24, 56:25, 57:2, 57:3, 57:6, 57:22, 57:24, 58:10, 58:14, 59:4, 59:7, 59:8, 61:11, 63:3, 63:13, 63:18, 63:19, 68:5, 75:5, 75:23, 76:1, 80.17 statutes [4] - 48:20, 50:13, 56:12, 60:19 **statutory** [10] - 11:2, 19:5, 24:3, 24:9, 27:6, 50:16, 50:22, 74:17, 75:3, 80:14 steer [1] - 15:1 step [11] - 47:8, 51:22, 59:5, 59:6, 59:7, 59:13, 59:20, 60:19, 60:22, 60:24, 63:4 steps [1] - 12:15

Steve [1] - 7:10

**still** [9] - 22:2, 35:14,

39:25, 49:3, 64:21,

76:7, 76:22, 76:23

19:13, 19:21, 22:1, **stopping** [1] - 29:8 storage [2] - 9:17, 53:13 **Story** [1] - 41:20 **straight** [1] - 61:2 Strategy [1] - 49:25 strictly [1] - 79:23 stringent [1] - 78:5 **structure** [3] - 13:15, 15:14, 75:5 **structured** [1] - 76:10 structures [2] - 15:9, 30:1 **study** [1] - 58:2 stuff [2] - 3:14, 60:25 sub [1] - 60:21 subdivision [18] -20:9, 24:16, 24:18, 24:23. 25:7. 25:9. 53:18 25:11. 25:14. 25:17. 25:20. 26:4. 26:6. 26:16, 26:19, 26:21, 37:13, 38:2, 38:4 subject [4] - 12:5, 17:9, 35:10, 63:23 **subjects** [1] - 16:16 **submit** [1] - 75:7 submitted [7] - 28:3, 61:9 28:25, 37:16, 38:13, 47:12, 47:21, 48:1 subpart [11] - 55:18, 58:5, 58:16, 59:16, 61:13, 61:17, 61:20, 62:6, 62:18, 63:10 subsection [15] -11:17, 13:14, 24:12, 26:8, 32:13, 36:2, 36:10, 37:11, 39:16, 39:23, 44:21, 46:12, 46:20. 55:18 subsequently [1] -62:3 subset [1] - 81:5 19:8 substantive [3] -11:14, 12:8, 13:10 16:21 **subsurface** [1] - 21:20 sudden [1] - 72:6 suddenly [1] - 70:1 64:23 **sufficient** [1] - 29:13 suggest [4] - 11:12, 53:17, 78:14, 78:15 **suggested** [1] - 61:15 **suggestion** [1] - 79:1 **suggests** [1] - 14:6 suitable [1] - 66:21 **summarize** [1] - 7:25 30:8 Summit [61] - 3:2, 8:15, 9:11, 10:5, 10:12, 10:14, 10:23, 10:24, 11:12, 14:6, 14:12, 14:19, 14:21, 25:1 15:4, 15:10, 16:22, synonymously [1] -17:14, 17:16, 18:12,

22:7, 22:14, 23:10, 24:11, 25:8, 27:8, 28:3, 28:22, 28:25, 29:11, 30:16, 33:11, 34:4, 35:16, 38:25, 41:10, 41:15, 41:20, 46:6, 46:23, 46:25, 48:4, 49:16, 49:18, 50:12, 50:20, 51:4, 52:6, 53:19, 54:5, 54:16, 55:7, 61:15, 63:16, 63:17, 64:22, 65:6, 76:16, 77:17 **Summit's** [9] - 13:9, 14:22, 15:24, 22:4, 29:15, 62:18, 64:19, 81:7, 81:8 supercedes [1] superfluous [4] -25:9, 26:18, 74:21, supersede [14] - 4:8, 4:9, 24:17, 24:22, 27:24. 27:25. 28:16. 28:17. 29:14. 32:3. 32:6. 38:3. 60:24. superseded [23] -5:25, 12:14, 12:16, 12:17, 25:18, 25:22, 26:14, 26:15, 26:17, 26:24, 27:2, 27:4, 27:5, 27:22, 28:23, 30:19, 37:8, 37:14, 37:19, 37:20, 40:2, 62:15, 63:11 supersedes [3] -36:13, 61:23, 65:25 superseding [3] -34:4, 35:18, 40:5 supersession [1] supplemental [1] support [5] - 17:21. 18:7, 64:19, 64:20, supported [1] - 60:19 **supportive** [1] - 76:17 **supports** [3] - 26:3, 27:10, 81:7 **supposed** [1] - 50:6 Supreme [1] - 50:24 surface [2] - 21:21, sweep [3] - 19:14, 23:23, 74:13 **sympathize** [1] - 67:5 synonymous [1] -

31:5 system [2] - 69:18, 77:19 systems [3] - 9:18, 9:19, 65:11

#### Т

tab [7] - 56:15, 56:24, 57:10, 57:21, 58:9, 61:11, 62:22 tactic [1] - 49:23 talks [8] - 16:7, 35:20, 39:17, 50:12, 56:20, 57:1, 58:17, 77:7 targeted [1] - 22:1 TC [1] - 76:19 **Technical** [1] - 57:3 template [1] - 49:24 ten [11] - 12:11, 26:13, 26:17, 27:23, 30:18, 30:21, 37:4, 43:1, 43:3, 70:7, 80:21 tend [1] - 19:13 term [4] - 12:11, 16:13, 61:19, 74:25 terms [3] - 47:20, 58:22, 68:15 test [1] - 70:16 testify [1] - 22:13 testimony [3] - 59:22, 67:24, 67:25 theory [1] - 32:5 therefore [2] - 31:16, 54:23 they've [4] - 23:3, 50:2, 51:7, 51:11 thinking [1] - 70:13 thinks [1] - 55:4 third [3] - 54:17, 57:9, 59:23 three [3] - 11:13, 12:7, 13:10 threshold [2] - 46:21, 68:7 throughout [3] - 7:13, 34:24, 52:11 Tim [1] - 3:5 timeline [1] - 37:7 timely [1] - 46:2 timing [1] - 72:21 today [14] - 3:8, 4:5, 5:9, 5:22, 6:10, 6:19, 47:15, 56:16, 64:15, 64:18, 64:23, 65:4, 81:22, 82:6 today's [2] - 6:5, 7:24 together [6] - 13:14, 27:17, 27:18, 31:4, 41:2, 48:20 top[1] - 20:15

topic [1] - 4:5

tourist [1] - 21:19 township [11] - 35:6, 43:10, 43:16, 43:17, 43:19, 43:20, 43:21, 43:23, 60:6, 70:5, 72:4 Township [1] - 69:25 townships [12] - 35:7, 35:9, 35:12, 36:25, 42:22, 43:9, 43:13, 52:13, 52:14, 52:18, 53:1, 70:23 track [1] - 68:24 tradition [1] - 3:16 traditional [3] - 23:15, 52:6, 77:5 traditionally [2] -23:11, 77:1 trailer [1] - 21:20 train [1] - 34:11 training [1] - 34:22 transmission [33] -4:7, 9:18, 11:22, 12:2, 12:9, 12:24, 13:1, 14:24, 15:17, 17:25, 18:10, 20:18, 20:19, 21:16, 22:3, 36:3, 36:12, 36:24, 43:3, 45:3, 45:9, 48:23, 53:15, 54:20, 58:12, 61:22, 63:10, 65:10. 66:7. 67:13. 69:20, 69:22, 79:19 Transport [3] - 5:23, 8:1, 9:11 Transportation's [1] -42:17 treat [2] - 13:22, 18:16 treated [1] - 11:14 true [1] - 80:12 **trump** [1] - 55:5 **try** [7] - 32:21, 64:13, 71:18, 74:6, 74:8, 74:13 Trygg [3] - 69:25, 72:3 trying [7] - 29:9, 46:10, 48:13, 60:9, 67:1, 71:8, 76:15 turn [4] - 3:18, 5:3, 9:6, 30:17 turned [3] - 5:21, 30:21, 67:3 two [34] - 10:3, 14:21, 15:13, 15:21, 26:5, 32:17, 32:25, 34:2, 35:21, 36:5, 40:22, 42:6, 42:14, 43:6, 43:12, 43:18, 43:23, 47:15, 53:3, 58:14, 59:1, 59:5, 59:6, 59:7, 59:13, 59:20, 60:19, 60:21, 60:24, 63:4, 63:20, 66:10,

68:4, 80:2 **two-step** [7] - 59:5, 59:6, 59:7, 59:13, 59:20, 60:19, 63:4 **twofold** [1] - 72:18 **types** [1] - 72:25

#### U

ultimate [1] - 75:16

ultimately [4] - 33:15,

66:13, 66:15, 67:10

under [29] - 3:24, 4:16,

21:24, 26:7, 26:15, 34:7, 34:23, 35:23, 36:1, 36:2, 36:10, 36:22, 39:16, 41:12, 50:14, 51:14, 53:3, 56:24, 57:9, 57:13, 57:21, 59:7, 59:16, 62:21, 63:7, 63:10, 74:13, 78:6, 82:2 undermine [1] - 17:19 understood [1] -30:15 underway [1] - 15:25 unduly [6] - 66:2, 66:9, 68:11, 70:14, 70:15 unenforceable [1] -42:15 UNIDENTIFIED [1] unified [1] - 18:17 uniform [1] - 18:17 **Union** [3] - 8:4, 64:9, 64:12 unique [5] - 10:1, 19:17, 29:11, 74:11, 74.24 unless [3] - 40:15, 55:22, 61:14 unnatural [1] - 81:3 unquote [1] - 46:14 unreasonable [3] -15:18, 16:1, 76:8 unreasonableness [1] - 15.6 unreasonably [11] -14:16, 15:11, 24:25, 28:7, 28:25, 30:24, 32:9, 37:24, 38:6, 77:20, 81:11 unusual [2] - 16:18, 76.9 **up** [25] - 8:19, 19:14, 22:6, 23:23, 30:9, 32:25, 34:3, 39:11, 43:15, 44:4, 44:15, 54:7, 54:13, 55:9, 55:10, 60:18, 71:5, 74:7, 75:22, 76:12,

77:9, 78:24, 79:25 upfront [1] - 10:16 upstairs [1] - 9:2 uses [5] - 20:6, 21:13, 21:16, 21:18, 21:23 Utilities [1] - 7:1 utilities [1] - 76:7

#### V

value [2] - 4:1, 4:2

valves [3] - 16:15,

variance [2] - 51:13,

39:17, 39:18

78:3

variances [3] - 77:18, 77:20, 77:22 various [3] - 10:9, 23:3. 33:13 verbatim [1] - 76:18 verbose [1] - 24:5 version [1] - 47:25 versus [1] - 4:1 vested [1] - 65:13 veto [3] - 17:20, 66:12, 69:19 VI [5] - 9:17, 20:9, 21:15, 21:19 vicinity [3] - 23:14, 77:3, 77:6 Victor [1] - 7:2 view [2] - 9:25, 65:7 viewed [1] - 13:20 visual [1] - 56:13 vital [1] - 65:11 voluntary [1] - 17:15 vote [1] - 11:8 W W201 [1] - 69:16 Wachter [1] - 7:6 wait [1] - 60:12 waive [1] - 73:14 waiver [5] - 22:9, 72:9, 73:4, 73:19, 78:3 waivers [6] - 22:7, 22:16, 29:7, 77:18, 77:19, 77:22 walk [1] - 24:8 wants [2] - 28:23, 57:1 Warford [9] - 7:6, 47:16, 47:17, 48:2, 49:10, 49:15, 49:16, 49.22 warnings [1] - 58:21 wasted [1] - 10:21 water [2] - 20:19, 30:8 waving [1] - 3:14 weaponized [1] -71:10

weighed [1] - 67:18 welfare [2] - 47:2, 47.14 white [2] - 52:13, 69:24 whole [5] - 13:13, 13:20, 31:23, 32:2, wide [1] - 11:20 willing [1] - 69:4 wind [2] - 66:6, 66:22 wish [1] - 8:16 witnesses [1] - 11:5 word [1] - 24:12 words [11] - 11:3, 13:24, 25:12, 27:16, 31:5, 51:20, 57:3, 57:17, 58:22, 68:7, 72:21 wordy [1] - 24:5 workers [1] - 65:7 works [4] - 27:7, 59:21, 73:18, 74:24 worms [1] - 71:16 worst [1] - 14:11 wrap [1] - 8:19 wrapped [1] - 15:2 writing [1] - 78:2 written [2] - 63:15, 76:18

#### Υ

year [1] - 10:4 years [2] - 58:14, 66:25 yelling [1] - 3:14 yourself [1] - 72:14

# Ζ

Zachary [1] - 6:25 zones [2] - 16:7, 16:8 zoning [46] - 4:8, 11:21, 11:24, 14:24, 23:5, 25:6, 25:24, 26:9, 31:14, 31:15, 35:3, 35:5, 35:7, 35:10, 35:11, 35:13, 35:15, 35:19, 36:14, 36:25, 37:6, 37:8, 38:12, 38:14, 38:16, 38:17, 39:1, 39:10, 39:12, 39:16, 39:20, 40:1, 40:6, 40:10, 40:12, 43:19, 52:2, 52:5, 52:8, 60:6, 60:14, 60:15, 60:16, 61:24, 65:25, 67:14