



### Master's thesis 2024 30 ECTS

Faculty of Environmental Sciences and Natural Resource Management (MINA)

# Local Participation in Practice: Case Studies of Municipal Decision-Making on Wind Power in Båtsfjord and Aremark

Henny Fossnes Kurland Renewable Energy

# Acknowledgement

I would like to thank my supervisor Marianne Zeyringer and Paola Velasco Herrejón for supporting me and guiding my thesis. I also want to express my gratitude towards the SAMVIND research group led by Paola Velasco Herrejón for including me in their project and giving me the opportunity to join their trips to both Båtsfjord and Aremark.

I will direct a thank you to everyone who has participated in the interviews. I am very grateful, and this thesis would not be possible without the participation.

I am also extremely grateful for my family and Kristian Strøm for all the support and encouragement throughout this process.

Henny Fossnes Kurland Ås, 15.12.2024

### Abstract

Wind power production in Norway has increased the last years. Simultaneously, the opposition to wind power has increased in several municipalities along with the development. This study aims to address how the local communities perceive their opportunities to participate in decision-making processes about wind energy in Norway, which concerns are connected to wind power in their municipality, and map who the participants are. This is done as case studies in the municipalities Aremark and Båtsfjord, using a qualitative approach with semi-structured interviews to identify the perspectives. As opposed to other research found within this field, the focus in this research are the people in the municipalities without a particular position.

The findings indicate concerns related to noise, destruction of nature and the municipalities' benefits from hosting wind power. The perspectives on the opportunities to participate in the licensing process are split in the two municipalities, where the opportunities are perceived as better by the respondents from Båtsfjord than the respondents from Aremark. The actors are identified as the municipality board, NVE, the landowners and wind power developers. Whether or not the local community can be considered an actor is unclear. This thesis highlights the need for further discussion regarding the wind power licensing process in Norway to ensure better collaboration between the actors involved.

# Sammendrag

Vindkraftproduksjonen i Norge har økt de siste årene. Samtidig har motstanden mot vindkraft økt i takt med utbyggingen. Studien tar sikte på å undersøke hvordan lokalsamfunnene oppfatter mulighetene til å delta i beslutningsprosesser om vindkraft i Norge, hvilke bekymringer som er knyttet til vindkraft i deres kommune, og kartlegge hvem deltakerne er. Dette gjøres som casestudier i kommunene Aremark og Båtsfjord, ved hjelp av en kvalitativ tilnærming med semistrukturerte intervjuer for å identifisere perspektivene. I motsetning til annen tidligere forskning, er fokuset i denne forskningen de menneskene uten en bestemt posisjon i kommunene.

Funnene indikerer bekymringer knyttet til støy, natur og kommunenes fordeler av å være vertskap for vindkraft. Perspektivene på mulighetene til å delta i konsesjonsprosessen er forskjellig i de to kommunene, der mulighetene oppleves som bedre av respondentene fra Båtsfjord enn respondentene fra Aremark. Kommunestyret, NVE, grunneierne og vindkraftutbyggerne er kartlagt som de involverte partene. Hvorvidt lokalsamfunnet kan regnes som en involvert part, er uklart. Denne masteroppgaven understreker behovet for videre diskusjon rundt konsesjonsprosessen for vindkraft i Norge for å sikre bedre samarbeid mellom de involverte aktørene.

# Contents

1	Introduction 1			
1.1 Literature review and research questions				
1.2 Power theory				
2	Methodology7			
	2.1 Semi structured interviews    7      2.2. Case studies    7      2.3. Data collection    9      9    9			
	2.4. Data analysis    11      2.5. Reliability and validity    12			
3	Results14			
4	Discussion 21			
5	Conclusion 27			
6	References			
Appendix A – Consent formI				
Appendix B – Local communityIV				
Appendix C – Governmental and organisational				

# List of tables

Table 1: Interview respondents	. 11
Table 2: Codes and quotes from interviews	. 16

### 1 Introduction

With the increasing demand for energy in the world, simultaneously with the pressure to reduce greenhouse gases, the need for green energy solutions is crucial. Renewable energy is seen as a promising field where the emissions can be reduced without compromising energy demand. When deciding which technologies to focus on, a series of factors will be evaluated. Whether it is economically or technically feasible and what kinds of resources are available. Wind power is not a new technology, but the recent development of better and more efficient turbines has reduced the production costs and made wind power more attractive for investments (Weir & Østenby, 2019).

Norway's main electricity source has for decades been hydro power with a large share being reservoir hydro. This is a beneficial energy supplier as it provides storable, cheap and clean electricity, but as the need for energy demand increases, especially considering plans for electrification of industry, the production has to increase. With the hydropower potential reaching its limits due to technical, environmental and economic potential, other solutions are needed. Luckily Norway is a country with great potential for other renewable technologies as well. Norway is a country with suitable conditions for wind power and in addition the profitability has increased. This has made wind power the natural choice. In 2017 wind power was accounting for 1,4% of the national production mix, whereas by 2022 it accounted for 10% (Eikeland et al., 2023). Along with the increased capacity, the opposition has increased too. In order to locate the area most suitable for wind power in Norway, The Norwegian Water Resources and Energy Directorate (NVE) published in 2019 a framework plan for wind power (NVE, 2022). This was assigned by the Oil- and Energy Department in Norway and the purpose was to update the knowledge and map suitable locations. Even though this was meant to mitigate conflict, the opposite happened. The National Framework Plan for wind power was met by massive opposition from municipalities across Norway and the case ended with the government scrapping the plan (Solberg et al., 2019). At this point wind power on land had become such a controversial topic and the same year the government decided to pause all wind power license processes (Aasland, 2022). Three years later in 2022, the government turned around and reopened the licensing process. This time with new requirements: Now the municipalities should be included from the beginning and wind power could only be built in a municipality where the municipality board had agreed to host wind power (Aasland, 2022).

This measure seemed to be to make the local communities feel more included rather than overruled. NVE is still the organ that makes the final decision, but the municipality would now have a say.

Wind power is still controversial given more knowledge and awareness about the impact from the wind power plants. There seem to be more concerns regarding living near turbines and how the municipalities would actually benefit from having to host wind power. On this note, it is interesting to analyse if inclusion of municipalities has been improved after the new requirements were added in the licensing process. What do the inhabitants feel about the decision-making process, alternatively, what changes would they like to see? In addition, it is interesting to study what types of concerns are present in municipalities where wind power plans are in progress.

After deciding that this research would be done on a municipality level, locations had to be established. To get a better perspective of the wind power situation in Norway and see what kind of research has been done on the topic of local community inclusion around wind power planning, a literature review was necessary.

### 1.1 Literature review and research questions

In this part, I will discuss previous research I have found related to wind power and social acceptance in local communities. Searches were done by using Scopus and Web of Science with the following keywords: *license process, wind power, local community* and *social acceptance*. With these criteria, the search was narrowed down, then I screened the titles for relevant papers, and if relevant, I read the abstracts. If the topics were found to be interesting, I read the rest of the paper to look for further relevant information. In some cases, these research papers had used other, interesting references, which then again provided me with additional relevant papers for the literature review.

The research papers I read and found to be relevant were on topics such as social acceptance in relation to wind power, concerns and community benefits. There was also discussion about the decision-making process and justice regarding compensation and fairness in the process.

Unpredictable and long licensing processes are a theme that is often brought up to discussion. Saglie et al. (2020) found in their research that the informants were satisfied with NVE in the process, but after the license has been granted, the developers are still allowed to change the environment, transportation and construction plans. This means that the exact location of the turbines and the height could be changed as well. Because of this, citizens were not happy with the outcome and felt like they had agreed on wrong or unclear terms. The same problem is found by Kühn, N., & Vasstrøm, M. (2024) where it was also added that these changes could lead to community mistrust and jeopardising political legitimacy. However, the situation has now changed. From 1st of July 2023, changes in the plan- and building law and the energy law came into force. It is stated in the Plan- and building law § 12-1 third paragraph, fifth sentence *"The regulation shall establish the overarching spatial conditions relevant to the decision on land use for the wind power facility."* (pbl, 2008) meaning that the municipality can set requirements regarding visibility and turbine height etc.

Insufficient compensation or tax arrangements are subjects of much previous research. Kühn, N., & Vasstrøm, M. (2024) found in their research that their informants state that the financial compensation has not been sufficient in compensating for loss of nature. They call for a more transparent and predictable long-term solution. Eikeland et al. (2023) also found that insufficient compensation was a negative aspect. This economic issue seems to be repeating in Norway regarding wind power and appears to be an important aspect. As this is such a topic of interest, looking to similar countries and seeing how they do it could be interesting. To compare it with Sweden for instance, a report from Lindvall et al. (2023) could tell that developers in Sweden are not obligated to pay any corporate or property tax to the municipality and neither compensation. The tax they pay goes directly to the state budget (Darpö, 2020). In Denmark however, there is no tax, but the host municipality is obligated to establish a green fund. The wind power operators are then required to pay a certain fee to the fund where the amount is depending on the installed effect of the power plants (Darpö, 2020). This shows that the Nordic countries have different practices on how the wind power companies pay for using the natural resources, but they all have in common that some sort of payment is applied.

Nature is important for Norwegians and is therefore naturally brought up as a big concern in different research. Several of the municipalities in Norway that are suitable for wind power are rural. Reduction of protected nature, giving a degraded landscape appearance, and loss of biodiversity is found to be a concern (Eikeland et al., 2023). These concerns were found in other studies as well, especially in municipalities where the project was seen as so immense that the identity of the place would be changed (Kühn & Vasstrom, 2024). Furthermore, there are also worries that the loss of untouched nature will give tourism a downfall and get in the way for

outdoor recreation which is seen as an important value (Kühn & Vasstrom, 2024). In addition, there are concerns about property values being degraded and loss of job creation within tourism (Eikeland et al., 2023).

Another research provided by Dugstad et al. (2020) shows that there is inconclusiveness in research on acceptance regarding human exposure to wind power development. They found that exposure led to lower acceptance, which is inconclusive with the recent literature they used, and therefore suggested that other factors may also play a role. Another study I found, looked into the acceptance of wind power in Norway and showed that the public opinions varied from strong support to strong opposition, but people were more sceptical if wind power were to be built in residential areas (Kaltenborn et al., 2023). This study also showed that the people who were against, in general saw wind power as more disruptive in the landscape compared to the supporters, who saw it as essential to meet the future energy demand. Regarding exposure to wind power, it will be interesting to see the answers in my thesis as previous research and literature seem to be inconsistent whether or not exposure leads to negative or positive perspectives.

A trend in almost all the research papers I looked into was discontent with the licensing process, both that it took too long and also that the communication was varying. Even though some were satisfied with some of the steps in the process, the opportunity to change the environment, transportation and construction plans have been seen as problematic due to the lack of predictability. A study from Kühn et al.(2024), suggests that wind power processes should rather use a bottom-up approach where collaboration with the municipalities are in focus and identify how the municipality can benefit from the wind power plant.

The methodology used in the research papers I have read are mainly qualitative studies such as Saglie et al. (2020) who used official documents, media reports, etc. and semi-structured interviews to research fairness in wind power development. But some quantitative studies have been done as well, e.g. Kaltenborn et al.(2023), who used surveys to measure attitudes toward wind power in Norway, and Dugstad et al. (2020), who also used surveys through Norstat (a Norwegian data collector for market research in Europe (Norstat, n.d.)) to measure social acceptance related to wind power development and to see how exposure to wind power affects their acceptance. For this research, semi-structured interviews are chosen due to its open way of including all aspects and opening for new perspectives.

The majority of the research papers that have been analysed have been conducted in Norway, on a municipality level, but two research papers regarding the same issue in Sweden and Denmark have been analysed for comparison. Previous research shows that there are quite a few concerns linked to wind power development. Going through the research, many of the same issues were mentioned independent from location of the either planned or already operating wind power plants. The issues were mostly regarding economic compensation, nature and the licensing process. Regarding the licensing process, many of the papers found in the literature search were not relevant for today's practice. The problem is that these papers were published before 2022, meaning before the new implementations in the decision-making process were put into practice as explained in the introduction. Out of all the papers I looked through, only a few discussed the licensing process after these changes. However, a study from Bonvik-Stone & Lykke (2024) looks more into what could affect the outcome of the municipalities decision and what instances the elected officials in the municipalities trust. Kühn et al.(2024) have also done research on the decision-making process but have focused on municipal political and administrative leaders in Norway. There is therefore a gap in previous literature considering how the people without a particular position in the municipalities perceive the decision-making process after the changes implemented in 2022.

The selected municipalities for my thesis are Aremark and Båtsfjord. These municipalities both have ongoing wind power plans and are geographically different, however, Båtsfjord already has a wind power plant within the municipality. The choice and locations will be further elaborated in the methodology chapter.

Given that decision-making processes have been identified as a recurring issue in different cases, it will be valuable to explore whether this challenge is also present in Aremark and Båtsfjord. This leads to my main research question and two sub research questions:

RQ: How do people living in Aremark and Båtsfjord perceive their opportunities to participate in decision-making processes about wind energy in Norway?

- What are their concerns connected to wind power in their municipality?
- Who participates in decision-making and why? Who does not participate?

### 1.2 Power theory

When discussing the decision-making process and participation, it is important to look into who gets to decide and where the decisions are made. Gaventa (2009) discusses this with a power analysis approach. Power analysis is a framework for better understanding power dynamics and how they are related to one another. To give a visual picture, the theory can be explained as a Rubik's cube. The cube has spaces, places and forms of power on the different sides. Like the cube, these are not fixed but can be rotated. Each side is linked together but is dynamic in the role they affect each other, therefore the link to the Rubik's cube (Gaventa, 2009).

In power theory, the spaces are defined as places for participation. These spaces can be closed, invited or claimed/created. Closed spaces meaning decision-making situations that are closed for public participation. In this case it can be the government or experts that make the decision and then present it for the people. In the invited spaces on the other hand, the public are invited to participate (Gaventa, 2009). Regarding wind power it can be the hearings where the local community are invited to express their concerns and opinions. When people are not invited to participate it can lead to them creating a space. This is referred to as created or claimed spaces and are done by the part considered the "less" powerful actor. This can be social movements or resistance and are a result of poor or no inclusion. It is important to remember that these spaces are dynamic and can change. Closed spaces can for example be opened to restore legitimacy (Gaventa, 2009).

In terms of power there are also different types. One that is quite obvious is the visible power, meaning the visible and definable aspects of political power such as political power and structures. A less obvious type is the hidden power. These can be powerful people or institutions who wish to exclude interference or dismiss concerns that work against their will. Another form of hidden power is to set the agenda or decide which people are included in decision-making processes (Gaventa, 2009). There are also other forms of power, but these are the most relevant for this thesis.

Regarding wind power this theory can be used to map the different interests and power dynamics between actors. This means the government, land owners, local community and wind power companies in this case. Who has the power in the decision making process and who sets the agenda? This approach can contribute to revealing hidden power dynamics. In this thesis I will take a further look into how the power is distributed between the municipalities and the government. It will also address the spaces for participation.

### 2 Methodology

The research was conducted together with the SAMVIND project led by Paola Velasco Herrejón at the University of Oslo (UiO). We collected data in two locations chosen as case studies. This chapter will further explain the cases, the methods used for collecting and analyzing data for this thesis.

#### 2.1 Semi structured interviews

A qualitative approach was chosen to enable an in-depth exploration of a complex issue that may not be easily quantified. To give opportunity to the local communities to be heard and give them a chance to speak freely, a semi structured interview was chosen to be the most suitable qualitative method to conduct the data. Semi-structured interview is a type of interview where the themes and some questions are prepared in advance, but that is mostly for guiding. The goal is to have a conversation with the respondent partly guided by the researcher, hence the name semi-structured (Andersen, 2020). Normally you write an interview guide based on the research question and the topics you would like to cover. For this thesis I wrote an interview guide in collaboration with the SAMVIND project. There were two guides, one for governmental institutions and organisations (appendix C), and one for the local community (appendix B). The guides were used as guidelines when conducting the interviews and made room for adjustments when doing the interviews. The same guides were used in the two cases, only adjusting for the municipality and their perquisites. Since the data collection was done in collaboration with SAMVIND the guides were based on SAMVINDs research question, but questions and themes for this thesis's research questions were also included.

#### 2.2. Case studies

A case study is the study of one unit, which in the context of this thesis is a municipality. Since choosing two municipalities I went for a comparative case study, meaning two cases are studied separately with the same methodology, and then compared (Wæhle et al., 2020). Aremark and Båtsfjord were chosen in collaboration with SAMVIND. The choice was based on both areas having ongoing wind power plans. The areas are also located in two very different parts of Norway with different nature and possibly different culture. It is therefore believed that they

may have different concerns or relations to wind power. Both municipalities are relatively small regarding population.

#### Case 1 Aremark

Aremark is a municipality in Østfold, located southeast in Norway close to the Swedish border. Aremark is a quite small municipality with 1 347 habitants in 2024 according to The Great Norwegian Encyclopedia (SNL) (Thorsnæs, 2024). Agriculture and forestry are the main industries with almost 80% of the municipality's area being covered by forest (Thorsnæs, 2024).

Back in 2013 a proposal for a wind power plant was turned down (Bølling, 2013). This was supposed to be Kjølen Vindpark and NVE's decision was based on the negative impact outweighing the positive with especially weight on biodiversity and degradation of untouched nature (Bølling, 2013). The process caused conflict in the municipality and it raised questions about incompetence within the municipality board because of bias (Andersen & Skolt, 2012). Now, about a decade later, there are three new proposals for wind power plants in Aremark. This has woken up the old debate and created new discussion. As for now there is no wind power in Aremark, but there is one in Marker which is the municipality that borders Aremark. Regarding renewable energy, Aremark has one hydro power plant, Strømsfos, that has been operating since 1994 (Thorsnæs, 2024).

#### Case 2 Båtsfjord

Båtsfjord is a municipality in Finnmark in the very north of Norway with 2 113 habitants in 2024 according to SNL (Askheim, 2024). These mainly live concentrated around the municipality centre (Askheim, 2024). Fishing is the main industry, and they refer to themselves as the fishing capital. The nature surrounding the municipality centre is relatively rural.

In Båtsfjord there is already a wind power plant - Hamnefjell wind power. It is visible from the municipality centre and has been operating since 2017 (NVE, n.d.-b). Initially, it was applied for 160 MW installed effect, divided into two parts where the first part was 50 MW and the last 110 MW due to limitations in grid capacity (Finnmark-Kraft, 2011). The license granted by NVE approved for a total of 120 MW. Today, the operating wind power plant is Hamnefjell I which consists of 49,5 MW installed capacity divided on 15 wind turbines. The second step

(Hamnefjell II) has been postponed due to limitations in grid capacity still being an issue. In addition to this, there are now new plans regarding a third step, Hamnefjell III, which will give an additional 100 MW (Finnmark-Kraft, 2024). These plans are in the hearing process, meaning it is open for people to come with input, and the deadline for input is in February 2025 (NVE, n.d.-a).

Parts of Båtsfjord are used as grazing areas by reindeers, and this is making Båtsfjord relevant regarding the debate about wind power and reindeer herding as well (Askheim, 2024).

#### 2.3. Data collection

The interviews in Aremark were conducted in August and in the beginning of September 2024. To get a greater perspective of the municipality and a chance to conduct interviews in person, the SAMVIND group, consisting of 4 researchers and I went to Båtsfjord at the end of August. At that point only one interview was arranged. The idea was to do snowball sampling. This is a method often used in a qualitative approach where the participants are asked to refer the researcher to new participants. Then these new participants are asked the same, and in that way the researcher finds more participants (Noy, 2008). The snowball sampling was a success and we were given contact information to different people. The same approach was used in all interviews and led to more people to contact. In Aremark it was easier to contact people because we did not have the same geographical challenge with distance and were therefore able to be more flexible with scheduling interviews. The snowball sampling was also used in Aremark. A possible problem with this method is that people only want to include the people with the same perspective as themselves, to strengthen their case. This did not turn out to not be an issue as many of the interviewees even suggested people they knew had different perspectives.

In addition to contacting people, we also made a Facebook post in both municipalities where we explained our research and were seeking for people to interview. The reason for reaching out through Facebook, was because many municipalities in Norway have groups for the inhabitants where information is spread and things are discussed. We therefore thought it was worth a shot. The Facebook post was a success and led to people contacting us, willing to contribute. We also heard from several respondents who we had reached out to, that they had

seen our post, so it was a good way for reaching out and making us visible. The distribution of respondents is shown in Table 1.

Being interviewed can be an uncomfortable setting for some people. It was therefore important to make sure the people being interviewed were as comfortable as possible. They got the opportunity to choose a place for the interviews, whether it was at home or at a neutral location. Having the interview online on Teams was also possible. It was important that the participants were given this opportunity as in some places the conversation could be affected by people being too aware of their surroundings especially since this subject has caused tension in many municipalities in Norway. In addition, it was important to give the interviewees the choice of doing the interview in English or Norwegian since there were both English and Norwegian speakers in the research group. Even though most Norwegians are speaking English very well, they are not necessarily comfortable being interviewed in English. It can also cause misunderstandings or the feeling of not being able to fully express their opinions and thus weaken the validity. Most of the interviews were conducted with two researchers from the SAMVIND group, but I did one alone and some with the whole group. This depended on what the respondent preferred and what language the respondents chose for the interview. Two researchers worked best as everyone in the research group had different backgrounds and could therefore cover a more broad perspective with the follow up questions.

The main topics for the interviews relevant for my thesis were perceptions about wind power and local community engagement. Some of the questions included questions about if the participant had been engaged in the decisions about wind power, if they felt like their opinions had been heard or what changes they would like to see in the licensing process. In the topic of perceptions about wind energy we made two different sections adjusted for whether the municipality had wind power or not. The complete interview guides are found in appendix B and C.

All interviewees were given an information sheet and a consent form (appendix A) they had to sign before the interviews could start. In the information sheet they could read about the project, what participating would entail and where they agreed to recordings being taken. All respondents were comfortable with being recorded, and the interviews were therefore recorded. The recordings made sure no details were left out and made it easier to later process the data. All recordings were then anonymized and given pseudonyms to ensure anonymity. Transcription was done by using UiO's Autotext transcription software. To secure that the quality was good, and the transcription was correct, the recordings and transcripts were manually checked for errors as well.

Actor	Type of participant	No. of
		interviewees
Community	People who live in a municipality with wind	7
	power	
	People who do not have wind power in the	2
	their municipality	
	People related to reindeer herding	1
Government	Local politics	2
	Total:	12

Table 1: Interview respondents

### 2.4. Data analysis

The processing of data was done by using NVivo. I coded the interviews into different categories. To answer the research question, the main categories were concerns, decision making process and participation. This was made into a table (Table 2) where the key findings were listed as key words and some quotes from the respondents were presented. A challenge with the quotes was that some of the interviews were in Norwegian. The quotes therefore had to be translated into English and that may give some small deviations from the direct quote, but the content is the same. The participants in this research are divided in two groups based on which municipality they represent. They are named as either a respondent from Båtsfjord or Aremark. This choice was made to ensure anonymity because both municipalities are quite small and therefore, the risk of being recognized could be a possibility if too much detail were added.

#### 2.5. Reliability and validity

As for the reliability of this methodology, semi structured interviews are hard to repeat in later studies. This is because of the human factor and setting. LeCompte and Goetz (1982) explains it well: *"Because human behaviour is never static, no study can be replicated exactly, regardless of the methods and design employed"*. Another researcher would probably not be able to achieve the exact same results as in this thesis, since this topic is very time relevant. As we have seen in Norway, the perspectives on wind power can change quite rapidly and therefore the situation could be different five years from now. In addition, new regulations can be implemented and we can gain new knowledge. The research is still relevant as it addresses the situation now and can be used for further development of processes regarding wind power.

Internal validity is a measure on whether or not the research is representative of the correct scenario for the population (Patino & Ferreira, 2018). When doing interviews, it is therefore important that the methodology is done correctly. To increase internal validity, interview guides were formed thoroughly and adjusted for the respective municipalities. The interviews were recorded to make sure nothing was left out, and even though a transcription tool was used, it was manually checked for errors as well. When doing the interviews, I asked questions when something was unclear, but did not try to lead the conversation in a certain direction. As my background is within renewable energy, I was careful not to let my knowledge affect the interviews or correct any wrong as the interviews were about people's perspectives, not knowledge about renewable energy.

Competence validity is referring to the researcher's competence for conducting qualitative data (Grønmo et al., 2024). The competence validity is increased by the data collection for this thesis being done in collaboration with a postdoctoral research fellow who has a doctorate in development studies within community perspectives of wind energy. Thus meaning she has experience with this type of methodological approach.

External validity is about how generalizable this research is, and whether or not the findings can be applied to another setting (Patino & Ferreira, 2018). To increase the external validity of this research, the approach with two different municipalities was chosen. This to see if the findings in each of the municipalities were similar or comparable. In addition, the findings have been compared to previous research within this field to see if there are similarities. If the

findings are similar, the chance for it to apply for other situations as well is greater. A measure that could have strengthened the validity could be including other data such as a survey to see if the same results were found. This was not possible due to limited time and budget.

It is also important to note that results in the analysing process could be affected by the researcher's interpretation of the data. To reduce the chance of wrong interpretation, the quotes were used for the result.

# 3 Results

In this part, the findings from the interviews are being presented. In total twelve interviews were conducted. Seven interviews in Aremark and five in Båtsfjord. Most of the interviews were completed in person, but two of them were held online using Microsoft Teams. This applied to one respondent from Båtsfjord and one from Aremark. The respondents from Båtsfjord were politicians, people in the industry and one person connected to reindeer herding. From Aremark the respondents were farmers or somehow involved in the local community (see Table 1). To answer the research question, answers from respondents have been categorized in three main categories; concerns, decision making process and participation (see Table 2). I then chose quotes from different respondents. To give an overall picture of the situation, quotes from different views were selected. Further in this chapter the findings are presented more thoroughly, and these are later discussed in the discussion chapter.

Categories	Key words	Quotes from the interviews
Concerns	"Noise", "shadow	"The best place is where it's located now
	flickering", "health	because of the wind, but also because it
	issues", "nature",	doesn't have so much impact on nature or
	"tourism"	people using the nature."
		Respondent 3 from Båtsfjord
		<i>"And destroy very important nature, which I</i>
		think is going to be in short supply at the
		time. And I think you also create problems by
		doing it that way. Both because there are
		conflicts between neighbours and residents.
		And there will be a greater burden both
		physically and psychologically on the
		residents."
		Respondent 3 from Aremark
		"In principle, I think wind power is a positive
		thing.

		However, it should preferably be built in
		areas that already have noise and noise
		pollution."
		Respondent 1 from Aremark
		"And one point is probably that Halden
		vassdraget, as a natural gem with tourism
		and related activities, (Wind power) might
		have a negative impact for the municipality."
		Respondent 6 from Aremark
Decision-making	"transparency", "too	"These are too big decisions for such small
process	big decisions"	municipalities."
		Respondent 5 from Aremark
		"Being transparent and honest would have
		benefited both the municipality and its
		residents to a much greater extent."
		Respondent 3 from Aremark
		"I would argue that they do very little to
		have a dialogue with the citizens."
		Respondent 7 from Aremark
		"NVE is absolutely clear, they have given
		clear notice of what they are going to do."
		Respondent 1 from Båtsfjord
Participation	"no debate", "hard to	<i>"At the same time, I would argue that thev do</i>
Ĩ	participate"	very little to have a dialogue with the
		citizens.
		And when someone raises questions to the
		municipality, they say yes, no, this is a type

of question that we cannot answer."
Respondent 7 from Aremark
"It has been negotiated in advance.
There are no debates."
Respondent 5 from Aremark
"I have experience with quite a few slightly
arrogant, condescending attitudes.
I think it's sad that it has to be like that."
Respondent 3 from Aremark
"We are often told that we should provide
input on things.
Or that they want our input.
So then we will have to decide on that.
But aside from that, I don't have any very
important or major input to make."
Respondent 4 from Båtsfjord

Table 2: Codes and quotes from interviews

# How do people in Aremark and Båtsfjord perceive their opportunities to participate in decision making processes?

Regarding participation the respondents are very split. Some state that it is easy to participate if you would like to and that you are being heard. Others claim that the municipality board had already taken a stand regarding wind power issues and are not open for perspectives from people in the municipality. A few of the respondents also found it hard to know where to participate and had difficulty in finding information about the wind power plans within the municipality.

The opportunities to participate in the decision-making process are perceived differently among the respondents in Aremark. Out of all the respondents from Aremark, five were negative about their opportunities to participate in decision-making processes, one was in between, and one had a positive experience. Lack of information, lack of knowing where to participate, and a feeling of not being included is the experience for many. "We don't get an opportunity, we take an opportunity," is a quote from one respondent in Aremark. Another respondent had experiences from the previous process and thought it was very tough. The different perspectives had split the local community and negatively affected the relations between individuals positioned on opposing sides of the wind power debate. The same respondent also meant that some of the people in the municipality, especially the ones who would like to have wind power, exaggerated the municipality's impact on the decision. This is because in the end, NVE is the one in charge of a final decision. On the other hand, one of the respondents was satisfied with the process: "It is a rather long process in the municipality. You can say no at least three times if that's the case. Therefore, I think it feels very safe".

In Båtsfjord the situation was perceived quite differently. The respondents were mostly satisfied with participation and felt that there was room for input. One respondent said that the industry the respondent worked in were often asked for input in these situations. One respondent however, who is connected to politics, thought that the last process with the wind power already in operation was rather long, and would like to see the decision-making process going faster. This process had, according to the respondent, taken more than ten years. The concern about the process being too long lasting was not equally present for the new planned wind power plant. The process is more systematic now and the plans are more clear, according to the respondent linked to reindeer herding did not feel satisfied with the decision-making process. This respondent said that monetary compensation would not change the problem, whereas other respondents claimed that a collaboration with the reindeer herders would be feasible with compensation.

#### What are the main concerns regarding wind power in Aremark and Båtsfjord?

In Aremark the impact of nature, the noise and the economy seems to be the biggest concerns. Regarding the economy the monetary distribution is seen as unfair as the landowners receive money as compensation for having turbines built on their land, but the people living in the area get the same consequences as the landowners but without any compensation. An example from respondent 7 from Aremark asks: *"Why should the municipality and some landowners make a lot of money, and then it will affect many other of the municipality's residents."*.

In addition, the municipality is in need of money. Respondents claim wind power is seen as one factor that can help with the economy and prevent merging with another municipality. Other respondents say it is less important to remain independent and will rather merge than to have

wind power. Others again claim that the economy is not as bad as claimed. There are different views on the economy linked to wind power, but what is really the case for the municipality is not further researched. There also seems to be a problem with trust in the wind power companies, as several of the interviewees perceive promises not being kept by developers in the neighbouring municipality where a wind power plant is in operation, as well as in other projects in Norway.

The respondents from Aremark were afraid the wind power would destroy nature as Aremark has 80% of the municipality's area being covered by forest as mentioned above (Thorsnæs, 2024). All of the respondents mentioned destruction of nature as an important aspect of their perspectives. One respondent's main motivation for engaging was because of nature: *"The reason I'm interested in this issue is because, as you can see, we think it's very important to take care of nature"*. There were concerns about the wind power being too dominant in the landscape. One respondent also said that the wind turbines would ruin the experience of outdoor recreation by removing the character of untouched nature.

In Båtsfjord on the other hand, the respondents were mostly neutral to the wind power plant or felt it was necessary for the energy supply. The process and collaboration with NVE were seen as good. However, they missed more involvement in the municipality from the wind power companies. As one respondent stated, "*I don't even remember the name of the windmill company, that's how far away they are*". The respondent missed more engagement in the local community with other contributions than tax. A suggestion was for example support to the children community such as sport. In that way the local community would feel that they received something back, as a compensation for living close to the wind turbines. Another respondent however, claimed that the wind power companies do not leave enough monetary value.

Nature was also seen as important in Båtsfjord among the respondents. However, the wind power plant did not interfere with their experience of the landscape as the location of the wind power plant was not in an area that was used for outdoor recreation anyway. as shown in Table 2 one respondent from Båtsfjord stated: *"The best place is where it's located now because of the wind, but also because it doesn't have so much impact on nature or people using the nature."* 

Who participates in decision making and why? Who does not participate? In Aremark the actors identified are the municipality board, NVE and the wind power companies. Based on the interviews it looks like the people in the municipality in Båtsfjord are considered an actor to a greater extent than the ones in Aremark. This is due to the respondents from Båtsfjord talking about more inclusion. In Finnmark the Sami population is also considered an actor as the wind power development is in conflict with Sami interest. The response from the interviews in Båtsfjord is diverse, as all the respondents except one, claim there are no conflicts with reindeers, whereas the interview with the person linked to reindeer herding could inform about the opposite. In Aremark, as the quotes in Table 2 shows, the respondents are not satisfied with their opportunity to participate and find it hard to know where and how.

#### What do the local community think about the wind power plant?

Since Aremark does not have any wind power, the people in Båtsfjord were asked about how it is to live with wind power. This because it could be interesting to see if the concerns that many respondents from Aremark had become an issue for the respondents from Båtsfjord. In particular, noise was a recurring issue mentioned in Aremark. In Båtsfjord none of the respondents had any issues regarding noise, but they addressed that some people might have been affected. When asked if noise was a problem, a respondent from Båtsfjord answered:

No, nothing. They are located way up in the mountains, so I don't know. I don't think anyone is bothered by the noise from them. But of course it might be someone, but at least not that I've heard anyone talk about.

After hearing the answers from the respondents it looks like the location of the wind power plant is relevant for the fact that there are so little issues connected to it. The area up in the mountain is referred to as a "moon landscape":

The place looks like a moon landscape. There is not much there other than wind. Nothing grows, nothing lives. So a lot of the problems that they're talking about other places, which is about what it has to do for the animals that live there. It's not really applicable here in Båtsfjord.

Therefore, the respondents were not too concerned about the impact on nature either, as the conditions in the area are pretty harsh. It was stated that if the wind power plant were to be located in another area where people actually used it for hiking and outdoor activities, the situation might be perceived differently.

The results from Aremark and Båtsfjord show in this case quite different views on both the opportunity to participate and the decision-making process. In Båtsfjord the respondents were generally more positive and satisfied, whereas in Aremark the respondents were overall more negative and had less trust in the process and the developers. The same applies to the consequences. In Aremark there were more concerns regarding noise, nature and health. In Båtsfjord there were more concerns regarding noise, nature and health. In

### 4 Discussion

After conducting the interviews, the first reflections regarding Aremark and Båtsfjord was that the perspectives from the respondents on wind power are different. The advantage with doing the interviews in person and actually visiting the locations gave a perspective on the atmosphere in both municipalities. The interpretation was that in Aremark wind power is a more sensitive topic. This could be a result of their experience with a previous wind power proposal. This has been brought up by some of the respondents as well. The analysis of the results confirmed that the concerns regarding wind power are more present in Aremark than in Båtsfjord.

In Aremark the respondents perceived their opportunities to not be sufficient. There were different opinions on whether or not the information flow was good. This can probably be explained by the respondents' knowledge on where to find information, but if everyone should have an opportunity to be included in the process, the information should be provided based on the recipients' arenas. Regarding actually having an opportunity to impact, most of the respondents did not feel that their input was considered.

As of 1st of July 2023 new legislative changes in the plan- and building law and the energy law was implemented. This means by law the municipality has to clarify the plan for the area suggested for a land based wind power plant (Kommunal- og Distriktsdepartementet, 2024). This also gives the municipality the opportunity to set a framework for the measure. The municipality gets more power regarding having the opportunity to decline a proposal as NVE cannot grant a license for a wind power plant without the municipality having clarified the area. This could in theory give more opportunities to participate in the decision-making process creating an open space for the municipality. The problem is nevertheless that the municipality board then has a great impact. Several of the respondents in Aremark meant that communicating with the municipality board was difficult and that they did not make room for input by the local community. Related to power theory, this could be explained as the Government creates a space for the municipality, but then the municipality only invites a few to participate, making it a closed space. To make it a more open space the municipality could invite the local community and include them more in the decision-making process. In addition to the spaces for participation, the power distribution is shifted. Another respondent meant that the law changes gave too much power to a small municipality without sufficient knowledge. This could mean that the municipality board has more power than the people in the municipality. In addition, if the municipality board does not have sufficient knowledge, the power distribution can change

in another way, where the developers have more knowledge than the municipality board and could therefore potentially angle the situation in their favour.

The decision-making process was not a concerning issue according to the respondents from Båtsfjord. Out of the respondents asked, the impression was that they did not have too strong feelings either way in the decision-making process, and when asked if they were satisfied with how the process works today, they mostly were. However, one respondent from Båtsfjord was in fact not satisfied with the licensing process. This respondent was linked to reindeer herding and had the experience that the consultants doing the impact assessment did not have the sufficient knowledge to decide whether or not reindeers were affected. The respondent also said that the consultants were more interested in checking off a list, rather than learning from the actual reindeer herders. This means they could miss important factors or issues they had not taken into account.

The decision process is perceived very differently in Aremark and Båtsfjord based on the findings in this research. It is difficult to pinpoint exactly what the reason is, as the same process applies for both municipalities. One factor that may be considered is the different experiences. With an already operating wind power plant, Båtsfjord has had a license process that was approved and they did not have strong feelings related to how the process went. Despite not having any wind power, Aremark has already gone through a license process about ten years ago with Kjølen wind power plant, which got rejected. Even though the license process has changed since then, it is reason to believe that the experience affects how they feel about the license process system. Also, as mentioned by one respondent, it is difficult to understand why new licensing processes in Aremark are started, when the last one got rejected. The justification for rejection was regarding loss of biodiversity and landscape degradation, and that issue has not changed since then. It is therefore hard for many to believe that not just one, but three licensing applications are in progress now. In addition to the previous rejection, the trouble within the municipality board has not been forgotten. One respondent could tell about relationships being changed between people being on different sides in the wind power debate.

In Aremark the noise concerns were significant whereas in Båtsfjord, where a wind power plant is already in operation, this did not seem to be an issue. That could be interpreted to mean that actually living near a power plant might not be as "bad" as feared. This is contradictory with the research by Dugstad et al. (2020) who found that exposure to wind power led to lower acceptance. On the other hand, as their study was contradictory with previous literature, they suggested that for their case other factors might have played a role. As for Båtsfjord, the location of the wind power plant is possibly a more important factor than exposure. Hamnefjellet wind power plant in Båtsfjord is located up in the mountain and therefore the noise is not necessarily as bothering as a wind power plant located closer to residential areas in a rather flat landscape. One respondent from Aremark, who was negative to wind power development in Aremark, was not opposed to wind power, but thought that they should be built in places where there is already noise pollution. As for my own experiences, when visiting Båtsfjord, the noise was mainly from construction or other industries than the wind power plant. As the noise was not a severe problem in Båtsfjord according to the respondents, there is reason to believe that the experience of noise disturbance is less significant if the wind power plant is located in areas already exposed to noise pollution.

The visibility is mentioned as a concern by some of the respondents from Aremark, as the size of the turbines could be quite dominant in the landscape. Regarding location in Båtsfjord, the disadvantage with the turbines being located on the mountain is that they are definitely visible. On the other hand, speaking with the informants, the visibility of the turbines does not seem to be a big issue. Some stated that the turbines represent development and when asked if the wind power plant had an impact on their everyday life, the response was:

No, by no means. It has generated jobs, and it has created development, so no. I have nothing bad to say about them. They now look perfectly fine. It could have looked much worse, but I think they look nice and modern. So, they don't bother me, at least.

Trying to understand why the differences are so significant between the respondents from Båtsfjord and Aremark, the cultural differences may play a role. My interpretation is that in Aremark wind power is by many of the respondents seen as industry, and the industry is ruining the landscape. Aremark have the character of a cultural landscape, so the industry will stand out in the landscape. In Båtsfjord on the other hand, the municipality is built around industry, and it is seen as important for job creation, and it is giving back to the community. Jobs are important for people to stay in Båtsfjord and for further development. This could be an explanation for the different perspectives regarding visibility and possibly being more accepting on other "issues". In addition, these findings also draw similarities to the research by Kaltenborn et al. (2023) who found that people who were against wind power saw it as more disruptive in the landscape compared to the people who saw it as essential to meet the energy demand.

The other industries in Båtsfjord seemed to be more involved and therefore being more appreciated by the local community. It was an interesting comment from one of the respondents working within industry in Båtsfjord. The respondent stated that if the wind power companies would contribute with other visible goods, such as a contribution to the children's football arena, it would be a physical reminder that they are giving back to the municipality. There was also a comment from another respondent that there had been a discussion regarding if the wind power companies contributed at all. This shows that it is not clear for the inhabitants how, and with how much, they are contributing. Being more involved in the local community would probably generate more acceptance for wind power as it would be clear what the municipalities receive back. A possible explanation for the lack of involvement can be the ownership in the companies. According to NVE, 67% of all wind power plants are owned by companies from foreign countries. For reference, 88% of all hydro power plants in Norway are owned by the Norwegian government (NVE, 2024). The owners from foreign countries are possibly less willing to contribute as they do not necessarily have any relation to the country or municipality other than the power plant itself.

Other concerns identified in Aremark were decrease in property value and nature interventions. These concerns are identified in research by Eikeland et al. (2023) as well. The respondents from Aremark were afraid of their property value being degraded, and if they would like to move, they would not be able to achieve the expected value. As Aremark is a municipality with tourism, there was also mentioned concerns connected to loss of tourism because of destruction of nature. This is a concern that is also found by Kühn et al (2024).

Distrust with the developers was a subject brought up by many respondents especially in Aremark. They had seen in their neighbouring municipality that the promises from the developers had not been held. One respondent states that the municipality received less property tax, less jobs, and none of the employees lived in the community, the roads built were wider than promised. This experience has made it difficult for the respondents in Aremark to believe the wind power developers when they talk about all the benefits the municipality will receive. In addition, there was discontent in Aremark with the wind power companies allegedly having contacted the landowners first and had meetings with them discussing compensation. The compensation itself was confidential, but there were rumours about the amounts. There was a desire for a more open process from the beginning instead of "secret" meetings with the respective landowners separately. Being transparent from the beginning with what would

actually be the outcome would probably work better long term regarding social acceptance. When feeling misled it is natural to start to become doubtful about the developers.

Regarding participation it looks like the municipality board, NVE, the wind power companies and the landowners are the actors in the wind power process. As for the rest of the people in the municipality, the ones that manage to involve themselves are a possible actor. This seem to be people who have interest in the case and claim a space for participation. One respondent from Aremark when talking about the public meetings regarding the discussion of wind power stated: "But they were incredibly unpleasant, because they are directed by the municipality. It's too tough a climate to ... Or the issue is too tough to discuss, really, I think." The respondent had been engaging in the previous debate in Aremark, but now thought that it was too tough to engage. This is opposite of the experience from one respondent in Båtsfjord who could tell that they were asked for input. When looking into the power distribution, NVE has visible power as being the organ in charge for the actual decision being made. However, some of the power from the wind power companies can be seen as hidden power in terms of them influencing the landowners by promising a significant amount of monetary compensation. Having the landowners onboard can possibly strengthen the developers' case.

Reindeer herding is a factor it is impossible to go around when looking into wind power in Finnmark. The respondents from Båtsfjord were not aware of big issues related to wind power and reindeer herding in the particular location of their wind power plant. However, a respondent linked to reindeer herding shared a different perspective during an interview. According to this respondent, the reindeer avoided the areas with wind turbines, this leading to a change in their pathways and grazing areas. This apparently means the reindeers go sooner to the grazing areas that are meant to be for later, resulting in a shortage in food supply for the reindeers. This is an area beyond my knowledge, but in my opinion it should be carefully considered in development processes. Also, reindeer herders should be included, as their knowledge in this field is learned through generations and by practice. I suggest further research on wind power and reindeers, how they and their pathways are affected. Since this issue is very important, this should be looked into further in research. Inclusion of the reindeer herders in the research and also in processes of development should also be required.

This thesis had a limited budget and a limited time period, resulting in a limit of people to interview which are not representative of the inhabitants in either location. To get a better perspective of the opinions of the local community a survey would probably cover a more representative view of the municipalities. On the other hand, a survey does not have the same ability to go in depth or give the researcher a chance to make follow up questions. The survey's design will also probably be affected by the researchers' prior knowledge of the subject. In a semi-structured interview there is room for the conversation to change paths, allowing new angles that could have been missed in a survey. Interviews were nevertheless the chosen methodology as it was important to really understand people's perspectives and give them an opportunity to speak freely. In this thesis the main focus was to have a conversation with the people and give them an open space. As the interviews were conducted a bit differently, one by myself and some together with the whole or parts of the SAMVIND group, results could potentially have been affected as it can vary how comfortable respondents are with many interviewers. To prevent this from having too much impact, we made sure the respondents were comfortable with the number of researchers, or as in one case, the respondent on own initiative invited the whole group to join. In these cases, we decided which of the researchers led the interview to prevent too much imbalance between the interviewers and the respondent. Results in the interviews depend on the respondent being honest and sincere in their answers. To not influence the answers, staying neutral and not asking leading questions was in focus. The study shows however well the nuanced views of people and their desire for factual information, to feel included in the decision making and of fair compensation.

### 5 Conclusion

The goal of this research has been to look into how the people living in Aremark and Båtsfjord perceive their opportunities to participate in the decision-making process about wind energy in Norway. It has also been important to address the main concerns and see how it has been to live near a power plant, using Båtsfjord for reference. In addition, the aim was to map the actors, see who gets to participate and how the power is distributed.

With a qualitative approach using semi structured interviews I found that the two municipalities used as case studies in this research are split in their answers about the decision-making process. In Båtsfjord respondents showed mostly satisfaction with the opportunities to participate in the decision-making process, whereas in Aremark most of the respondents were more dissatisfied with the opportunities. They missed an open space for participation as now they had to claim their space. As for the decision-making process itself there was satisfaction with how NVE handled the cases, but more discontent with the wind power companies' approach, regarding transparency and community involvement. There were also different perspectives on whether or not it was beneficial that the municipality board have influence in the licensing process.

As for the concerns, the main concern regarding wind power found in this research is noise and the impact it has on nature. Noise was the most mentioned concern overall in this research. The respondents from Aremark seemed to be more concerned about wind power in their municipality, than the people in Båtsfjord were for further development. Whether or not exposure leads to more acceptance is not clear. Sufficient compensation and the effect wind power would have on property values and tourism are also identified concerns.

The actors in this case are identified as the municipality board, NVE, the wind power companies/ developers and landowners. The people in the municipality are not necessarily included as actors, but many of them, especially in Aremark, felt like they had to include themselves as actors. Some people who expressed strong opinions about wind power in the interviews were hesitant to participate as they did not feel that their perspectives were taken into consideration, and that it cost more than it gave.

Overall, there is still a need for further discussions to identify how the licensing process can be improved to secure a better collaboration with municipalities, the government and the wind power companies. If wind shall be a part of the solution to meet future energy demand, none of the actors will benefit from increasing opposition.

For further research it is recommended to look more into the impact on reindeer paths and behaviour. Looking more closely into what the people in the local communities would like to see from the wind power companies and the government could also be interesting.

### 6 References

- Andersen, G. (2020). *Kvalitative intervjuundersøkelser*. NDLA. Retrieved 01.12. from <u>https://ndla.no/r/verktoykassa---for-larere/kvalitative-</u> intervjuundersokelser/8d14b73d9e
- Andersen, P., & Skolt, H. B. (2012). Kan bli omkamp om vindmøller. *NRK*. <u>https://www.nrk.no/ostfold/kan-bli-omkamp-om-vindmoller-1.8234065</u>
- Askheim, S. (2024). *Båtsfjord* Store norske leksikon Retrieved 05.10.2024 from <u>https://snl.no/B</u>åtsfjord
- Bonvik-Stone, D., & Lykke, K. V. (2024). Whose Expertise and Whose Knowledge Matter? Influencing Wind Power Decisions in Norway. *Environmental Communication*, 18(8), 1062-1077. https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2024.2341931
- Bølling, J. K. (2013). Kjølen Vindpark AS —Kjølen vindkraftverk med tilhørende nettilknytning i Aremark og Halden kommuner, Østfold fylke —Vedtak om avslag på søknad om konsesjon. nve.no: Norges vassdrag- og energidirektorat Retrieved from <u>https://webfileservice.nve.no/API/PublishedFiles/Download/201001191/684962</u>
- Darpö, J. (2020). Should locals have a say when it's blowing? The influence of municipalities in permit procedures for windpower installations in Sweden and Norway. <u>https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342232613\_Should\_locals\_have\_a\_say\_whe</u> <u>n\_it's\_blowing\_The\_influence\_of\_municipalities\_in\_permit\_procedures\_for\_windpo\_wer\_installations\_in\_Sweden\_and\_Norway</u>
- Dugstad, A., Grimsrud, K., Kipperberg, G., Lindhjem, H., & Navrud, S. (2020). Acceptance of wind power development and exposure - Not-in-anybody's-backyard. *Energy Policy*, 147, 14, Article 111780. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2020.111780</u>
- Eikeland, P. O., Taranger, K. K., Inderberg, T. H. J., & Gulbrandsen, L. H. (2023). A wind of change in Norway: Explaining shifts in municipal stances on wind power by policy

feedback and energy justice. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 104, 12, Article 103231. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2023.103231</u>

- Finnmark-Kraft. (2011). *Hamnefjell vindkraftverk- Revidertkonsesjonssøkand*. <u>https://webfileservice.nve.no/API/PublishedFiles/Download/200701187/448556</u>
- Finnmark-Kraft. (2024). Melding med forslag til plan- og utredningsprogram for Hamnefjell vindkraftverk trinn 3.

https://webfileservice.nve.no/API/PublishedFiles/Download/071b4fc9-7f5a-4431-91e8-b171558ea145/202407776/3440487

- Gaventa, J. (2009). Finding the Spaces for Change: A Power Analysis. *IDS Bulletin*, *37*, 23-33. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1759-5436.2006.tb00320.x</u>
- Grønmo, S., Dahlum, S., & Svartdal, F. (2024). validitet. In *Store Norske Leksikon*. snl.no: Store norske Leksikon.
- Kaltenborn, B. P., Keller, R., & Krange, O. (2023). Attitudes toward Wind Power in Norway-Solution or Problem in Renewable Energy Development? *Environmental Management*, 72(5), 922-931. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-023-01870-5</u>
- Kommunal- og Distriktsdepartementet. (2024). *Vindkraft planlegging av vindkraft etter plan- og bygningsloven*. Regjeringen. Retrieved 07.12. from <u>https://www.regjeringen.no/no/tema/plan-bygg-og-</u> <u>eiendom/plan\_bygningsloven/planlegging/fagtema/vindkraft/id3022769/?expand=fact</u> <u>box3022773</u>
- Kühn, N., & Vasstrom, M. (2024). A public administration perspective on wind power development: decision-making logic of local government officials. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 26(2), 205-217. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/1523908x.2024.2321186</u>
- LeCompte, M. D., & Goetz, J. P. (1982). Problems of Reliability and Validity in Ethnographic Research. 52(1), 31-60.
   <u>https://www.colorado.edu/education/sites/default/files/attached-files/LeCompte\_Goetz\_Problems\_of\_Reliability\_Validity\_in\_Ed\_Re.pdf</u>
- Lindvall, D. (2023). Why municipalities reject wind power: A study on municipal acceptance and rejection of wind power instalments in Sweden. *Energy Policy*, 180. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2023.113664</u>

Norstat. (n.d.). Om oss. Norstat. Retrieved 12.12.2024 from https://norstat.co/no/selskap/

- Noy, C. (2008). Sampling Knowledge: The Hermeneutics of Snowball Sampling in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 11(4), 327-344. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/13645570701401305</u>
- NVE. (2022). Sammendrag. NVE. Retrieved 05.11.2024 from <u>https://www.nve.no/energi/energisystem/vindkraft-paa-land/nasjonal-ramme-for-vindkraft/sammendrag/</u>
- NVE. (2024, 14.10.2024). *Eierskap i norsk vann- og vindkraft*. NVE. Retrieved 11.12. from https://www.nve.no/energi/analyser-og-statistikk/eierskap-i-norsk-vann-og-vindkraft/
- NVE. (n.d.-a). *Hamnefjell 3 vindkraftverk*. NVE. Retrieved 14.12.2024 from <u>https://www.nve.no/konsesjon/konsesjonssaker/konsesjonssak?id=19341&type=A-</u> <u>1,A-6</u>
- NVE. (n.d.-b). *Hamnefjell vindkraftverk*. Retrieved 15.08.2024 from https://www.nve.no/konsesjon/konsesjonssaker/konsesjonssak/?id=93&type=A-6
- Patino, C. M., & Ferreira, J. C. (2018). Internal and external validity: can you apply research study results to your patients? *J Bras Pneumol*, 44(3), 183. <u>https://doi.org/10.1590/s1806-37562018000000164</u>
- pbl, P.-o. b. (2008). *Lov om planlegging og byggesaksbehandling* (LOV-2024-06-25-53). https://lovdata.no/lov/2008-06-27-71/§12-1
- Saglie, I. L., Inderberg, T. H., & Rognstad, H. (2020). What shapes municipalities' perceptions of fairness in windpower developments? *Local Environment*, 25(2), 147-161. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2020.1712342</u>
- Solberg, E. L., Skei, L., & Befring, Å. M. (2019). Regjeringen dropper nasjonal rammeplan for vindkraft. NRK. <u>https://www.nrk.no/norge/regjeringen-dropper-nasjonal-</u> <u>rammeplan-for-vindkraft-1.14744999</u>
- Thorsnæs, G. (2024). *Aremark*. Store norske leksikon. Retrieved 05.10.2024 from <u>https://snl.no/Aremark</u>
- Weir, D. E., & Østenby, A. M. (2019). Teknologianalyser 2018 Kostnadseffektiv vindkraft. NVE. https://publikasjoner.nve.no/faktaark/2019/faktaark2019\_03.pdf

Wæhle, E., Dahlum, S., & Grønmo, S. (2020). case-studie. In. snl.no: Store Norske Leksikon.

Aasland, T. (2022). *En nødvendig gjenåpning for vindkraft*. Energidepartementet. Retrieved 20.11. from <u>https://www.regjeringen.no/no/aktuelt/en-nodvendig-gjenapning-for-yindkraft/id2909724/</u>

### Appendix A – Consent form



### Informasjon til deg som deltar i forskningsprosjektet SAMVIND

I dette dokumentet gir vi deg informasjon om formålet med prosjektet og hva deltakelse vil innebære for deg.

Hva er formålet med prosjektet? SAMVIND er finansiert av EU Horizon 2020 og har som formål å støtte integreringen av livskvalitet og andre sosio-tekniske parametere i energisystemmodellering, som er et verktøy som brukes i planlegging og utvikling av energisystemer (produksjon og forbruk av energi). Dette vil gjøre det mulig å definere fornybare energiscenarier for Norge som tar hensyn til samfunnsperspektiver samt identifisere muligheter for sosialt rettferdig energiomstilling. SAMVINDs fulle tittel er 'Utforming av en metodologi for å integrere samfunnsperspektiver på vindenergi i energisystemmodellering'. SAMVIND er også tilknyttet forskningssenteret Include, som ledes av Tanja Winther ved UiO.

Hvorfor får du spørsmål om å delta? En viktig del av prosjektet er å forstå folks oppfatninger av livskvalitet og deres forhold til utviklingen av vindkraft i Norge. Denne kunnskapen vil bli oppnådd ved å engasjere interessenter (individer og grupper som har noe å vinne eller tape på vindprosjekter) for å forstå deres oppfatninger av vindkraft.

**Hva innebærer det for deg å delta?** Hvis du deltar i dette prosjektet, vil du inviteres til å stille til et intervju for å snakke om temaene nevnt ovenfor. Vi vil også spørre om din bakgrunn, for eksempel om din eventuelle arbeidsplass og hvilken rolle du har der. Intervjuet vil vare i rundt 45-60 minutter og vil bli arrangert på et tidspunkt og sted som passer for deg. Du vil først bli bedt om samtykke til at det tas lydopptak av intervjuet. Deltakelse er frivillig, og alle bidrag vil bli anonymisert. Du står fritt til å trekke deg når som helst, uten å oppgi noen grunn. Hvis du velger å trekke deg fra studien, vil alle opplysninger samlet opp til det tidspunktet bli slettet og ikke bli brukt i studien. Du kan velge å hoppe over spørsmål hvis du ikke føler deg komfortabel med å svare på dem, samt komme med egne innspill.

#### Ditt personvern – hvordan vi oppbevarer og bruker opplysningene.

Vi vil bare bruke opplysningene om deg til formålene vi har beskrevet i dette skrivet. Vi behandler informasjonen konfidensielt og i samsvar med personvernregelverket. Ditt navn og kontaktinformasjon (personopplysninger) vil bli erstattet med en kode som lagres på en separat navneliste adskilt fra andre data. Alle detaljer som kan føre til din identifisering vil bli slettet i transkripsjonene. Alle data vil bli lagret og analysert i henhold til de juridiske forskriftene ved Universitetet i Oslo.



#### Du har rett til:

- innsyn i hvilke opplysninger vi behandler om deg,
- å få utlevert en kopi av opplysningene,
- å få rettet opplysninger om deg som er feil eller misvisende,
- å få slettet personopplysninger om deg,
- å sende klage til personvernombudet ved UiO eller Datatilsynet om behandlingen av dine personopplysninger.

Hva gir oss rett til å behandle personopplysninger om deg? Vi behandler informasjon om deg basert på ditt samtykke. På oppdrag fra Universitetet i Oslo har SIKT – Kunnskapssektorens tjenesteleverandør vurdert at behandlingen av personopplysninger i dette prosjektet er i samsvar med personvernregelverket.

**Hvem er ansvarlig for forskningsprosjektet?** Universitetet i Oslo er ansvarlig for forskningsprosjektet. Prosjektet utføres av postdoktor Paola Velasco Herrejón, <u>p.v.herrejon@its.uio.no</u>, i samarbeid med professor Marianne Zeyringer, <u>marianne.zeyringer@its.uio.no</u>, og professor Tanja Winther, <u>tanja.winther@sum.uio.no</u>. Vennligst kontakt oss hvis du har spørsmål eller bekymringer angående studien, eller hvis du ønsker å benytte deg av dine rettigheter.

Hvis du har spørsmål knyttet til SIKTs vurdering av prosjektet, kan du kontakte:

• SIKT - Kunnskapssektorens tjenesteleverandør, e-mail: postmottak@sikt.no.

Med vennlig hilsen,

Paola Velasco Herrejón

Postdoktor, Institutt for tekonologisystemer-ITS



This project was funded by the European Union under grant agreement No  $101061882\,$ 



### Samtykkeskjema

Jeg \_\_\_\_\_\_ (navn) samtykker å delta i forskningsprosjektet SAMVIND.

- Jeg har mottatt skriftlig forklaring om formålet med studien.
- Jeg bekrefter at jeg er over 18 år og at jeg deltar frivillig. Jeg gir tillatelse til at det kan tas lydopptak av intervjuet. Opptaket vil bli slettet så snart det er transkribert og anonymisert.
- Jeg forstår at jeg kan trekke meg fra studien, uten konsekvenser, når som helst i løpet av prosjektet og inntil to måneder før prosjektets slutt (juli 2026).
- Jeg forstår at data gitt til prosjektet vil bli behandlet konfidensielt og at anonymitet vil bli ivaretatt i rapporten ved å skjule min identitet.

Signert: .....

Dato: .....



This project was funded by the European Union under grant agreement No 101061882

### Appendix B – Local community

### Semi-structured Interview Guide Interview Notes

- Interviewees should be assured of the confidentiality of the project.
- Informed consent should be obtained from all interviewees.
- Interviews should be recorded, where the interviewee gives permission, otherwise detailed notes should be taken.
- Interviewees should be assured there are no right or wrong answers, in all cases, you are looking for their experiences and/or their personal opinions.
- Questions to be asked are numbered.
- These are semi-structured interviews, the interview schedule is designed as a guide for conversation, not a questionnaire. The interviewer should make sure they elicit a response to all questions below, especially the key topics listed in the checklist at the end. However, an effort should be made to maintain the natural flow of the conversation.
- Allow the interviewee scope to expand upon topics that are of interest to them, while possibly spending less time on others. You may also find that in answering one question, the interviewee will also give a response to another that you have not yet asked. In this case, there is no need to formally address this topic again.

# Semi-Structured Interview guide Local Community Members

### Participant profile / deltaker informasjon

 Can you tell me a little about yourself? Prompts: area of residence; age range; gender; occupation, for how long have you lived/worked here Kan du fortelle litt om deg selv? bosted, alder, kjønn, yrke, hvor lenge har du bodd/jobbet her

### Information about the community / Informasjon om lokalsamfunnet

- Tell us about your community (name of the place).
  Prompts: People, landscape (cultural, nature, industries, economic activities)
  Fortell litt om lokalsamfunnet ditt (navn på kommune). folk, landskap (kulturelt, natur, industri, økonomisk aktivitet)
- 3) What are the most important issues your community is currently facing? Hva er de viktigste utfordringene lokalsamfunnet ditt står overfor nå?

### Valued ways of doing and being (capabilities) / verdier

 In your opinion, what are the most important aspects of a 'good' life? Your answers can include aspects of your life you have or don't have and would like to achieve.

Hva betyr et "godt liv" for deg? Det kan inkludere aspekter av ditt liv som du har eller ikke har og ønsker å oppnå

5) What would be required to attain this good form of life? Hva må til for å oppnå dette (ditt syn på et godt liv)?

### Perceptions about wind energy / syn på vindkraft

- 6) What does wind energy mean to you? *Hva betyr vindkraft for deg*?
- 7) How do different groups of people in your community feel about wind energy? *Hva mener ulike typer folk i lokalsamfunnet ditt om vindkraft?*

### If there are no wind farms in the region / hvis det ikke er vindkraft

- How would you feel if there were to be a wind energy project in your local region? Hva hadde du følt hvis et vindkraftprosjekt hadde blitt planlagt i din region?
- What would be your main concerns if a wind energy project were to be implemented/proposed in this region?

Hva ville vært dine største bekymringer hvis et vindkraftprosjekt hadde startet i din region?

• Who would gain/lose from it? Both within and outside your community. *Hvem ville vunnet/tapt på dette? Både i og utenfor lokalsamfunnet.*  If there are wind farms in the region

- How have wind farms in the region impacted your everyday life? Hvordan har vindkraftverk i regionen påvirket din hverdag?
- To what extent are wind farms contributing to attaining a good form of life?
  - a. Follow up: If not, what could have been done differently so that wind farms contribute to attaining a good life?

I hvilken grad bidrar vindkraftverk til å oppnå et "godt liv"?

• How have wind farms in the region impacted the everyday lives of different groups in your community?

Hvordan har vindkraftverk i regionen påvirket hverdagen til ulike mennesker i lokalsamfunnet ditt?

### Local community engagement / deliberation / lokal deltakelse i beslutninger

- 8) Have you been engaged in decisions about energy projects in your area? Har du deltatt i beslutningsprosesser om vindkraft i din kommune?
- 9) Have you been given meaningful opportunities to voice your opinions? Har du fått reell mulighet til å uttrykke din mening?
- 10) To what extent do you feel that your voice/opinions have been heard? I hvilken grad føler du at din stemme / mening har blitt hørt?
- 11) If decision-making processes could change, how would you like to participate? Hvis du kunne endret beslutningsprosessen, hvordan ville du ønsket å delta?
- 12) If you haven't engaged, are you interested in engaging in decisions about energy projects in your area? If so, in what ways?
  Er du interessert i å delta i avgjørelser om vindkraftprosjekter i ditt lokalsamfunn?
  Hvis ja,, hvordan / på hvilke måter?
- 13) What are your main sources of information / knowledge? Hva er dine viktigste informasjonskilder?

### Energy futures / Energi i fremtiden

14) In your opinion, what does the future of energy look like? (Concerns and hopes, forms of energy production, levels of consumption) Slik du ser det, hvordan ser energisystemet ut i fremtiden? bekymringer og forhåpninger, energi produksjon, forbruksnivå

- 15) What role does wind energy play in this future? And solar energy? (ask if these technologies were not mentioned) Hvilken rolle spiller vindkraft i denne framtiden? Og solenergi? (spør om disse teknologiene ikke ble nevnt)
- 16) How can wind energy developments contribute to a good form of life in your community?

Hvordan kan utviklingen av vindkraft bidra til en "godt liv" i ditt lokalsamfunn?

17) What should be the main criteria when considering wind energy in your community?

Hva bør være de viktigste kriteriene når man vurderer vindkraft i ditt lokalsamfunn?

18) What does sustainability means to you?

Hva betyr bærekraft for deg?

19) In your opinion, who has the responsibility for a socially and environmentally sustainable energy system? What hinders sustainability? *Hvem anser du som ansvarlig for å sikre et sosialt og miljømessig bærekraftig energisystem? Hva hindrer bærekraft?* 

As part of the project, we plan to give back the results from the project to all participants. Is there a particular form in which you would prefer us to provide you with this information?

### Appendix C – Governmental and organisational

### Semi-structured Interview Guide Interview Notes

- Interviewees should be assured of the confidentiality of the project.
- Informed consent should be obtained from all interviewees.
- Interviews should be recorded, where the interviewee gives permission, otherwise detailed notes should be taken.
- Interviewees should be assured there are no right or wrong answers, in all cases, you are looking for their experiences and/or their personal opinions.
- Questions to be asked are numbered.
- These are semi-structured interviews, the interview schedule is designed as a guide for conversation, not a questionnaire. The interviewer should make sure they elicit a response to all questions below, especially the key topics listed in the checklist at the end. However, an effort should be made to maintain the natural flow of the conversation.
- Allow the interviewee scope to expand upon topics that are of interest to them, while possibly spending less time on others. You may also find that in answering one question, the interviewee will also give a response to another that you have not yet asked. In this case, there is no need to formally address this topic again.

# Semi-Structured Interview guide Government/NGO Participants

### Participant profile

- 1) Can you tell me a little about yourself?
- 2) Prompts: area of residence; age range; gender; occupation, for how long have you lived/worked here
- 3) What is your role in the company/organisation? Prompts: main responsibilities

### Valued ways of doing and being (capabilities)

- In your opinion, what are the most important aspects of a 'good' life? Your answers can include aspects of your life you have or don't have and would like to achieve.
- 5) What would be required to attain this good form of life?

### Perceptions about wind energy

- 6) What does wind energy mean to you?
- 7) How do people in Norway feel about wind energy?

#### Norway and the wind energy sector

- 8) How has your organization's perspectives on wind energy in Norway changed over time?
- 9) What has been your organization's role in the development of renewable energy in Norway?
- 10) How are decisions about wind energy development taken within your organization? Who makes these decisions?
- 11) What do you consider a successful wind power project?
- 12) In your opinion, what have been the social and environmental impacts of wind farms in Norway?

#### **Energy futures**

- 13) In your opinion, what does the future of energy look like? (Concerns and hopes, forms of energy production, levels of consumption)
- 14) What role does wind energy play in this future? And solar energy? (ask if these technologies were not mentioned) What are the main challenges and opportunities associated with the development of renewable energy in Norway?
- 15) What are the main criteria that should be considered when planning wind farms in Norway?
- 16) How do you imagine communities engaging in energy production and consumption?

### Semi-strukturert intervjuguide

### Statlige deltakere/ ikke-statlige organisasjoner

### Deltakerprofil

- 1. Kan du fortelle litt mer om deg selv? Bosted; kjønn
- 2. Hva er din rolle i selskapet/ kommunen/ organisasjonen? Hovedansvar

### Valued ways of doing and being (capabilities)

- 3. Hva betyr et godt liv for deg? Svaret kan inkludere ting fra ditt eget liv, enten noe du har eller ikke, og kunne tenke deg å oppnå.
- 4. Hva skal til for å oppnå et godt liv?

### **Oppfatninger rundt vindkraft**

- 5. Hva betyr vindkraft for deg?
- 6. Hva synes befolkningen i Norge om vindkraft?

### Norge og vindkraftsektoren (Deltakere fra bransjen)

- 7. Hva har organisasjonens rolle vært i utviklingen av fornybar energi i Norge?
- 8. Hvordan blir beslutninger rundt planlegging av vindkraft avgjort av organisasjonen? Hvem er det som tar disse avgjørelsene?
- 9. Hva kjennetegner et vellykket vindkraftprosjekt?
- 10. Hva mener du de samfunns- og miljømessige konsekvensene av vindkraftverk er i Norge?

### Fremtidige scenarioer

- 11. Hvordan ser energifremtiden ut for deg? (bekymringer og håp)
- 12. Hvilken rolle spiller vindkraft i dette scenarioet?
- 13. Hva er de største utfordringene og mulighetene knyttet til utvikling av fornybar energi i Norge.
- 14. Hva burde være hovedkriteriet når det planlegges utbygging av vindkraft i Norge?
- 15. På hvilken måte kan lokalsamfunnet delta i energiproduksjon og konsum?
- 16. Tror du at energisamafunn(?) er et gjennomførbart alternativ i overgangen til fornybar energi i Norge?



Norges miljø- og biovitenskapelige universitet Noregs miljø- og biovitenskapelege universitet Norwegian University of Life Sciences

Postboks 5003 NO-1432 Ås Norway