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EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's get on the record and deal with any housekeeping matters.

MR. POTTS: We would -- we've had some discussions with staff, and one of the new exhibits we filed with Mr. Holtz's surrebuttal -- I'm trying to find the number of it right now.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.

MR. POTTS: We think it would be easier for the Commission and everyone if we added a column that showed the costs of the different re-routes. So that exhibit is an exhibit of all the different re-routes that have been proposed by staff or the applicants that the applicants are -- have found acceptable, and we would propose to add a column of the cost differences and then add on the bottom of that table the other items that have been raised that would have cost impacts, like the bird study and the estimated cost impact, which we would just use the cost of -- from the Crane Foundation and any others. Obviously parties could object afterwards. EXAMINER NEWMARK: Right. So that would be Holtz 1?

MR. POTTS: I think it's Holtz 1, yes.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: So the Crane Foundation

1, that would be just based on the data request response figures?

MR. POTTS: It's actually in the FEIS.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Oh, is it? Okay. But it's those numbers you're talking about?

MR. POTTS: I think it's about 140,000.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
MR. POTTS: So it would just be easier for the Commission.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Sure.

MR. POTTS: And the Commission staff I think is in agreement with it.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. That works. So it will just be considered a late exhibit. We can apply the three day --

MR. POTTS: We'll just file a revised Exhibit 1 for Holtz.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Right. And we'll just apply three-day filing deadline, three day right to object.

MR. POTTS: It may take a couple days to pull.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Well, how much time you need, that's fine. Week?

MR. POTTS: Yeah, we'll file it next week.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. That's fine.
All right. Let me just note that on my -- anything else housekeeping related?
(No response.)
EXAMINER NEWMARK: I think it's agency witness day, my favorite day. So I'm going to leave it up to staff to propose or to call the witnesses in the order they wish. I know we started -- the other party intervenors went with need and then routing, so I'm assuming we'll take that tack here but --

```
So this is Ms. Halpin.
```

ALICE HALPIN, WDATCP WITNESS, DULY SWORN
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. LORENCE:

Q Could you state your name for the record, please.
A Alice Halpin.
Q And where do you work?
A The Wisconsin Department of Agricultural, Trade \& Consumer Protection.

Q And in preparation for today's hearing, did you file direct testimony and --

A And rebuttal.
Q -- and rebuttal testimony and one exhibit, correct?
A Yes, I did.
Q And if I asked you the questions in your direct and rebuttal testimony today, would your answers be the same?

A Yes, they would.
MR. LORENCE: I believe her testimony is already into evidence, and she's available for cross.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. That's right. Yeah. Any questions?

MR. WILL: Nothing from ATC.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Anyone else?

MS. KUNZE: Your Honor, I have some questions.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Come on up. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. KUNZE:
Q Thank you. Good morning, Ms. Halpin.
A Good morning.
Q I'm Laura Kunze, self-representing.
A Okay.
Q Ms. Halpin, your direct testimony, page 2, lines 10 through 23, and the AIS refers to land surveys and charts. I note that input data are not from responses to survey and comments by farmland owners and are not totals but do provide an indication of the degree of impact. Does that mean that the data provided in the survey responses was not independently verified?

A No. It means that we didn't survey every single farmland owner who would be affected, we only surveyed where they might have four acres or more potentially acquired as easements. So any -- any acquisition -- or any easement acquisition less than four acres we didn't survey.

Q Okay. And does it mean that the Department of Agriculture did not gather information and relied
only on survey responses? You didn't do outreach?

A We relied on our surveys. We looked at the -- some of the public comments as they came through. I didn't read every single public comment that came through, but I did try to read as many as I could. We were at the original public meetings that the PSC held, and we gathered information there.

Q Okay. So the information was voluntary?
A Yes.
Q Your testimony states that it is valuable to
recognize that -- this is page 3, lines 1 through 5.
It is valuable to recognize that these three
responses do not include all landowners who are concerned about the four impacts along the proposed route. How were impacts on landowners not surveyed taken into account?

A Our survey was generally to gather the types of concerns people had, not to -- not to do a complete summary of all of them. So it's -- we didn't -- the concerns that people had from the larger acquisitions we assumed would also be concerns that smaller -people having smaller acquisitions would have.

Q So how were -- were the landowners that were not surveyed taken into account at all?

A They were in the totals of acres affected.

Q Even if they had not replied to the survey?
A Right.
Q So how did you tally that information? How did you gather that if it wasn't via survey? And I'm referring also to those parcels under four acres.

A The -- ATC, the applicants, provided information to us about their corridor and their anticipated impacts, and then we received that in a GIS -- in several GIS layers, and we had a GIS analyst who also reviewed that and totaled the summaries for cropland, pasture, other agricultural lands like oat fields and specialty crop farmland.

Q Would you agree that the AIS is not a complete analysis of all farmland and farm operations in the project area?

A I would agree.
Q And are you aware of the Town of Springfield's comprehensive land use plan in which an
agricultural -- long-term agricultural preservation area is listed?

A I have not reviewed that.

MS. KUNZE: May I please submit an
exhibit, please?
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's see. Distribute
copies, and I'll need a copy.

MS. KUNZE: May I approach?

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Yes. Just make sure everyone has copies.

MS. KUNZE: Sorry for the delay.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: We can mark this

Halpin 1 (sic).
(Exhibit Halpin 2 marked for identification.)

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Can you just describe where this is from?

MS. KUNZE: Town of Springfield website.

MR. LORENCE: It will be Halpin 2.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: You're right, Halpin 2.

MR. POTTS: Your Honor, this may already be in the record, the application, its map.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Well, I guess the application is big enough. We're going to speak to it directly --

MS. KUNZE: Thank you. Unless you can point it out where it is in the record already.

MR. POTTS: We're trying. It's a big record.

MS. KUNZE: Yes, it is. Thank you.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: We'll just put this in.

Well, go ahead with your questions.

MS. KUNZE: Thank you.

BY MS. KUNZE:

Q So how might pole positions, just moving on, and the 120-foot right-of-way affect contour farming?

A It could interfere with a farmland owner's pattern of cropping his field, which in turn would interfere with the contours.

Q And --
A It could be an obstacle I guess would be the best way to say it.

Q It could be -- I couldn't hear, I'm sorry.
A It could be an obstacle for the person farming.
Q Okay.
A And so they wouldn't be able to cover their fields in the same pattern, crop their fields in the same pattern as they had in the past.

Q Thank you. And what is the purpose of contour farming?

A To minimize erosion.

Q Uh-huh. How could this detour and obstacle issue be mitigated?

A I believe the applicants have some leeway along the centerline of their easement for moving poles, and so it's my understanding that it's their intention to work with landowners where possible if they needed to move the poles a few feet. You know, tens of feet,
not -- certainly not hundreds of feet. So moving a pole may help a farmer if they have issues of access or moving around fields, that sort of thing.

Q Would they still have to steer around that pole within the contour?

A If it's in their field.
Q Have you read the public comments from farmers from Segment A?

A I've read many of the public comments. I haven't read all of them. I've read many of them.

Q Are you aware of a farmer who has sustained a serious physical injury that makes excessive steering of farm equipment difficult?

A I'm not.
Q Would you agree that placement of transmission poles on his land could create additional steering issues and undue hardship?

A It could.
Q And how could those issues be mitigated?
A I'm not an expert in adjusting equipment, but I
assume there may be adjustments to the equipment that could be made to make it easier to steer or a re -as I was saying earlier, if the pole could be moved to a location that is -- causes less steering issues, that could be a solution.

Q In your -- in the AIS, page 58 to 59 , reports only three questionnaires were sent and that there were two farmland replies. My farm was not included. The concerns I have regarding my farm operations are not addressed in the AIS, and I have concerns about specifically EMF, how that affects the cortisol level in cattle and how that might affect cattle insemination and weight gain rates.

A Uh-huh.
Q And I would also be concerned about cross-contamination of crops and pesticides from the neighboring nonorganic farm onto my principally organic-run farm due to complete removal of a tree-lined wind break, loss of hay crops from construction and future losses, potential invasion of pasture, animal containment areas due to fence loss on line during construction phase and potential future loss, minimum number of animals raised due to pasture and animal containment area reductions potentially. How would these concerns be addressed going forward?

A It is my understanding that once -- if the project is approved and route is selected, that it's our recommendation to the applicants that they contact each farm operation individually and survey them for
potential concerns and then deal with those concerns individually.

Q Were these concerns taken into effect before the route has been chosen?

A That would be the Commissioners who would do that.
Q The first page of the AIS states that the AIS offers applicants practices and techniques to avoid or mitigate damages to farmland and farm operations, and that information in an AIS cannot stop a project. What if impacts cannot be mitigated?

A The actual loss of land, the land that's used for the pole foundation, any -- that's -- any impacts due to the pole's location, that farm is -- cannot adjust to, I guess that would be it.

Q Well, what if the concerns and issues and impacts cannot be addressed and mitigated by the applicant or other agency, what happens to the farmer?

A I would assume the compensation for that, any things that cannot be mitigated for, would be part of the easement compensation that the landowner receives.

Q If the easement compensation plan states that only compensation is given for land value, would these other issues that would impact the farmer be addressed?

A That would be a question for ATC. It would be up to
them.
Q For the purpose of AIS, how is farm defined?
A I believe it's any operation that can produce $\$ 1,000$ worth of produce or income in one year or 3,000 over three years. 3,000, it's over three years.

Q Most farmers live on their land. How does the AIS take this inherent impact into account?

A We do through the concerns that they raise. If they raise concerns about living there, we try to list those in their comments.

Q So if a farmer were not aware of this project fully and they had not received a survey, would they know how to contact you ahead of time to help work through this issue and mitigate any potential impact?

A They might not.
Q I raise horses and train, and I require a substantial number of outbuildings, corrals, pastures where horses are housed, bed, trained and intense human presence would be in these areas, and for these reasons my farm is vulnerable to the encroachment of a transmission line, and I expect to lose pasture and working area and suffer animal and human health impacts related to living and working in this area. Would you -- would this be regarded as a unique agricultural type in the AIS?

A There are other livestock owners along the routes and others who use outbuildings and pastures, so I would think it would be in addition to the existing -- to any of the land -- farmland owners and farm operations along the routes.

Q How is the encroachment of transmission addressed in the AIS?

A I don't understand your question.
Q Is it -- do they address how the impact of these lines on the land of the farmers at all, limiting work, operations, et cetera?

A That's the full scope of the Ag Impact Statement is describing the impacts, yes.

Q Is the scope complete?

A We didn't -- as we discussed before, we didn't survey every landowner, so every landowner's concerns are not included, but we feel the -- the breadth of the impacts are complete.

Q How could this be mitigated? How could we have a more complete statement and analysis?

A We could survey every single landowner, but that would increase the cost and the time and would -we'd have to spend more time processing the surveys rather than looking into concerns that people had.

Q But would you be aware of the concerns if they had
not been contacted?
A If someone has concerns that weren't addressed, I would assume we would then be aware if we contacted everyone.

Q I guess I'm sorry, I didn't quite understand your reply.

A The -- if we had -- the contacts we made were to get an overall view of the potential impacts. They weren't to get everybody's concerns. So if -- if we contacted everyone, they would have that opportunity to express their concerns.

Q If you had contacted everybody, you would know the concerns, did I understand that correctly?

A If they chose to reply.
Q If they chose to reply. The AIS states that there are specific considerations to assess route segment decisions and degree of impacts. It goes on to mention total agriculture land across a segment corridor where a fence, pasture or paddock is affected. How are the impacts on a larger area within the fenced area evaluated?

A We describe how fencing could be affected. We describe potential loss of land for cropland, not so much for pasture because the animals still would have access, except for the areas of the foundation, so
those impacts are.
Q And the new versus existing right-of-way on agricultural land, where new right-of-way will be taken to expand an existing easement, how is that evaluated?

A We compare the numbers.
Q And the right-of-way in comparing, is it listed in a table?

A I believe so.
Q Would that be page 3 ? We'll get to that.
The right-of-way, let's see, on AIS page 66 does not address the new land to be taken from -- for the easement that is to be added. It's not clear that that map is done, I guess, is what I'm saying. So I wonder where that is recorded. I'm talking about the difference. Do you know what I'm asking, the difference between the smaller right-of-way for a lower voltage and then between the larger right-of-way, is that accounted for in here?

A You're talking about the new versus existing?
Q Yes. Uh-huh. That difference in acreage between the right-of-way easements.

A It will take me some time.

Q Is it just a simple math calculation, Ms. Halpin?

A It's in our table at the beginning. It's simple math calculation, yes.

Q Okay.
A I'm looking at the NSP versus $O$ in the executive summary.

Q Uh-huh.

A The tables there, they have right-of-way.
Q Yes, on page -- the third page of the summary. So is the -- there's existing row and there's new row.

A Right-of-way.
Q Right-of-way, sorry. Thank you. Is there a differentiation in -- are you accounting for the difference in the acreage?

A Existing right-of-way is where there's any existing easement along an existing transmission line or existing road right-of-way. New right-of-way is where there's no existing easement.

Q But where the existing easement is less than the proposed new easement, is that difference accounted for?

A I don't understand what you mean by accounted for. I mean, it's there in the table.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: It's included in the new right-of-way acreage, the expansion of an existing easement?

THE WITNESS: Well, there's new and there's existing.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. So it is part of the new exist -- part of the new --

THE WITNESS: The new plus the existing would be the total.

BY MS. KUNZE:
Q So I guess is the expanded portion of the easement on an existing corridor included in the new right-of-way number?

A If there's acreage that is part of an existing easement, that would be existing right-of-way. If there's acreage that is not -- does not have an existing easement, that would be new right-of-way.

Q Okay. The right-of-way extends on -- is on the prime and other highly productive farmland classes. AIS page 66 does not address the new land to be taken with easement that's to be addressed and use what we're talking about, existing right-of-way, that was provided. Do we know how many required acres are we referring to with the new easement?

For the sake of time, I'm going to move on. One moment, please.

Did you or another contributing member look at surveys to determine land divisions and property
boundaries?

A In the GIS layer, there is owner-owned parcel level data that identifies owners so, yes.

Q Aerial map. So the actual property lines are visible, not -- or are you relying on visual cues from the -- from the GIS?

A I wasn't the person who did the GIS in that analysis, but I believe there are property lines visible.

Q I can represent to you that my property extends beyond the fence and tree line. Was that factored in? Was that considered?

A Your individual property?

Q Uh-huh.
A I did not look at your individual property on its own, no.

Q Then there's the number and type of agricultural operations impacted. There's dairy, organic, specialty, row crop, et cetera. Why tally the different types of ag operation? What does that accomplish?

A To give an idea of what types of farm operations are being affected. It's just to give another factor that can be considered when analyzing the project.

Q And do some types of agricultural operations have a greater weight than others?

A No.
Q Is -- why is prime agriculture and agriculture land of statewide importance broken out?

A Because prime farmland is more productive than other types of farmland.

Q So would you say that prime farmland and farmland of statewide importance would have a greater weight than others?

A It's just pointing out that they are more productive. It's not giving them a weight.

Q Would a more productive property add more value in terms of farm productivity?

A Presumably.
Q The second page of the AIS states that the applicants and the affected landowners should be aware of and prepared to mitigate the major potential impacts to agriculture, including impacts on crop production, topsoil, and mixing soil compaction, erosion control during construction and restoration, impacts on drainage and irrigations system, impacts on residences, affects on property value, impacts on farm viability and future farm expansions. For each of these, how might they be mitigated?

A You want to go through the list one by one or --
Q Can they all be mitigated? In the interest of time,
would you like to detail those that --
A I think --

MR. LORENCE: Your Honor, I'm going to interject here and object. Her testimony is to describe the impact statement, not the mitigation of. Those are questions better addressed to the applicants.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
MS. KUNZE: To the applicants?
MR. LORENCE: Uh-huh.

MS. KUNZE: Thank you, Mr. Lorence.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: And were covered to a large extent in the hearing already.

MS. KUNZE: Okay.
BY MS. KUNZE:
Q So in the AIS there is talk about the potential of hiring an independent agricultural monitor and inclusions of this requirement as an order point. Is this a foregone conclusion, or is this something that would require further effort?

A If it were ordered, then it would have to -- that person would need to be hired, and I'm not sure what you mean by further effort. Presuming to be hired and learn about the project.

Q Who would order that?

A Commissioners.

Q Okay. Let's see. In looking at that same table that we were looking at earlier, page 3, in looking at the table, where is farmland of statewide importance included?

A I don't believe it's included in that table.

Q Would you agree that due to its shortest length, that Segment A has the lower total right-of-way area?

A Versus B?
Q Yeah, versus the two Bs.

A Yes.
Q Would you agree that despite the shortest distance, Segment A has the highest number of poles in agricultural land?

A Yes.
Q Would you agree that Segment $A$ has the highest percentage of right-of-way land in agriculture at 61.9 percent versus 38.6 and 35.5 percent in the others?

A Yes.

Q Would you agree that Segment $A$ has the highest number of prime farmland acres in the right-of-way?

A Yes.

Q Appendix 3 to the AIS is the full Landowners Bill of Rights, and that's attached to the Ag Impact

Statement as Exhibit A. Should the entire 182.017 be incorporated and not just Subdivision 7?

A Incorporated into?

Q Into the AIS.

A In the future we could do that, yes.

Q Is the Landowner Bill of Rights made part of the utility's permit?

A I don't know.

Q How does a landowner assure compliance with the Landowner Bill of Rights?

A The Commission monitors the project after it's ordered, so that would be beyond my expertise.

Q Will a drain tile inventory be gathered prior to construction on the land?

A As I've said before, we've -- part of our request is that the applicants contact each farmland owner individually if the route -- if the project is approved and question them about their concerns, and one of the questions we would ask them to pursue would be drainage and drain tiles.

Q The crop damage compensation takes three forms. Is damage to crops growing at the time of construction compensable?

A Yes.

Q Is damage to crops due to compaction where soils take
time to recover from compaction compensable, excuse me?

A I don't know.

Q You had mentioned just now that the applicants would interact with the individual farmers and landowners to ascertain what their issues are. Would it not be prudent, would you agree, to weigh in on those concerns to make a complete analysis prior to decision of the route?

A I believe our analysis is thorough. It may not be -it may not touch on every single landowner, but it is thorough.

Q The Landowner Bill of Rights states that the landowner shall not be responsible for injury to persons or property caused by the design construction or upkeep of the high voltage lines or the towers. If the landowner is not, who is?

MR. WILL: Your Honor, that's really sort of a legal hypothetical because it would depend on the circumstances and all sorts of other things, and I don't really think that's an appropriate question for this particular witness.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Yeah, we're going to -- we'll have to skip that question. MS. KUNZE: All right. Fair enough.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: I think as it relates to the Landowner Bill of Rights, there is a process with Commission review of all complaints.

MS. KUNZE: Commission review.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: So I think it would probably be a Commission -- Commission would be involved in that type of matter.

BY MS. KUNZE:

Q So Exhibit $C$ is a certificate of compensation, and after a party is compensated for perpetual easement, where is that filed?

A That's beyond my area of expertise.

Q Okay. And at the end of the AIS, a mailing list is included. How was that determined? How would you determine who's on that mailing list?

A There are some statutory requirements about who's on the mailing list, so that would include the Governor and the chairs of the Assembly and Senate Ag Committees. The AIS is also supposed to be available for public viewing, so we included libraries and county and town clerks so they could put it out for public viewing.

MS. KUNZE: Thank you, Ms. Halpin. No further questions, Your Honor.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. I just wanted to
make sure the Town of Springfield comprehensive plan, how were we -- what was the purpose of introducing that at this point?

MS. KUNZE: That there is an agricultural preservation area within the Town of Springfield that should be considered within AIS.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
MR. POTTS: Your Honor, and I have found it. It is in the application. It's in Appendix A, figure $8-B$, page 10 of 12.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
MR. POTTS: But we have no objection if you want to enter it twice. I just want to note that for the record.

MS. KUNZE: Thank you. I guess it just reflects back on my cross-exam just now in which I asked if it was considered, if they were aware of it.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. We'll leave it in as Halpin 2. You'll just need to file it on ERF.

MS. KUNZE: Thank you.
(Exhibit Halpin 2 received.)

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Other questions, cross questions?

MS. WESTERBERG: I have actually one brief
question.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Go ahead. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. WESTERBERG:
Q Ms. Halpin, Christa Westerberg from Clean Wisconsin. I see in your prefiled testimony you mentioned that organic farms can be affected by the project, and you list some that have been identified by your agency and you state that the applicants should work with the certifiers of any organic property that is crossed so that procedures can be followed that would ensure the farm would maintain certification. Do you recall that testimony you filed?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Would you agree that if herbicide applications occur on properties adjacent to an organic farm, that could affect the organic farm certification potentially?

A Yes.
Q Do you know if there is a procedure in place for notification to the organic farmer prior to herbicides being sprayed in a right-of-way property adjacent to that farm?

A No, I don't know if that is.
Q Would you agree that something like that would be
appropriate in this case to avoid impacts to organic farms?

A Yes, I would agree.
MS. WESTERBERG: Nothing further.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Other cross?
(No response.)
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Redirect?
MR. LORENCE: Is there anything else you'd
like to add?
THE WITNESS: No.
MR. LORENCE: No redirect.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Thanks. You're excused.
(Witness excused.)
EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Who's next?

ROBERT FASICK, WisDOT WITNESS, DULY SWORN

EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right.
DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. LORENCE:

Q Can you state your name for the record.

A Robert Fasick.

Q And where do you work, sir?

A Wisconsin Department of Transportation.
Q In preparation for today's hearing, did you prepare direct and rebuttal testimony?

A That is correct.

Q And did you also file six exhibits?
A Yes.

Q And if you were asked the same questions as in your testimony, would your answers be the same today?

A Yes, they would.
Q And do you have any corrections to your testimony and exhibits?

A I'm sorry, no.

Q Okay. Have you listened to any of the testimony this week?

A Yes.

Q Is there anything you'd like to add before you're available for cross?

A No. Most of it was on need and other things that
weren't pertaining to my part of it, which is routing.

MR. LORENCE: Okay. Mr. Fasick's available for questions.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. WILL:
Q Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Fasick. Trevor Will.
I have a couple questions for you.
A You said three.
Q I know. But I mean three cubed.
In your direct testimony, you identified three locations where the DOT had particular concerns, one was Segment P-East at U.S. Highway 53, County Highway MH interchange. A second one was at the County Highway CS/I-90 interchange between there and the rest area near the Town of Poynette, and the third one was the Fairfield Marsh area, correct?

A Correct.
Q And your rebuttal testimony addresses discussions that were had and an alternative arrangement that was made with the applicants in the Fairfield Marsh area that's now acceptable to the DOT?

A Correct.
Q Have you also had further discussions with the
applicants about the U.S. Highway 53/County Highway MH interchange on Segment P-East?

A Correct.
Q And were the applicants able to propose a realignment there that meets the DOT's concerns?

A Correct. Just at the interchange itself.

Q Yes. Also with respect to the County Highway CH area in the Town of Poynette up to the rest area on the interstates, have you had further discussions with the applicants about the routing in that area?

A Correct. In CS, by the way.
Q I'm sorry, I thought --
A That's all right.
Q Yeah, it is CS.
A I think it's the Town of Dekorra.
Q Yes. Poynette is on the interchange?
A Yes.
Q I apologize. It says Poynette on the signs when you get off the expressway of the interstate at County Highway CS, yes.

All right. In that area, have you had discussions with the applicants about an alternative routing that addresses the DOT's concerns as expressed in your direct testimony?

A Correct.

Q And has there been an alternative proposed that would meet the DOT's concerns?

A Yes, there has been.
MR. WILL: That's all I have for you. Thanks very much, Mr. Fasick.

THE WITNESS: Sure.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Let's go off the record a minute.
(Discussion held off the record.)
EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Get back on the record. More questions?

MS. WESTERBERG: I do have some. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. WESTERBERG:

Q Good morning, Mr. Fasick. Christa Westerberg representing Clean Wisconsin. You mentioned you had been here for some of the prior testimony. Were you here for any testimony regarding potential bird collision in the Leopold-Pine Island Important Bird Area?

A I was online watching everything as much as I could.
Q Okay.
A I heard some of the conversations.
Q Okay. And I want to focus our -- my questions on Segment H adjacent to I-94.

A Okay.
Q Your understanding is that that segment uses at least some Department of Transportation right-of-way, correct?

A Yes.
Q And would it be your understanding that the Badger Coulee line, if Segment $H$ is selected, will be visible from the interstate in that stretch?

A Yes.
Q And you're aware that this Leopold-Pine Island Important Bird Area is this large wetland complex to the north of the interstate there?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Has there been any discussion among Department of Transportation personnel about potential collisions of large bodied birds like cranes with the Badger Coulee line in that area?

A I haven't had anything directly with other staff.
Q Okay. Well, as you may have heard over the last few day, witnesses have testified that that area is frequently used by migratory birds and large volumes of migratory birds in the fall when cranes congregate there, and other witnesses have testified in their prefiled or live that collisions with the lines are likely. Would you have any concern that collisions
between birds in that area in the power line would create a distraction for drivers on the interstate? If those -- if those collisions were to occur, would you have a concern about there being a distraction issue?

A There's so many different distractions that could happen. Car-deer collisions, there could be collisions between semis and birds. I don't know. There are people texting when there shouldn't be, so I really can't say one way or the other. A lot of things are distractions out there, let's just put it that way.

Q Okay. Yeah. And I'm not asking you to compare this as a potential distraction issue to other issues, but if it occurred do you know whether -- let me rephrase.

If those distractions occurred, would they -- if those collisions occurred, would they create a distraction? You don't know?

A I can't answer that because that's up to every human being who's out there driving. I could be out there and doing some driving going straight ahead and not notice something, and then another day it could happen and I could notice it. So I think that's every human being's reaction would either notice it
or not notice it.
MS. WESTERBERG: Okay. I just wanted to note whether that had been discussed. Thank you. THE WITNESS: Sure.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: That's it. More cross? CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. KUNZE:
Q Good morning, Mr. Fasick.
A Good morning.
Q I'm Laura Kunze, self-representing. I just have a few questions. What is the relationship between DOT and FAA and jurisdictions in matters of siting transmission near airports?

A I can't answer that. That's not my area of expertise. I only deal with the highways.

Q Only, okay. So --
A We do have -- let me just explain. My area is with Bureau of Highway Maintenance, and I handle the permitting aspect.

Q Okay.
A And we have our own Bureau of Aeronautics that handles matters with FAA.

Q And that was the Bureau of --
A Aeronautics.

Q So is there a situation where you might not be able
to -- or it might not be prudent to proceed with permitting before a situation is resolved?

MR. LORENCE: Your Honor, could I ask for more clarification?

THE WITNESS: I was going to ask the same thing. What's the situation that's resolved? BY MS. KUNZE:

Q In your direct, page 4, for example on lines 12 through 14, you state that the DOT will not issue a permit and that the line is too close to the northbound structure. Describe a meeting with ATC where they are working on the realignment with this one.

A I'm sorry, which page again?

Q Page 4.
A Okay. Let me get there. 12 to 14 ?

Q Uh-huh.
A Right. That particular issue was just discussed. That particular issue involved -- we have the CapX line that is already on Highway 53 southbound, and the proposal was to put P-East real close to the northbound structure, which would prevent us from getting a crane in there to rebuild the bridge, re-deck it, things of that nature. So we work with the applicants to try to get them to realign that
particular segment such that we could get a -- park a crane in a spot. And I would have to then, which I did, go to our bridge maintenance folks and our bridge design folks and say is this acceptable alignment. So those are the types of issues that come up in these types of transmission line proceedings.

Q Have you reviewed FAA comment and/or review of the project in relation to the airports in the protected area?

A FAA is not my area.
Q Okay, okay. Is there potential for the Department of Transportation denial of permits for structures based on department jurisdiction over airspace?

A Possibly. Again, that's not my area.
Q Possibly, okay. And that would also be the Bureau of Aeronautics, sir?

A Correct.

Q And how would those issues then be discussed or analyzed within the Environmental Impact Statement and other issues?

A I only comment on what affects the highways. And with regards to airports, I'm sure there's -- there's federal and other -- and ATC also probably works with the -- our own Bureau of Aeronautics, and I thought
there was some discussion about our Bureau of Aeronautics being involved. But again, my area is pretty segmented as far as relationship to the highways.

MS. KUNZE: Okay. Thank you for your time, sir.

THE WITNESS: Sure.
MS. KUNZE: No further questions, Your Honor.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Other questions? (No response.)

EXAMINER NEWMARK: No. Just something that came up during the course of the hearing regarding Fort McCoy. I just wanted to make sure we clear up for the record on that. Do you know if Route 90 as it goes through Fort McCoy, is that Department of Transportation easement, or is there some portion that's a permit from the Department of Defense?

THE WITNESS: I actually was paying attention during that part.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Wow. Okay. Someone's paying attention.

THE WITNESS: I e-mailed our bureau -- our real estate person in our Southwest Region La Crosse
office. He has yet to respond. When I do get an answer -- he's going to check on it.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
THE WITNESS: But that is a good question because sometimes we're only there by permit, and that's the case in some Indian territories as well.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Uh-huh. So just inform staff of that.

THE WITNESS: Sure.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: And if -- well, I'll leave it up to staff if they want to supplement the record with that.

THE WITNESS: Do you want me to send something to Mr . Lorence?

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Yeah. Mr. Lorence or Ms. Silver Karsh.

MR. LORENCE: Send it to her.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: I don't know where your e-mails will go, John.

MR. WILL: Could I have a follow-up on that?

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Yeah. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. WILL:

Q Mr. Fasick, are you aware whether the applicants
studied whether the transmission line could fit within the highway right-of-way through Fort McCoy?

A Yes.
Q And then that route was considered and then ultimately not put forward?

A Yes.

MR. WILL: Thank you.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Uh-huh. All right. Any redirect?

MR. LORENCE: I don't believe, unless you want to add anything.

THE WITNESS: The one thing that's in my testimony that the department is still -- has heartburn with is the segments of $P$-East coming out of the Briggs Substation heading towards MH. If we get hemmed in on both sides, it prevents a big conflict for us if we have to expand 53 in that area. So the interchange issue has been resolved, but, you know, having transmission lines on both sides is really a tough bind for us. We can handle it on one side. It's very -- you know, we can expand to the other side if necessary.

So that's the only thing that is still of concern for us, but if we had to go with it, we would work with it as much as we could.

MR. LORENCE: Okay. Thank you.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Thanks. You're excused.
(Witness excused.)
MR. WILL: Excuse me, Your Honor. Could I have just a second off the record.
(Brief break taken.)
MR. POTTS: I think we're finished with you.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Thank you very much.

MR. WILL: Your Honor, we have a witness or two witnesses that can elaborate on your question about the Fort and the analysis of the interstate right-of-way if you want that information on the record. We can put them up on the stand and -EXAMINER NEWMARK: Well, let's go off the record.
(Discussion held off the record.)

TERENCE HENN, APPLICANT WITNESS, DULY SWORN
EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right.
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. WILL:

Q Mr. Henn, you've been asked to come to the stand to address one specific issue. Did the applicants study the possibility of routing the Badger Coulee line along the Interstate 90 right-of-way through Fort McCoy?

A Yes. On both sides in fact.
Q And what did that analysis show?
A The analysis showed that the existing right-of-way where we would need to put the locations of the structures relative to the edge of the pavement, there are rules that we have to follow with the DOT, it's referred to as a clear zone, safety of traffic on the interstate, where the poles would need to be located, the distance away, then the extent of the right-of-way would exceed the available right-of-way that is either owned by easement or permit by the Department of Transportation. So regardless, we would -- we would need rights from the fort as well.

Q So regardless of whether the DOT owns or is there by permit, the right-of-way is too narrow to locate the transmission line there?

A Completely within the DOT right-of-way, correct.
MR. WILL: Thank you.
MS. WESTERBERG: I do have one follow-up on that then. Thanks, Judge.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. WESTERBERG:
Q Are you talking about, Mr. Henn -- Christa Westerberg, Clean Wisconsin -- a specific portion of the right-of-way around Fort McCoy just -- are you talking about just on the portion of the property that is actually owned by Fort McCoy where that would need to happen?

A Primarily for the duration of I-90. Typically unless -- unless the highway right-of-way is extremely wide because there was some anticipated expansion plans in the future, just the extents of the DOT right-of-way is insufficient to contain the required easement for the structures. Especially on an interstate highway because of the speeds of the highway, the clear zone is wider, therefore the poles have to be further from the edge of the pavement, and the right-of-way that we need would extend onto -onto private property.

Q And you in fact ran into this issue also at the Camp Douglas Airport; is that true?

A Volk Field?
Q Yes.

A Yes.
Q Okay. And in that case, isn't it true that the applicants departed from existing right-of-way to route around the airport and the clear zones?

A The -- the principle reason for departing the interstate in the vicinity of Volk Field was the accident potential zone associated with the airfields at Volk Field as well and our interactions with air operations representatives at various open houses from Volk Field indicating the presence of the accident potential zone and that there would be no overhead lines permitable within the accident potential zone.

Q Right. So if you had wanted to route in the area of Fort McCoy along the interstate, you would essentially need to have done what you did at Volk Field to route around the clear zones there, correct?

A Meaning the accident potential zone?

Q Yes.
A But to route around the accident potential zone at Fort McCoy would involve still going on Fort McCoy property in another location.

Q And you stay on -- did you stay off Volk Field
property on that routing?
A We are not on Volk Field property at all to the best of my knowledge.

MS. WESTERBERG: Okay. Thank you.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right.
MR. LORENCE: I have just one follow-up question.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. LORENCE:
Q You just discussed about the problems of using the DOT right-of-way along the interstate and the distance that you would have to keep away from the interstate and that there wasn't enough easement, correct?

A Yes, sir.
Q And so you would have to go partially into -- extend the transmission easement into the private property next to the highway, correct?

A That is correct.
Q And that would be the same whether it was Fort McCoy or an individual landowner, correct?

A That's correct.

MR. LORENCE: Thank you.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Great. Any redirect I guess?

MR. WILL: No.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Thanks. You're excused.
(Witness excused.)

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Who's next?
MS. CORRELL: I think we agree that the
Department of Natural Resources would proceed next.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right.
MS. CORRELL: I'm used to the microphones that don't amplify but record very well. So I'll try to not shout.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: I don't think we'll have a problem with your voice.

MS. CORRELL: Ben Callan.
BENJAMIN CALLAN, WDNR WITNESS, DULY SWORN
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Go ahead.
DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. CORRELL:
Q Good morning, Mr. Callan.
A Good morning.
Q Sorry. Just a second here. You provided direct testimony and sur-surrebuttal, prefiled written testimony in this proceeding; is that correct?

A No. I provided direct testimony and surrebuttal.
Q Oh, excuse me. Thank you for the clarification.
And if you provided the testimony that you submitted in writing here today, would your testimony be any different?

A To my direct, there would be a couple of changes. To my surrebuttal, I would not change anything.

Q Could you clarify what -- what additions you might like to have on the record here today?

A Sure. On page 10 of my direct testimony, lines 9 and 10, I indicate in my direct that the in-lieu fee program is currently not an option for mitigation, and that is no longer the case. In other words, it is an option for mitigation.

And then there are three similar questions
and answers regarding the process to grant the utility easement across state property. The first one on page 11. The answer is lines 19 through 22. I would change that answer to read, Since federal money through the National Park Services Land and Water Conservation Fund was used in acquiring Mirror Lake State Park, the DNR works directly with the National Park Service and the applicants to ensure that the project will minimize and mitigate any conversion of recreational use on Mirror Lake State Park.

A similar response would be provided on page 12, lines 13 through 16: Since federal money through the National Park Service Land and Water Conservation Fund was used in acquiring these trails, the DNR works directly with the National Park Service and applicants to ensure that the project minimizes and mitigates any conversion of recreational use.

And then the similar response, page 13, lines 10 through 13: Since federal money through the National Park Service Land and Water Conservation Fund was used in acquiring Black River State Forest, the DNR works directly with the National Park Service and the applicants to ensure that the
project minimizes and mitigates any conversion of recreational use on the Black River State Forest.

Q Do you have anything else you want to add at this time on direct?

A

MS. CORRELL: I tender the witness for cross-examination.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Questions?
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. POTTS:

Q Mr. Callan, my name is Brian Potts. I represent American Transmission Company. I just have one line of questioning. Are you -- I believe in your testimony you referenced the Mirror Lake State Park re-route that was -- was entered into the record by the applicants?

A Yes.
Q And does the DNR support that re-route?

A In my discussions with the superintendent for Mirror Lake State Park, they've indicated a preference to locate the line such that it would maintain buffer between the transmission line and the interstate.

Q And so does the DNR have any opinion on that specifically?

A As you'll note, there's some criteria or conditions
associated with that, including the potential relocation of the state trail or a trail that's on the state park property. If those criteria are met and the applicant -- the project's approved and the -- that route is selected, then -- and the applicants are willing to accommodate those other provisions regarding that relocation, then yes.

MR. POTTS: Okay. Thanks. THE WITNESS: You're welcome. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. WESTERBERG:

Q Good morning, Mr. Callan. Christa Westerberg, Clean Wisconsin. Have you reviewed the testimony of Mr. Henn on behalf of the applicants?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And do you recall the portion on page 7 of his rebuttal testimony where he stated that the applicants are -- would like the Commission to order that they only need to obtain permits for the portion of the line that they're working on rather than ordering that all permits be obtained before construction can commence? Does that ring a bell?

A It sounds familiar. I can't say it's very clear in my head, but yeah.

Q Yeah, okay. And Mr. Henn testified on Tuesday that
by portion of the line they're working on, he meant construction segment, the segments the applicants have designated for construction, grouping portions of the existing routes within those segments. I can show you. It's been marked as Exhibit 5 for Mr. Henn.

May I, Judge?
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Yes.
BY MS. WESTERBERG:
Q So you should be looking at the chart on Exhibit 5 of mister -- of Henn Exhibit 5 indicating the construction segments. Have you seen those before?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And have the applicants discussed with you the possibility of getting permits segment by segment rather than in advance of construction of the entire line?

A No, I wouldn't say permits.
Q Can you explain your answer?
A When -- if the Commission orders a route, and the Department is responsible for issuing a permit by law within 30 days of that order, that's our permit decision. There may be additional requirements of that permit for information to be submitted and approved by the Department at a later date, and that
would be my understanding of those construction and mitigation plan approvals being segmented after a permit decision is made.

Q Okay. So to the extent we're talking about a Chapter 30 permit or a wetland permit, it should be addressed within 30 days of the order anyway; is that your testimony?

A That's a requirement.
Q Yeah. And then to the extent there are other approvals or reviews required by the DNR, they would be done at the time of the construction segment; is that your understanding?

A When -- when the project is ordered, it's my understanding that the applicants then spend their time and effort going through final design and construction planning, including erosion control planning, potentially addressing any other sensitive species habitat issues. What I deal with is issuance of the waterway and wetland permit, and the permit that I issue comes out 30 days after the order is issued, and those other decision-making documents may come at a later date and then supplement -supplemental to the Chapter 30 and wetland permit would be the submittal of construction and mitigation plans, which would also require approval from the

Department.
Q Does the Department have any position on whether all of those approvals should be issued prior to construction commencing on any portion of the line versus by construction segment, or can you say that sitting here today?

A I -- I don't know if -- I don't have an opinion specifically on that question. I mean, I'm very familiar with the waterway and wetland component of it. Areas beyond that, other DNR staff can -- can help later in today's proceedings. But regarding what you've handed me and the schedule that's laid out there, I don't know if there are other concerns or issues with approvals beyond what I'm directly involved in.

Q I want to direct your attention to your prefiled testimony on page 2 where you state on line 9 that you participated in pre-application meetings.

MS. CORRELL: You're looking at the direct testimony I assume?

MS. WESTERBERG: Yes. Thank you.
BY MS. WESTERBERG:
Q And can you just describe for me at the time you participated in those pre-application meetings, were the proposed routes that we see now, the northern and
southern routes, more or less identified by the applicants?

A And it depends on when we talk about the pre-application. I believe at some point the study area for the project expanded, so I would say that the northern segments of $N$ and $P$ may not have been on those earlier pre-application meetings, but at some point those corridors were refined to routes, yes.

Q Okay. And was the Department consulted on essentially the best ways to get from Point $A$, being La Crosse, to Point B, being Middleton?

A I wouldn't characterize the inquiries in that way. I would say that corridors were identified that were being presented by the applicants for feedback from the Department, but generally those are on a higher level. You don't get down to a lot of detail. There was no inquiry, to the best of my knowledge, about, you know, how would you get from Point $A$ to Point $B$ or $B-1, B-2, B-3$.

Q Okay. Was a routing option presented to you that traveled more directly from essentially the Onalaska area to Tomah like we see in Mr. Mosca's Exhibit 8?

A I would have to look at some of those earlier maps, but I believe that there were corridors identified in those areas.

Q Did the Department at that time present an opinion about whether that would be a good route option as opposed to something that goes as far south as Segment $O$ ?

A
I don't specifically recall providing feedback like that.

Q Okay. Ms. Parrett I believe mentioned in her sur-surrebuttal testimony that in NR 216, the applicants will follow NR 216 for storm water purposes. Do you recall that testimony?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And under NR 216, can you briefly describe what the reseeding requirements are for disturbed areas?

A It's a little beyond my area of expertise since $I$ do waterway and wetland permitting, and there is a separate erosion control permitting process for a project like this, but $I$ believe there are technical standards, best management practices, for re-vegetation that could be applied. And in general, when an area has the potential to affect the waterway or wetland, we include specific conditions in our waterway and wetland permit to address those erosion concerns.

Q Okay. We're in an area that is not a wetland, a more
upland area. Do you know under NR 216 how long the area is required to be monitored for an erosion control permit?

A I believe it's until it's re-vegetated to a density of 70 percent.

Q And that could happen in a matter of months in certain areas, correct?

A Potentially.
Q Yeah. Once the 70 percent cover is obtained, does the DNR have any continuing oversight over re-vegetation efforts in those upland areas?

A There's a number of factors in upland areas that could come into play in a scenario like that. If it's on state property, yes. If there's a state easement in an area, yes. If there's some other, maybe. And there will be additional DNR staff that may address this. If there's a requirement under an incidental take authorization, then there may be additional requirements beyond just meeting that 70 percent threshold.

Q So other than those three situations you just identified, DNR would not have any continuing oversight over reseeding efforts in upland areas?

A I can't say that.
Q Okay. You just don't know one way or the other?

A I mean, I imagine that there's other factors that could come into play that just aren't coming to mind right now.

Q Okay. So suffice it to say, there will be areas where the DNR does not have continuing oversight over reseeding areas once that 70 percent cover is obtained, fair?

MR. POTTS: I guess I'll object. He just testified that he doesn't really know. I mean, he's not -- he's the wetland and waterway permitting guy, and she's asking about reseeding.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: He seems to know a lot anyway, so let's let him answer.

MS. CORRELL: And I think you also, just for clarification, on the record misspoke because you said he wasn't the wetland --

MR. POTTS: He is the wetland and waterway permitting, he's not the storm water expert. Thank you.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: To the extent you know. THE WITNESS: I'd just agree with what the judge said, I know a lot.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
THE WITNESS: Could you please repeat the question?

MS. WESTERBERG: Yes. Could you read it back, please.
(RECORD READ.)
THE WITNESS: Yes.

BY MS. WESTERBERG:
Q Does the DNR require native seeding as part of storm water -- as part of the storm water permit re-vegetation?

A That's beyond my permitting authority.
Q Okay. Did the DNR assign a permit -- a storm water permit specialist to this case?

A Yes.

Q And have they been in -- well, strike that.
What have they done so far?

A They've received a preliminary application, which is essentially on hold until a route decision is made by the Commission. And if it's approved, then the route is selected, and then once the final erosion control plans are developed, they would provide their feedback on that before issuing a decision.

Q All right. Have you been here for the discussions -you reviewed the prefiled testimony of Mr . Mosca and Dr. Howe for Clean Wisconsin?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Do you recall, I think Dr. Howe in particular
is concerned that there will be a high risk of sediment runoff into streams in the Coulee area where there is ground disturbance. Does that ring a bell?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Will -- and that primary concern there being the topography being so steep and the presence of $a$ lot of streams at the -- in the valleys between the hills. Do you recall that?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And you would agree that it would be a concern if sediment did make its way into those waterways?

A Absolutely.
Q Okay. Is the primary regulatory tool that the DNR has to deal with that issue the storm water permit?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And will the primary means to address that issue -- the primary way the storm water permit will address that issue, will that be through the use of best management practices?

A That would be the main mechanism. That's not the only mechanism. Part of that process does require the submission of or development of an erosion control plan, and a plan is required to meet the minimum standards but they often exceed those minimum standards.

Q Would you foresee the need for the plan to exceed the minimum standards in this case given the topography?

A I think that's beyond my area of authority.
Q As the storm water management specialist assigned to this case, have you determined what BMPs are appropriate for this area yet?

A I haven't discussed that with them directly. So you couldn't say right now whether the DNR will require any specific measures to address construction water or storm water runoff into the streams in the Coulee area?

A Well, in the waterway and wetland permit where we have authority, if the line is approved and so that route is selected, then we would have conditions in that permit, and then there would also be requirements in the erosion control permit, but I don't know what those necessarily standards would be because I haven't seen their final erosion control plan.

Q The first permit you mentioned would essentially address disturbance that occurs right next to the stream, correct?

A For the most part, correct.
Q I'm going to show you just briefly Howe Exhibit 18. Sorry, not 18, 11.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's go off the record.
(Discussion held off the record.)
BY MS. WESTERBERG:
Q And I'll represent this is a photo that Dr. Howe took near an existing -- new and existing right-of-way near the proposed Segment N. Would you have any concern that -- that this is basically denuded hillside is not covered in any way?

A Potentially. It's a snapshot so, you know, there are even built into the erosion control standard limits on amount of time an area can be exposed and what the appropriate response is. So depending on factors that you can't tell from the picture, it could be a concern or it might be just one step in the process.

Q Okay. So you would agree that a condition like this would generally need to be addressed under the storm water permit?

A Yeah.
Q I'm going to ask a different question about springs. The final EIS discusses potential impact to springs, primarily around Segment O. Do you recall that discussion?

A Somewhat, yes.
Q Okay. So on page 32. And it mentions that the area
of Wisconsin with the highest concentration of springs is the driftless area, and there are many known springs between the Town of Leon and Elroy in Segment O. Are you geographically with me?

A So far.
Q Okay. Would you agree that springs in this area are the source for a lot of trout streams, do you know?

A In combination with other groundwater discharge, sure.

Q Uh-huh. Okay. And would you agree that construction of, let's say, a large pole for a transmission line could potentially disrupt the streams -- the springs' hydrology?

A I haven't experienced that in my time working with utility projects.

Q Would you agree there's a possibility that construction of any large project could divert or change direction of a water course that feeds a spring?

A Depending on location, that's possible.
Q Would the change to spring hydrogeology require any sort of permit from the DNR?

A Normally if there's a proposal to place either temporary or permanent fill in a wetland area, which more than likely would apply for an area that has a
spring or groundwater discharge, then there are conditions that we implement in our permit decision to minimize the long-term deleterious effects from that project.

Q So in that -- in that -- so you can think of one situation where it would require a permit and that being the wetland fill situation?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Otherwise does the DNR have any oversight over that issue that you're aware of?

A It's possible. Off the top of my head I can't give you an answer to that.

Q Okay. Mr. Mosca in his testimony discussed the use of CECPS. Are you familiar with that term?

A I recall reading it in his testimony.
Q Are you familiar with the use of CECPs in the CapX case?

A I was --
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Can you just explain what that is for the record.

MS. WESTERBERG: Oh, acronym.
Construction Erosion Compliance Plan, I believe. Let me double-check that. I had a note, and I can't find it. Construction Environmental Compliance Plans.

BY MS. WESTERBERG:

Q Is that your understanding of the acronym?
A Yes.
Q Okay. And did -- do you recall whether those Construction Environmental Compliance Plans were used for -- to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements for wetlands in the CapX case?

A I wasn't directly involved with the CapX project from the Department's perspective.

Q Okay. Do you understand that the applicants will be submitting some form of detailed assessment plan -detailed assessment and plan for construction for each wetland involved in this case once a route is chosen?

A I would say for each wetland that's affected by the project, those plans would be compiled into, you know, a certain number of distinct documents, and we anticipate that for this project should it get approved.

Q Okay. One second. So even if it's not called a CECP, the DNR will require preparation of some similar document for Badger Coulee?

A Absolutely.
Q Okay. In portions of wetlands that are not directly impacted by, say, placement of a pole but are used
for construction access, will the DNR require restoration of those areas, for example if there's rutting or some other impact?

A Once an order is made and permit is issued, we would have authority over all of the wetlands that are affected by the project. So whether it's primary impact of fill or secondary impact of driving through it to access a location, and if there's disturbance associated with the construction in those areas, then it would -- there would be some requirement to ensure that it's restored to the previous locations.

Q Is that considered a temporary or permanent impact or neither?

A What impact?

Q The construction access.

A It -- it in general is considered a temporary impact unless we're talking about forested wetlands. Then we consider that a conversion, more of a permanent impact.

MS. WESTERBERG: Okay. Thank you.

Nothing else, Judge.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Other
questions?
(No response.)

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Redirect?

MS. CORRELL: Yeah, I just have a couple questions on redirect.

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. CORRELL:

Q You were asked a few questions by counsel from Clean Wisconsin regarding, you know, for lack of a better term, a more direct route or a more central route to the northern and southern routes in this proceeding, something -- maybe not specifically the modified Route O provided by Mosca, but loosely something in that general vicinity. I just wanted to clarify a little bit further what your personal knowledge and experience was in regards to preliminary routing plans. So if you could, just explain what your involvement was in terms of plans that included routes in the areas that we've been discussing.

A From the pre-application perspective?
Q Correct.

A In those situations, the applicant or applicants could bring information to a meeting with state agencies generally describing some of the areas that we're looking at. I believe they referred to them as corridors at that point, fairly high-level overview, and there -- it's my understanding they're taking into account many of the factors that go beyond the
environmental issues associated with siting transmission lines and putting those corridors together and either determining whether or not they're viable routes for an application.

So during those pre-application meetings, they're fairly broad view, high-level maps and information. There aren't a lot of details regarding specific locations or routes in regard to many of the issues beyond just environmental. So we take that opportunity to provide what information we can as an agency to help try and guide the applicants to presenting something that would be permitable in their application.

Q Are you provided the maps prior to the pre-application meetings typically?

A Generally not.
Q In this particular case were you provided maps prior to the meeting?

A I don't recall seeing maps before we actually sat down at meetings.

Q Did you have information -- I guess just to be a little more specific on what you mean by not detailed, did you have sufficient information to analyze whether or not routes would either raise concerns -- raise DNR concerns or permitability
issues?

A I wouldn't say we had the level of detail we need to make those decisions. During the pre-application process, it's not quite that detailed. The discussions, it's bigger-picture items, large environmental -- environmentally sensitive areas, large complex state parks, state trails, those kinds of things.

Q And then following the type of pre-application meeting that you've described, would the Department then have additional time to review those maps and provide feedback?

A I -- my recollection is that we don't keep the information at that point because it's all preliminary draft, and $I$ think that it's just a matter of waiting until the next opportunity to see how things change or how corridors get refined.

MS. CORRELL: Okay. Thank you. THE WITNESS: Sure.

MS. CORRELL: I have nothing further. EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Now let's go off the record.
(Discussion held off the record.)
EXAMINER NEWMARK: So let's get back on the record. Let me make sure we're all on the same
page in terms of the corrections Mr. Callan offered to his direct testimony. Are there any objections? (No response.)

EXAMINER NEWMARK: No, okay. We'll expect those corrections in as a new version of his direct. Okay.

MR. POTTS: Your Honor, we did have just a little bit of cross in response.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Go ahead.

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. POTTS:

Q Mr. Callan, I'm Brian Potts. I represent American Transmission Company. You just had a discussion with your counsel about the pre-application meetings, and I think you were also asked by Clean Wisconsin's counsel. Do you remember those discussions?

A I do.

Q There were multiple meetings, pre-application meetings with the applicants; isn't that right?

A Absolutely.

Q And there were also discussions with the applicants about the routing that were outside of the meetings as well?

A Correct.

Q And the applicants in fact changed their routing
based on some of the DNR's comments, correct?
A Pre-application?
Q Yes.

A It's possible. I -- I don't recall the extent of all of the discussions that took place and all of the different variations of corridors and routes.

Q Well, let me give you an example. For example, in the area around the Elroy-Sparta Trail, do you know which area I'm referring to?

A Yes, I do.
Q And did the DNR have concerns with routing in that area?

A Yes, we did.
Q And did the applicants remove those corridors from consideration after those discussions with the DNR?

A Yes. Those -- those segments were dropped. I don't recall when, if that was -- you know, what point during the process that the applicants dropped those proposals.

MR. POTTS: Okay. We have nothing further.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
MS. WESTERBERG: Can I have one
clarification also?

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Sure, why not.

MS. WESTERBERG: I'm sorry.
RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. WESTERBERG:
Q Mr. Callan, I just want to make sure I understand your testimony. So you're saying that the pre-application process, DNR staff are invited to a meeting and presented with some maps for the first time showing potential routes; is that essentially the first step?

A It's part of the pre-application process. I don't know if it's the first step.

Q Okay. And so at those meetings you're then asked essentially for your opinion on the routes that have been presented?

A It's a little more than that. It's an explanation of why these segments or corridors are on the map and why some are not, and a whole group of reasoning to support that, and kind of an update or a narrative process of where we are in that -- in their planning process.

Q Okay. But you were not -- as I understand it, you were not asked your opinion -- you were not asked for your opinion on possible other routes such as a more direct route between the Sparta and Tomah areas?

A I wouldn't say I'm not asked my opinion. I think
there's an opportunity to provide feedback. Whether or not there's a specific question of what's your opinion of how to get here, I don't know that that's true.

MS. WESTERBERG: Okay. That's all I have.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Anything else?

MS. CORRELL: NO.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Thanks. You're excused.
(Witness excused.)

MS. CORRELL: Stacy Howe -- Stacy Rowe.
STACY ROWE, WDNR WITNESS, DULY SWORN

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. CORRELL:

Q You provided written testimony in this proceeding.

A Correct.
Q Is that correct?

A Yes.
Q And would your testimony be the same here today if you were to present oral testimony?

A Yes.

Q Do you have any corrections to that testimony that you'd like to --

A No, I do not.
Q Were you present yesterday for the testimony of Dr. Howe?

A Yes, I was.
Q And would you concur with his statement that the Commission should provide an order point to -- for the applicants to conduct additional rare species surveys?

A Yes, I would agree with that, especially where we do not have rare species data currently.

MS. CORRELL: I would tender the witness
for cross-examination.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. I just want to make sure, you're Stacy Howe?

THE WITNESS: Rowe.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Rowe, okay.
THE WITNESS: R-O-W-E.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Now I'm confused.
R-O-W-E, okay.
Questions?
MS. WESTERBERG: I have a couple. Do
you --
MR. POTTS: I don't have any.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Go ahead.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. WESTERBERG:
Q Good morning, Ms. Rowe. I am Christa Westerberg with
Clean Wisconsin.
A Hi.

Q I was wondering, on page 14 of your direct testimony
you indicate that surveys will likely be needed for
the Northern Long-Eared Bat, Eastern Massasauga
Rattlesnake, and Bullhead?
A Correct.
Q And the Eastern Massasauga is state-endangered?
A Currently, yes.

Q And you mentioned it's about to be federally listed this year?

A Correct.
Q You said a federal Incidental Take Permit would be required for construction of the line that the species is found as part of the surveys, right?

A That would be dependent on what Fish and Wildlife Service says.

Q Sure. Not your call, understood.
A Yep.

Q Can the state issue its own Incidental Take Permit if it's found?

A Not if it's a federal-listed species. We would go to the Fish and Wildlife Service for that.

Q Okay. So basically once the -- is it your testimony that once it's federally listed, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service takes over?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Assuming it is not listed by the federal government and it is -- remains a state endangered species, could the state issue its own Incidental Take Permit for that species?

A Yes.

Q Okay. That -- I had a question about that. Isn't it true under the state's protocol for the Eastern

Massasauga that the species is so endangered that an Incidental Take Permit can't be granted?

A It could be granted assuming that the entire -- or the population of the Eastern Massasauga is not going to be threatened because of the current project that's being proposed.

MS. WESTERBERG: Okay. May I approach, Judge?

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Yep.
MS. WESTERBERG: I unfortunately don't have these stapled.

BY MS. WESTERBERG:

Q Okay. I've just handed you what's titled Protocol For Incidental Take Authorization, Eastern Massasauga Rattlesnake, dated June of 2011.

A Uh-huh.

Q Do you recognize this document?
A Yes. And I should clarify that this protocol is for -- is the grassland/savanna protocols, and it's only specific for certain grassland/savanna management activities.

Q Okay. And are any of those environments present on the Badger Coulee route?

A The habitats you mean?

Q Yes.

A Yes.
Q Okay. And at the top on the third page of this document, the -- it states, since there are no apparently stable Massasauga populations in Wisconsin and each individual is deemed critically important to species survival, no incidental take is allowed. Do you see that?

A No, I do not. At the top of the document?
Q Page 3.
A Oh.
Q My apologies.
A That would be for incidental take. They would allow for an incidental take, in this case an authorization, not a permit, because it's being authorized by a state agency. So my understanding -I'm not the incidental take coordinator for the Department, but my understanding is that we would allow for an install take authorization for the species.

Q Can you explain why that -- I'm not understanding your answer. Why that would be in light of what the guidance says?

A I guess I wouldn't have that information because I'm not the incidental take coordinator.

Q Okay. So sitting here today, you can't tell me
whether incidental take would be allowed for the Eastern Massasauga in this situation?

A I could say I've had discussions with both the species expert and the incidental take coordinator for the Department, and I have no reason to believe why an incidental take authorization would not be allowed.

Q Okay. Did you specifically discuss this language with them in the protocols?

A No. We did not look at the grass and savanna protocols because the activities that are being proposed do not fall under these protocols.

Q And why is that?
A For the construct, because they're -- it's specific to grasslands/savanna management, and my understanding is it's for the -- a construction of a utility line.

Q Okay. And do you know whether similar protocols would occur for -- well, let me back up.

Do you know whether similar protocols would apply for this line?

A We don't have any standard protocols for construction. It all is very project specific.

Q Okay. And regardless of what kind of project we're discussing, I mean, the fact is still that there are
no apparently stable Massasauga populations in Wisconsin, and each individual is deemed critically important. I mean, that's true whether that's grassland/savanna management or a power line?

A Yes, that's correct.
Q The -- so in light of that fact, you think an install take permit would still be granted for this power line?

A It would really depend on the activities where the poles are being placed, the specific habitat on the ground, time of year. It would really depend. It would be very site specific.

Q Okay. And does that further re-enforce the need for survey of that species?

A Correct. Yes.
Q I'm going to show you Henn Exhibit 5. I'll represent that these are the construction segments proposed by the applicant, essentially the month and year the applicants intend to construct the routes depending on which route is selected. Are you with me on that?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Have the applicants discussed those construction segments with you or with anyone in the natural resources department?

A I am aware of that timeline, yes.

Q Okay. Have you discussed with the applicants whether these -- the time periods planned for construction conflict with avoidance periods for any endangered resources along the route?

A We have not had those discussions until the project has been approved and a route has been selected.

Q Okay. So it could be that the time periods for construction will in fact conflict with the avoidance periods for some species?

A There's potential, yes.

MS. WESTERBERG: Okay. That's all I've got. Thanks, Judge.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Nothing? Anyone else with cross?
(No response.)
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Redirect.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. CORRELL:

Q I guess I'd just like to clarify with regard to the Incidental Take Permits. To the best of your ability, since as you've already testified you're not the permitter for Incidental Take Permits, when would those permits be issued?

A We would want them issued probably the same year that the project's going to start.

Q Okay. And as you were just asked, if you can answer this question, if there were a conflict regarding avoidance, are there mechanisms in the Incidental Take Permit to address conflicts with construction schedule and seasonal concerns for specific species, be it the Eastern Massasauga or other rare species?

A Yes. There are mechanisms within the permit and authorization to do it, whether it's time of day restrictions or if we need to mitigate for the species. There's a variety of mechanisms to do that.

Q So it's fair to say then it's possible that, if necessary, slight deviations from the construction schedule would be required by the Department?

A Correct.
MS. CORRELL: Okay. That's all I have on redirect. Thank you.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. You're excused.
(Witness excused.)

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's go off the record.
(Discussion held off the record.)

EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Let's take Ms. Steele. YOYI STEELE, WDNR WITNESS, DULY SWORN

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Have a seat.
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. CORRELL:

Q Good morning, Ms. Steele.
A Good morning.
Q You've provided both direct and surrebuttal prefiled written testimony in this proceeding?

A That's correct.
Q And with respect to that testimony, would you provide the same testimony here today?

A Yes, I would.
Q Do you have any other clarifications that you'd like to add to your testimony?

A I do have one clarification to surrebuttal. This would be on page 3 of my surrebuttal, lines 6 through 14 regarding use of $H$-frame structures on the portion of subSegment H5 that is directly west of where Leopold-Pine Island Important Bird Area begins. So in this -- when I answered this question in surrebuttal, I said that we would recommend the use of $H$-frame structures along that portion, and I just want to clarify that we would
like those structures to begin where the interstate crosses County Highway A, so just to be clear.

Q And those structures then would -- strike that.

Would it be your recommendation for those structures to continue for additional segments of $H$ ?

A Just from -- so from the subsegment of H 5 that begins where the interstate crosses Highway A then to proceed as has already been -- where the applicants have already expressed a willingness to employ them throughout where the route would fall adjacent to the Leopold IBA.

Q And to clarify that section for the record, could I have you refer to what's been marked PSC reference number 201149, please?

A
Yes.

Q Is this what -- I'm referring to what's been marked 201149.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let me just interrupt a second. Is there an exhibit number for that? MS. CORRELL: It is an attachment to a response, data response, which is -THE WITNESS: That's 201143? MS. CORRELL: Yes. PSC Reference No. 201143.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's go off the
record.
(Discussion held off the record.)
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's get on the record. We'll refer to it as Henn 2 and then the response number, which is?

MR. POTTS: 01.52.
THE WITNESS: 1.52 .

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
MS. CORRELL: I'm sorry. So are we referring to the response as Henn 2 or the maps that are attached as Henn 2?

MR. POTTS: Henn 2 incorporates all the data request responses, so any time you cite a data request response, you would say Henn 2 and then number of data request response and attachments.

MS. CORRELL: Oh, okay.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Thanks. Go ahead.

BY MS. CORRELL:

Q Okay. So to clarify for the record, referred you to a map that's already been marked in the record as Exhibit Henn 2, response to data request 1.52 .

A That's right.
Q Do you have that in front of you?
A I do.

MS. WESTERBERG: Counsel, I'm sorry. Just
for clarification, at the top of the map it should say which -- it's 01.52 dash --

MR. POTTS: 01.520.

THE WITNESS: Dash 5 in this case.

MS. WESTERBERG: Thank you. It's in tiny letters at the very top of the image.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. So let's give the entire citation at least once in one place in the record.

THE WITNESS: So it would be Henn 2, Response 01.52, attachment -5. Is that --

MS. WESTERBERG: I'm with you. Thank you.

MS. CORRELL: I'll trust you. I can't read that right now. It's too small.

MR. POTTS: Could I ask a clarifying question? Is the portion we're talking about all within H5?

MS. CORRELL: It's not. The map that is provided -- that's what I'm going to clarify on the record.

MR. POTTS: Okay. BY MS. CORRELL:

Q So could you elaborate as to your understanding of what this map provides?

A What this map provides?

Q Right. In terms of the discussion we were having regarding the location of H -frame structures.

A Sure. My understanding is that that map represents what the applicants indicated would be feasible bird collision mitigation strategies for the Leopold-Pine Island Important Bird Area. So the map contains some color coding along the different segments to represent the different strategies, and along the portion of subSegment $H 5$ that is west of where the IBA begins, they indicated a willingness and feasibility for line marking devices. A little bit to the east where the IBA actually begins they indicated a willingness to employ line marking and avian mitigation structures, so --

Q Just to clarify --
A -- that's what the map represents.
Q When you refer to avian mitigation structures, are those the same as the H-frame structures that you said before?

A That is my understanding, yes.
Q Okay.
A So the clarification to my surrebuttal where I said that they should -- that it's my recommendation that the avian mitigation structures be employed west of where the IBA begins, we would like those to begin
where County Highway A crosses the interstate, or where the interstate crosses County Highway A, from that point to the east.

Q And to the east, what segments does that include?
A So that would include the rest of H 5 and then through Segment H7, so to the end of H7.

Q Referring to what's been marked Exhibit Henn 2, Attachment 1.52-9 now, it should be a diagram that's titled Avian Impact Alternatives General Drawings, Badger Coulee, Exhibit 3?

A Too many papers. You said 9?
Q Yes. 1.52-9.
A Okay, okay.
Q Is that -- is this -- strike that.
What is your understanding of the $H$-frame
structure that's provided on M2, Attachment 1.52-9?
A My understanding is that this is a depiction of a typical H-frame structure.

Q Were you present yesterday in the hearing room to have the opportunity to hear the testimony of

Ms. Parrett?
A Yes, I was.
Q And so you heard the dialogue regarding structure height where $H$-frame structures would be included?

A Was that yesterday or was it the day before? It
seems like it was maybe the day before, in which case I was watching through the live broadcast but I was not present in the hearing room.

Q Yes, I think you're right. Okay. But you did have the opportunity to hear the entirety of her testimony?

A I did.
Q And you do -- you are familiar with the discussion that was had regarding the height of structures?

A Yes.
Q Specifically the H-frame structures adjacent or near the Leopold-Pine Island IBA?

A Yes.
Q Do you have an opinion regarding the height of the structures in addition to or to further elaborate upon your testimony you already submitted in writing?

A I guess what $I$ can say is that it's my understanding that 85 feet is the typical height of an H-frame structure. For the purposes of avian mitigation or for collisions, we would -- our preference is that the structures be as short as they possibly can with the understanding that 85 feet is the typical height, but that there may be modifications. I would say that our request is that they be as short as possible.

Q And do you have any recommendations for the Commission regarding the extent of use of H -frame structures adjacent to this particular IBA?

A Our recommendation to the Commission would be to include in the order that H-frames be employed from the points that I've just described, subSegment H5 that's west of the IBA start on County Highway A to end of H 7 .

Q And do you have any recommendation to the Commission regarding the height of the structure that should be in play?

A That they be as short as possible is my recommendation.

Q And you're not an engineer, right?
A I am not an engineer.
Q So you understand that there are feasibility issues?
A I understand that. I understand that I don't understand everything that goes into tower design and things that may influence tower structure, so it would not be possible for me to say -- to give a specific height, but merely to say that I understand that 85 feet is a typical height, and that to maximize the mitigation of avian collision, that the structures should be as short as possible.

Q Did you have the opportunity to review the
sur-surrebuttal submitted by ATC Witness Lorenz?
A Yes, I did.
Q Give you a minute to find that.
A I have it.
Q I'll refer you to page 1 at line 15 and to the end of the page, line 24.

A Okay.
Q Did you review this testimony?
A I did.
Q What's your understanding of -- or could you summarize your understanding of the testimony that's provided?

A By Mr. Lorenz?
MS. CORRELL: Yeah.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Could you what?
MS. CORRELL: Could you summarize.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: No, no. We don't need to summarize.

MS. CORRELL: Okay.
THE WITNESS: I did review the testimony, yes.

BY MS. CORRELL:
Q Okay. And it's your understanding that not only has ATC provided information that an 85 -foot structure is a typical structure, but it is feasible to be built
in the areas that we've had ongoing conversations about utilizing that mitigation method?

A Yes, that is my understanding.
Q Have you had an opportunity to review a letter submitted by the Leopold-Pine Island Important Bird Area dated January 5, 2015 and PSC Reference No. 229099?

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Let's go off the record.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have.
(Discussion held off the record.)
EXAMINER NEWMARK: That will be eventually made part of Weiss 3. It's probably a good idea just -- we'll reference it with the PSC number at this point, so that was fine.

Go ahead.

BY MS. CORRELL:
Q So you have had the opportunity to review what is now going to be referenced as PSC Reference No. 229099?

A Yes, I have.

Q Do you have an opinion in your role -- in DNR's regulatory role regarding the requests made in the comment letter?

A It's my opinion that -- that what the Leopold-Pine Island IBA partnership is requesting to be included
and eliminated, and the order should be included or eliminated.

Q Do you have any recommendations regarding whether or not the Department should be involved in developing an avian mitigation plan?

A Yes, I do. It's my opinion that the Department should be consulted on the avian mitigation plan, that the Leopold-Pine Island IBA partnership should be consulted on the mitigation plan, and that they also approve the mitigation plan.

Q When you say they should approve?
A The Leopold-Pine Island IBA partnership and the DNR as part of that partnership.

Q And what about the DNR as a separate regulatory entity rather than simply a partner within the Leopold-Pine Island Important Bird Area partnership?

A Yes.

Q Could you speak to specific concerns that you think should be addressed in the avian management plan?

A The avian mitigation plan.
Q I'm sorry, avian mitigation plan.
A Yes. The avian mitigation plan should address strategy -- multiple strategies to mitigate collision risk, including structure height, line height, line configuration, and line visibility.

Q Are there specific areas that you have the most concern regarding a mitigation plan going forward?

A My concerns as I've identified in my testimony would be regarding the Important Bird Areas that are along the proposed routes.

Q Is there anything in the Pine Island -- Leopold-Pine Island letter that's inconsistent with your opinion?

A No.

MS. CORRELL: Just a moment. I think I'm done.

BY MS. CORRELL:
Q I guess one more. The small issue is it sounds like there was agreement from Ms. Parrett as an expert in the field of ornithology as you are that standard guidelines provided by the APLIC are considered best practice in the field of mitigation of avian collisions?

A Yes.
Q Is that correct?
A You're referring to APLIC guidelines?
Q Correct.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's go off the record for a minute.
(Discussion held off the record.)
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Go ahead.

BY MS. CORRELL:
Q And do you have any recommendations for the Commission regarding which publication of the APLIC guidelines should be utilized --

A Yes, I do.
Q -- or in this proceeding?
A Regarding mitigation of avian collision, the most recent guidelines were published in 2012, and those should be the ones referred to and utilized. And regarding electrocution mitigation for birds, the 2006 are the most recent and are the ones that should be referred to.

MS. CORRELL: I would tender the witness for cross-examination.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Let's go off the record for a minute.
(Discussion held off the record.)
EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. More questions?

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. POTTS:
Q Ms. Steele, my name is a Brian Potts. I represent American Transmission Company in this case. You understand that the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin determines the alignment, structure type,
and location of structures --
A Yes.

Q -- for the route?
And so when you -- a minute ago when your attorney asked you about Segment $H$ and the avian mitigation plan and whether or not the Department and Leopold-Pine Island IBA should have approval authority over that mitigation plan, you were not suggesting that the Department or Leopold-Pine Island would be able to disapprove of the alignment, structure type, or location of the structures, correct?

A I don't -- I don't think I was saying that. I was saying where -- where it regards mitigation of avian collision and a plan to -- to do that, that they be consulted and -- and that they approve what is included as part of that plan.

Q Okay. But --
A And they have recommendations of what should be included. If -- if you're asking should they approve engineering specifications, I don't think I've represented that.

Q Okay. Well, in this proceeding it's been suggested that the avian mitigation plan should include the mitigation measures that are actually being decided
upon in this case such as the use of H-frame structures, the height of those H-frame structures, the location of those H-frame structures, and the alignment. If the Department were to have approval authority of the avian mitigation plan, I just want to make sure that the Department does not have any intention to disapprove of -- of the -- any of those items in the plan.

A I'm not really sure what you're asking.
Q Okay. What -- so specifically what kinds of mitigation measures in the plan are you asking the Public Service Commission to let the DNR and Leopold-Pine Island IBA to have approval authority over?

A The inclusion of strategies that address those characteristics of structures and placement that influence avian collision risk. So if the plan can include the multiple strategies that I've described, I think that is -- that is where the approval comes in that -- that it not -- that the AMP include multiple strategies to mitigate collision risk.

Q So if the Public Service Commission decides to use H-frame structures on -- as you proposed at 85 feet in the areas you've proposed on the alignment that is currently Segment $H$, is it your testimony that the

Department could still disapprove of that and then the Public Service Commission would no longer -- or the applicants could no longer build the route?

A No.

MS. WESTERBERG: I'm going to object to the characterization of the prior testimony because I don't think there has been a representation that the PSC will approve 85 feet specifically because prior -- or final engineering has yet to be conducted.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: I think we're speaking hypothetically.

MR. POTTS: Yeah.

BY MR. POTTS:

Q What I'm trying to get at is can the Department overrule the Public Service Commission's decisions on structure height, location, and type of structure. Is that what you're asking for?

A That is not my understanding of what I'm asking for.

MR. POTTS: Okay.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. I mean, if this is still an open issue, I think -- I guess what we're really talking about is how to word a condition of the order, and if that comes up in briefs, I guess it's a viable question. But, yeah,
you know, we'll leave it at that.
MR. POTTS: Okay. We have -- yeah, we have nothing further.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Uh-huh. Okay. Yeah, go ahead.

MS. WESTERBERG: Ms. Kunze, go ahead.
MS. KUNZE: Your Honor, you choose.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Come on up.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. KUNZE:

Q Good afternoon.
A Good afternoon.

Q I just have a few very general questions about birds and habitat if you don't mind.

A Sure.
Q Would you agree that residential communities that have shrubs and trees provide habitat for birds?

A That's reasonable.

Q And would you agree that agricultural areas with fence rows, wind breaks, and trees provide habitats for birds?

A Yes, some.

Q And would you agree that this residential community and agricultural habitat can be a significantly beneficial source of habitat that encourages local
bird populations?
A It can.
Q And would you agree that if the PSC permitted a route through a residential and agricultural community and construction and operation of this transmission line eliminated shrubs and trees through right-of-way clearing, that that bird habitat would be lost?

A In general I would say that is reasonable. I would qualify it by saying that there are birds that use many different types of habitats. All habitats are used by some birds. So when a habitat conversion takes place, in general some birds benefit and other birds experience loss of habitat. So that's how I would qualify my answer, but in general what you stated is correct.

Q Okay. And would you agree then that if a habitat would be limited or eliminated, that those -- you just kind of confirmed that really, and I won't worry about that.

If a habitat were removed from an area, where would the birds seek food and shelter?

A Well, it would depend on what kind of species we're talking about, what habitats they require, and where those habitats were available elsewhere on the landscape, and the birds' abilities to reach those
other areas if they were present.
Q So in other words, if that habitat were removed, they would need to seek other areas --

A That would be reasonable.
Q -- within the area?
MS. KUNZE: Thank you. No further questions.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Clean? CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. WESTERBERG:
Q Thank you. Ms. Steele, I'm Christa Westerberg with Clean Wisconsin. You've emphasized a few times the need for the avian mitigation plan to include multiple strategies to reduce collision risk?

A Yes.
Q And is that -- one particular mitigation measure we've heard a lot about is line marking devices?

A Yes.
Q And as I read your testimony, line marking devices are only somewhat -- they're effective to a point?

A Yes, that's correct.
Q So if I thought it was about 10 to 80 percent effective depending on multiple conditions?

A That really depends on the species.
Q Yeah.

A So, yes, they have very -- a wide range of effectiveness depending on the situation and the species.

Q And so is it your opinion that the avian mitigation plan should emphasize not only bird-marking devices, but other mitigation measures for reducing collisions?

A Absolutely.
Q Okay. And those aren't just structure design and location like we've heard, but also ongoing measures such as vegetation management?

A Yes, that's correct.

Q Okay. And that would be something like planting trees that would help obscure the line outside of the right-of-way?

A It could, yes.
Q And you mentioned that you had -- aside from the Leopold-Pine Island IBA, you were concerned about the other four Important Bird Areas that are along the proposed routes?

A Yes.
Q But it's not your testimony that the avian mitigation plan should be limited just to the IBA, is it?

A My understanding is that the avian mitigation plan is specific to the project. It's not necessarily my
understanding that it's only specific to certain segments of the project, but that it's specific to the project, to the Badger Coulee project.

Q Yes. And that's what I meant. Sorry.
A Yeah.
Q But to the extent there are other places where there is a high potential for bird collision such as a river crossing, you would want those addressed in the avian mitigation plan as well?

A Yes.

Q And that's in fact what the applicants have done with the CapX avian mitigation plan?

A That's my understanding.
Q You've reviewed that plan?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And is it also your understanding that the applicants will assess those areas for potential collision as part of developing that plan?

A That would be reasonable.
Q Aside from specific areas for bird collisions, are you concerned about the cumulative loss of habitat that will be created by all of the new right-of-way along the route, whichever one is chosen?

A There are some concerns, yes.

Q Okay. And do you believe those impacts of loss of
habitat should be mitigated if possible, such as replanting new vegetation?

A Yes, to the extent possible.
Q Okay. And if the applicants could plant forbs and shrubs within the right-of-way that might provide that habitat, you would agree with that mitigation measure?

A I would -- I would agree that planting as appropriate native species of shrubs and forbs would help to provide some habitat for birds, for a variety of birds.

MS. WESTERBERG: Okay.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: You said forbs. Can
you explain that?
THE WITNESS: Sorry.
MS. WESTERBERG: I think you said for a
variety of birds?
THE WITNESS: Forbs.

MS. WESTERBERG: Okay.
THE WITNESS: The plant. It's a type
of --
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Can you just
spell that for us?
THE WITNESS: F-O-R-B-S.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.

THE WITNESS: Sorry. That's a type of
plant.
MS. WESTERBERG: Nothing further. Thank you.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Any more cross? Assuming someone else is there. Go ahead.

MR. POTTS: Sorry. Just a couple questions.

## RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. POTTS:

Q So is it -- is the Department -- I believe your testimony earlier was that the Department is seeking the applicants to consult with the Leopold-Pine Island IBA and obtain their approval on the portion of the route that's essentially Segment H; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q Okay. But not the rest of the project area?
A Regarding the --
Q Leopold-Pine Island IBA.

A That's correct.
Q Okay. And then if the DNR wants the applicants -- or wants to have the Leopold-Pine Island IBA approve of an avian mitigation plan, couldn't the DNR just decide itself not to approve the avian mitigation
plan until the DNR can obtain Leopold-Pine Island IBA's approval?

A I suppose that's a possibility.
So in other words, there would be no real reason for the Public Service Commission's order to require the applicants to obtain the Leopold-Pine Island's approval because the DNR could just do that itself before the DNR gave its approval?

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Well, again, this is really just how we would draft the order point. I don't know. It's all just a logical flow, I mean.

MR. POTTS: But the DNR is asking specifically for the applicants to obtain the Leopold-Pine Island approval, and I'm just asking her whether --

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Why that is or --
MR. POTTS: And whether she can just obtain the order herself or whether the applicants need --

EXAMINER NEWMARK: To say DNR, yeah.
THE WITNESS: I suppose that would be one way to do it.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
MR. POTTS: Okay. We have nothing further.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Any
redirect?

MS. CORRELL: I just have a little bit of redirect to try to clarify the record.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. CORRELL:

Q The line of question regarding whether or not it's DNR -- your understanding that DNR could require certain structures that were not required by the Public Service Commission --

EXAMINER NEWMARK: No, no. That's not the issue. The issue is how would the Commission direct DNR's approval authority, so we don't need to go into that.

MS. CORRELL: No. That's the most latest detail, but earlier he asked her a question, and maybe it's been sufficiently answered, but I wanted to make sure the record was clear. Maybe I should start out with a foundational question.

BY MS. CORRELL:

Q Is it -- is it your understanding that the avian mitigation plan has some components that need to be determined before a Commission order and some components that may have to be determined after a Commission order?

A Yes, that is my understanding.
Q And with regard to $H$-frame structures and recommendations about Commission order points, is it your understanding that those types of avian mitigation strategies need to be included on the front end and it's the Commission's authority to make those decisions?

A Yes.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
BY MS. CORRELL:

Q However, there may be other issues. For example, there's been some discussion of bird diverters.

A Right.
Q And in particular swan-type of diverters?
A There are a number of different devices that could be used.

Q Are some of those types of ongoing discussions things that you anticipate could take place following a DNR order -- I'm sorry -- following a Commission order --

A Yes.

Q -- on the CPCN?
A Exactly. Definitely.
MS. CORRELL: Thank you.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. You're excused, thanks, before anyone else asks anything.

Let's go off the record.
(Discussion held off the record.) (Break taken.)
(Change of reporters.)
EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Do we have who we need? Okay. Great.

MR. LORENCE: Of the need witnesses for the staff, Don Neumeyer is the only witness testifying. The rest will submit affidavits.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Great.

DONALD G. NEUMEYER, STAFF WITNESS, DULY SWORN

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. LORENCE:
Q Can you state your name for the record, please.

A Donald G. Neumeyer, $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{U}-\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{Y}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{R}$.
Q And in preparation for today's hearing, did you prepare direct testimony?

A Yes, I did.

Q And you did not have any exhibits, correct?
A That is correct.

Q And you have no corrections to your testimony?
A No, I do not.

Q And if I asked you the questions in your prepared testimony today, would your answers be the same?

A Yes, they would.
Q Mr. Neumeyer, have you been monitoring the witnesses' testimony this week?

A Yes.

Q And have you heard several questions about the possible increased use of transmission structures that carry multiple circuits in order to minimize right-of-way width and environmental impacts?

A Yes.
Q Specifically there has been discussion about placing multiple circuits on a single pole in the area of
the -- in the area north of the Briggs Road Substation, correct?

A Correct.
Q What standards cover the usage of multiple circuit structures in planning?

A The North American Electric Reliability Corporation, NERC, reliability standards cover this design, specifically the transmission system planning performance requirements standard TPL-001-4 covers the system conditions and contingency analysis. For the purposes of reliability and performance, multiple circuits on a single structure does not violate NERC standards when the cumulative use is one mile or less for the new bulk electric system element. This has typically been used for substation exit and entry and river crossings.

Q So under NERC standards, three circuits on a single pole would be allowable as long as the cumulative length is less than one mile?

A Correct.

Q And from an engineering standpoint, you do not have an objection to such a configuration?

A No, I do not.
MR. LORENCE: No further questions.
Mr. Neumeyer is available.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Questions for the witness?

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. AGRIMONTI:
Q Mr. Neumeyer, I just have a question. Would you have any objection if the proposal was to extend the length of co-location for more than a mile?

A Yes, I would.
Q What would be the basis of that objection?
A It would violate the planning standard.

MS. AGRIMONTI: Thank you. No further questions.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
MR. JABLONSKI: I have a question. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. JABLONSKI:

Q Can you tell me the planning standard that would be violated?

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Introduce yourself.
BY MR. JABLONSKI:

Q I'm sorry. Frank Jablonski for the Town of Holland.
A It is the standard that $I$ just referenced as the NERC planning standard, that was that TPL standard.

Q So is that because it's a category $D$ and creates a category D contingency?

A It's a little more complex than that. The standards has been -- some of the older standards have been reconstituted in a new manner, and they use levels like $P$ and tables with extreme events. So the -we're very familiar with the terms. So it doesn't -isn't classified that way. So it has to do with circuit conditions, structure conditions, incidental events, subsequent events, and the situation with the loss of load or cascading situations.

Q Sure. And has a -- have you done any analysis of the potential for common source or common source contingency event to take out the transmission lines if they are close to each other as opposed to on the same set of poles?

A My reference was common structure. I was focusing on common structure. There are corridors used which are different.

Q Okay. So you haven't done an analysis as to the relative risk as opposed -- as between a common structure triple circuited and a common structure double circuited with another structure single circuited on the other side of the highway?

A The standards you take into account, the risks, those are why the standards are there, and the loads you could lose or not lose, firm/not firm situations.

Q So yes, you have done that analysis?
A I have reviewed the analysis where contingencies of multiple circuits on common structures show a collapse of the system which is unacceptable.

Q Okay. If the Commission declines to approve the Badger Coulee proposal, then the common structure -there will be a common structure with a 161 kV and a 345 kV ; is that correct?

A I believe that's correct.
Q And the -- if that goes down, you will have the exact same situation as if you would have taken out the 161 and two 345 s?

A Not exactly. Because it's a function of the topology. It's unique to every instance of existing and new topology designs. So it wouldn't be equivalent depending on the design.

Q Depending on the design of what?
A The network.

Q Depending on the design of the network. And so the analysis, the analysis for a commonly caused failure, that has been submitted into the record? Is that in any of your exhibits?

A I have no exhibits.
MR. JABLONSKI: Thank you.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Other cross?

No? Redirect?

MR. LORENCE: I can safely say I have no further questions.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Well, the witness is excused.
(Witness excused.)
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let me take this moment to congratulate Mr . Lorence --

MR. LORENCE: Off the record.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Off the record? Oh, come on.

MR. LORENCE: Thank you.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: This is his last hearing, his last witness, and we'd like to thank him for his service.
(Discussion off the record.)

MS. SILVER KARSH: I'd like to call Paul Rahn to the stand.

PAUL RAHN, STAFF WITNESS, DULY SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. SILVER KARSH:
Q Good afternoon. Would you please state your name for the record.

A Paul Rahn.

Q And what is your position at the Commission?
A I'm the environmental analyst in the energy division.

Q And did you submit direct testimony in this docket?
A Yes.

Q And if I were to ask you the same questions today that were in your direct testimony, would your answers be the same?

A Yes.

MS. SILVER KARSH: Thank you. I have no further questions. He's available for cross-examination.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Who has questions?

MS. SILVER KARSH: I believe Ms. Kunze had cross of Mr. Rahn.

BY MS. KUNZE:

Q Thank you. Good afternoon, Mr. Rahn. I'm Laura Kunze, self-representing. I just have a few questions. I'd like to refer to Table 11.1-1 of the EIS. Do you happen to have that?

A Do you have a page number?
Q I did not write it down. I'm sorry. But 11 is right around 360-something. So start there.

A .364? Yes.

Q You do have it?
A Yes, I have it.
Q Thank you. So in that table, the EIS is a comparison of right-of-way characteristics of the $A, B$ and B-north and B and B-south segments. Were comparisons done of the impact of these three segment alternatives in the context of the entire route, for example, north route with $B$ and with $A$, south route with B and with A ?

A B-north is a route using a segment called B-north and the rest of segment B. B-south is B-south with the remainder. So it's the entire route.

Q Did you interchange them and compare?
A They're two different alternatives, and they're comparable to A which connected the route.

Q Well, are you aware down below that $B$ and $A$ can be interchangeable and intersect later with other --

A They come to the same intersection point.
Q At $G$. In the context of the entire 160 - to 180 -mile route, would you agree that an additional three miles is less than a 2 percent difference?

A Of route length? Yes.
Q Where the easement width for the 138 kilovolt line would have to be expanded for a 345 kilovolt line, how many acres per mile would be required?

A I would have to calculate that.
Q Was that included in the EIS?

A It was included in the application of right-of-way required for higher voltage line, yes.

Q Where can that information be found?
A It would be in the application data tables.
Q Data tables. Why wasn't that included in the EIS?
A Those numbers are reflected here.
Q Okay. And the same table, how many of the existing right-of-way shared acres require additional acres of land to expand the easement and what does that acreage total?

A I think you will find that in the text for the various segments how much is expanded.

Q I'm sorry?
A It's in the text.

Q Could you find out where that is in the text.

A At page 362, under 11.2.1.1, first paragraph, where it says agricultural land represents 62.1 percent of the total required right-of-way. New right-of-way, not overlapping any existing facility right-of-way encompasses 29.7 acres of farmland.

Q So that's how you calculated --
A Yes.
Q Thank you for clarifying. So in the EIS Section 11.1.2, it addresses access where there are natural constraints such as steep hills, large high-quality natural resources, and other limitations where direct access is not possible. Would you agree that all of the Segment $A$, $B$ and B3a access roads would follow existing lanes or paths, the access roads?

A I don't know at this point without consulting other information.

Q The narrative states that Segment $A$ access road covers an area of wetland. Why isn't this reflected in 11.1-2?

A Where are you referring to?
Q 11.1-2, wetlands. The narrative states that there is an area of wetlands, but it's not included.

A I didn't work on that section, so I can't speak to it.

Q Okay. Fine. Regarding the number and length of distribution lines, did staff independently verify that data?

A I did not work with the distribution line information.

Q Were you present for Ms. Parrett's testimony or have you read her direct?

A I read her direct, yes. And listened to most of her testimony, I believe. Not all of it, though, at the end.

Q Well, perhaps you can answer, why is the undergrounding of the distribution line now under-built on the 138 kV line not discussed in Section 11.1.3.1?

MS. SILVER KARSH: Your Honor, I'd like to note that these are questions that are more appropriate for Ms. Weiss who will be coming up for testimony. Mr. Rahn did not work on that portion. MS. KUNZE: Thank you.

Q So if I touch upon something that -- obviously please tell me if somebody else is working on this to save us time. For the Environmental Impact Statement in the section for agriculture, was that something that you could answer to with regard to -- did you rely on the AIS for acreage figures?

A I used some of their figures and figures from the application, I used both.

Q Would you agree that much of the information in the AIS is obtained from self-reporting survey respondents?

A I couldn't speak to that because the ag. department prepared that.

Q Have you verified the information from the AIS?
A No, I do not verify their information.
Q How does the staff weigh agriculture versus forest in its environmental assessment?

A I think we explained impacts to all areas, but we don't try to emphasize or downgrade --

Q Do they weight them differently?
A I don't know that we make a judgment as to various weights.

Q Okay.
A Judgment is up to the Commissioners when they make their decision.

Q EIS Section 11.2.1.1 in one circumstance says under applicants' proposal where property would be bound on three sides by transmission lines.

A What section?
Q 11.2.1.1.

MR. LORENCE: Page 362 .

MS. KUNZE: Thank you.
A What page number?

MR. LORENCE: 362.
MS. KUNZE: Thank you, Mr. Lorence.
A And the question?
Q Was there property bound on three sides?

A Did we count every situation where that occurred?
Q Did it occur?

A Are you saying whether there is a property --
Q Um-hmm.

A -- with transmission line on three sides?
Q Yes.

A I can't say with certainty.
Q If transmission lines would be placed outside of cultivated fields and would be offset from field edges, how is that not encroaching on land and restricting use?

A In the sense that field edge is a worked area of the field, it's outside their -- directly on the property line may not affect tillage land.

Q Would a tractor still need to steer around those poles?

A Possibly.
Q And would the area still be disturbed and crops destroyed?

A Depends what is near it.
Q Potentially if a pole replaced an area of crops, would those crops be destroyed?

A Yes.

Q Regarding bird habitat, would you agree that residential communities that have shrubs and trees provide habitat for birds, generally speaking?

A I do not deal with that section.

Q Did you deal with magnetic fields?
A No.

Q Were you present for the testimony of Mr. Lorenz?
A I heard some of his testimony.

Q Are you familiar with Table 81 of Mr. Lorenz?
A No.

Q Do you deal with the amp loads or anything of that nature?

A The what loads?
Q Your amperage loads in your --
A No, not normally.
Q Do you deal with aesthetic and visual impacts analysis?

A Not for this project.

Q I'm sorry?
A Not for this project.

Q Were you present for the testimony earlier when the
self-weathering finish on poles was discussed?
A I heard that.
Q Would you agree that a self-weathering brown steel pole has heightened visibility when compared to a galvanized pole or gray or blue painted pole?

A It depends on the surrounding environment.
Q The section states that along the route, Segment A is more densely populated than segment B. Where in the chart -- where is the chart that shows the homes within that area referred to in the EIS?

A The section that shows houses?
Q Does it go -- does that chart include homes within the line of sight?

A I did not work on that section.
Q Is there a map of dots showing the homes and their -including their varying distances from the lines in this project?

A There was a GIS layer that indicates where homes are in relation to the lines.

Q Does it include the distances?
A That can be measured on those maps.
Q Were any models or computer [sic] generated before or after visual prepared for the EIS?

A Yes.
Q Where are those located?

A I did not deal with that section. You should ask somebody else.

Q Who might that be?
A Perhaps Ms. Weiss.
Q Thank you. If homes are in a wooded area, what is the impact of trees on visibility of nearby transmission would you say?

A I would say if there are trees between the home and the transmission line, they often provide screening of the line.

Q And if those screening trees were to be removed for right-of-way, how would that impact visibility on the lines?

A That may increase it.
Q You can move to 11.3.4, public lands and recreation.
A I did not work on that.
Q You did not. Okay. Did you work at all on communication facilities?

A No.
Q And airport and airstrips at all?
A No.
Q I just want to be clear we're covering what we need to, so you understand. Well, I guess that's all I have for you, Mr. Rahn. Thank you so much for your time.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Other questions?

MR. WILL: No.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Redirect?

MS. SILVER KARSH: No.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Nothing? Thanks. You're excused.
(Witness excused.)

MS. SILVER KARSH: I'd like to call Marilyn Weiss to the stand.

MARILYN WEISS, STAFF WITNESS, DULY SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. SILVER KARSH:
Q Good afternoon. Would you please state your name for the record.

A Marilyn Weiss.
Q And what is your position at the Commission?
A I'm an environmental analyst.
Q And did you submit direct and surrebuttal testimony?
A Yes.
Q And five exhibits?
A Yes.

Q And you filed an errata sheet PSC reference number 229437?

A Yes.

Q On page 4 of your direct testimony, beginning at line 6, you stated that data request 10 and 11 are still outstanding. Do you have an update to provide?

A Yes. At the time of the writing that was true. That is no longer true. All the data requests have been responded to by the applicants.

Q With this update and the errata sheets, if $I$ were to ask you the same questions today that are in your
direct and surrebuttal testimony, would your answers be the same?

A Yes.
Q And is the information in your exhibits true and correct to the best of your knowledge?

A Yes.

MS. SILVER KARSH: The witness is available for cross-examination.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. I just wanted to double-check with -- you will be filing Weiss 3, the public comments, right?

THE WITNESS: Right. Delayed exhibit.
(Exhibit Weiss 3 designated for delayed receipt.)

EXAMINER NEWMARK: That hasn't been filed. And since you have more data request responses, we'll need to update Henn $2 /$ Weiss 4.

THE WITNESS: Henn $2 /$ Weiss 4 is complete.
MR. POTTS: It includes the 10 and 11 that
she --

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Oh, okay, great. Oh, since your testimony. That's fine. Thanks. Well, any questions?

MR. OLIVEIRA: Yes, Your Honor.
CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. OLIVEIRA:
Q Good afternoon, Ms. Weiss. My name is Marcel Oliveira. I represent CETF and SOUL. I just have a few questions for you about the EIS. Starting with the goals of the EIS, would you agree that one of the goals in preparing the EIS is to avoid, prevent or mitigate environmental damage? I can repeat the question.

A Please do.
Q Would you agree that one of the goals in preparing an EIS is to avoid, prevent or help mitigate environmental damage?

A Its first order is to enumerate the impacts. It's the review process that we go through including the pre-application process that helps minimize or evaluate the different issues, impacts and mitigation that's potentially possible on the project.

Q And so that review process, would you agree that the goals you just described also go towards preserving natural vistas?

A It is a portion of many resources that are reviewed and analyzed.

Q Yeah. And I'm asking whether these are parts of the overall -- I'm sure there's several goals to it. I'm asking if these are parts --

A I wouldn't say it's a goal, but it's one of the things we review.

Q Okay. Is preventing damage to local economies or the damage to local economies that may result from a project something else that's reviewed?

A Perhaps peripherally, but we don't have the expertise to do economic analysis.

Q And what about protecting public health, is that one of the aspects that is reviewed?

A Once again, it's an assessment of the impacts.
Q An impact on public health is included in that assessment?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Are you familiar with the term "precautionary principle"?

A No.
Q If I represented to you that precautionary principle stands for caution in deciding whether to recommend a project or assess the impact of a project on the side of not recommending that in case there may be scientific uncertainty over environmental or health impacts -- I'll ask you this. Do you have any reason to question that definition of precautionary principle?

A Because I'm not familiar with it, I don't have an
opinion whether it's applicable or right or wrong.
Q Sure. Would you agree that under that definition, the precautionary principle is something the Commission takes into account when preparing an EIS?

MR. POTTS: Objection.
MS. SILVER KARSH: Objection.
MR. POTTS: She just said she isn't even aware of what that --

MR. OLIVEIRA: And that's why I provided the definition.

MR. POTTS: Now you're asking her for her opinion on whether the Commission --

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Just rephrase it using the terms --

MR. OLIVEIRA: I can withdraw the question and ask a different question.

Q Would you agree that -- well, instead of asking you whether you agree, I'm going to inquire whether the Commission in preparing an EIS looks into areas where there's scientific uncertainty, so the causal relationship between a component of a project and public health?

A Causal uncertainty sounds like it has some very specific meaning that I'm not familiar with. But I can say we do look at the current research, we are
not experts in everything, and we do make some evaluation as to the current state of the literature on some subjects.

Q And that was the thrust of my question, whether the Commission considers if it's brought up to its attention there is research out there to be reviewed, the Commission will then make an inquiry into the existing research?

A When you say Commission, are you talking about staff or the Commissioners?

Q Yes, I apologize, staff in preparing the EIS.
A We try to be as broad and inclusive as possible.
Q Okay. Were you involved in receiving, reviewing or processing public input into the DEIS from the scoping process through the conclusion of the final EIS?

A Yes.
Q And do you recall receiving public comments, concerns or research citations in the area of EMF?

A Yes.

Q Do you recall receiving the same in the area of corona-based emissions?

A Yes.
Q Do you recall receiving the same in the area of UV emissions? Ultraviolet radiation?

A Yes. Yes.
Q Do you recall receiving public comments, questions or concerns regarding physical or cyber security of transmission lines?

A Yes.
Q During the comment process on the draft EIS all the way up to the final EIS being put together, was there additional inquiry by Commission staff of the current research in any of those areas listed?

A Some.

Q And what areas were inquired into?
A We looked at the citations that were contained in the comments. We discussed things with the engineers and experts on staff where it touched on things that were of scientific engineering issues. We consulted with those people in the Commission that had knowledge, spoke to some other departments of the State of Wisconsin to get better insight. And some USGS, talked to some of them for some things.

Q And during that process of inquiry, the sources that were originally cited in the comments were looked into, I take it?

A Yes.
Q And do you recall during this entire process preparing the EIS whether the Commission or staff
received a request for socioeconomic cost/benefit analyses?

A Yes.

Q And were those responded to or followed up on?

A I believe in the early stages before we had the application, some letters were written back to those townships that had asked for a reply.

Q Okay. Do you recall what townships were responded to, by any chance?

A Not off the top of my head, no.

Q Do you recall an approximate number of responses?
A Not off the top of my head, no.

Q And do you recall the content of those responses insofar as there was actually a follow-up on the study or whether a response was --

A You seem to be asking two separate things. The request for a socioeconomic study is one object. The comments that asked for us to review additional literature is a different issue --

Q Yeah, I apologize.

A -- and the socioeconomic studies were responded to in letters prior to the application coming in before the review process was started. And that's why letters were written back to these people. After the review process started, there was a mechanism to have
comments and participate in the review of the application.

And I apologize for not being -- my question was getting at whether or not the response to the requests for socioeconomic studies actually involved socioeconomic studies that staff conducted?

A We did not conduct any socioeconomic studies.
Q I apologize. That should have been my question. No further questions, Your Honor. EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Other cross?

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. WESTERBERG:

Q Good afternoon, Ms. Weiss. I'm Christa Westerberg with Clean Wisconsin. Your final EIS at page 32 discusses impacts to springs. Were you here this morning when $I$ was discussing that issue with Ben Callan for DNR, were you here for that?

A Yes.

Q So I won't belabor that lead-up again. But the EIS indicates that the applicants have stated that prior to construction, if the spring with substantial -- if a spring with substantial flow is identified on the order route, the applicants state that they will make every effort to adjust the structure locations and
construction access. Do you know what is meant by substantial flow in that sentence?

A No.

Q Okay. Do you yourself have an opinion about whether that would be something like two cubic feet per second, more, less, anything?

A No.

Q So we don't really know what the applicants will do -- how the applicants will assess the size of the spring relative to making construction decisions?

A No, don't know.
Q They also -- the final EIS also indicates that if the spring cannot be avoided, the applicants would implement techniques to reduce surface exposure along with mitigation steps to prevent destruction of the flow of water from the spring, but also indicates that details regarding the techniques and mitigation strategies that would be implemented to minimize impacts on unavoidable springs were not provided. And that's provided to the Commission, correct?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Have you ever received that information?

A We haven't received it and we did not issue a follow-up data request.

Q Do you have any concern about whether mitigation
measures for springs would actually work?
A No.

Q You don't have any concerns?
A You asked me if they would work.
Q Okay. You don't think they would work?
A No, you asked if I had any -- please repeat the question.
(Requested question read by the reporter.)
A Let me retract that. I heard a different question.
Q It happens.
A Not knowing what mitigation strategies would be used, I have no way of knowing whether they would work.

Q Okay. Do you know if any further follow-up will be required with PSC or DNR on that issue beyond what you heard from Mr. Callan this morning?

A I don't think there will be.
Q The final EIS mentions that the majority of -- or the highest concentrations of springs on the routes, on the proposed routes -- well, actually in Wisconsin is on Segment 0 between the Town of Leon and the City of Elroy; is that right?

A Yes.

Q Is that a factor you think should be considered in making the routing decision?

A I think it goes more to construction practices.

Q How so?
A I think locating structures, talking with landowners, having knowledge of the hydrology of the area, can go a long way to avoid the impact in the first place.

Q Do you think that that has been done to date?
A No. I think it will depend on final engineering as they don't have structure locations at this point and it would require a Commission approval for them to do final engineering.

Q So are you saying that the location of springs should be ascertained and then structure location decisions be made after that?

A I think they'll do final engineering and there will be minor adjustments based on things that they find in the field, and that's typical for most large projects.

Q Okay. So then do you think there should be an order point for the applicants to assess the location of springs in the field before making final structure location decisions?

A I don't know.
Q Do you know of any other way that that would -- if there were not an order point, would there be any requirement for them to do that?

A I don't know. I feel that it would be to their
benefit not to disrupt the spring because that requires more dewatering and then DNR permits might need to be adjusted for the dewatering. So I think it is in their self-interest to avoid the springs.

Q Okay. But other than that, there would be no --
A I don't --

Q There would be no requirement to your knowledge,
there might be an incentive in another way, but not a requirement?

A It depends on what the Commission orders.
Q Okay. Would you also agree that if there is a route that doesn't impact as many springs, then we won't have as many of these issues?

MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection, "these issues,"
if you could clarify, please.
BY MS. WESTERBERG:

Q Structure location decisions, engineering, dewatering, all the things you just mentioned.

A There are issues on every project for every location; and springs is just one of many, many subjects.

Q Sure. I understand that. But if we could avoid this concentration of springs in segment $O$ and find a route without as many springs, at least that particular issue will be somewhat minimized?

A Sure.

Q Have you ever been involved in any discussions with the applicants regarding routing options in the Fort McCoy area?

A Yes.

Q Okay. What -- well, can you describe those discussions to me.

A I think it was an issue that was brought up during the pre-application as we asked for an explanation as to how they arrived out of the original spaghetti with the routes that were being potentially part of the application. We continued with data requests after the application came in.

Q And have you listened to some of the testimony about routing in that area throughout this week?

A Yes.
Q And there was discussion about data request response 05.17?

A Which one is -- I --

MS. WESTERBERG: May I, Judge?
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Yes.
(Document tendered to the witness.)
A Yes.

BY MS. WESTERBERG:
Q I just handed you at least the attachments to data request response 05.17 . Do you recall receiving that

## information?

A Yes.

Q And do you recall reviewing the applicants' explanation for the reasons they were limited in their routing decisions in the Fort McCoy area -- let me strike that.

Do you recall the applicants' explanation
of their perceived limitations in the Fort McCoy area as described in that document?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Did you ever attempt to independently verify with Fort McCoy the routing limitations as
represented by the applicants in their data request response?

A No.
Q Did anybody else at the Commission do that?

MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection, lack of
foundation.

MS. WESTERBERG: I'm asking if she knows.
A I don't know of anybody.

Q And why did the PSC request an explanation -- PSC
staff request an explanation as to why routing
couldn't be accomplished through that area through a data request?

A Because we didn't know the answer.

Q What would the benefit have been -- to a routing through that area have been in staff's view?

A There was a lot of comments that were received where people thought that the -- extending as far south as they did and going through the cashton area caused important impacts. And as part of our review, we often try to pull in other aspects of the spaghetti if we think they have value that the Commission should consider. So when in doubt, we ask the question.

Q And this was one of those situations clearly?
A Yes.
Q The final EIS contains many, many tables identifying the impacts to wetlands and forests and other features in terms of acreage.

A Yes.
Q Did the PSC staff attempt to independently -- well, let me strike that.

Where is the source of those numbers in those tables, the applicants' materials?

A The -- I believe -- most of that information, but not all, came directly from the applicants in their GIS data that they submitted. Areas that were other state departments' purview, such as Department of Ag. for agriculture and DNR for wetlands and waterway
issues, we substitute our judgment for theirs. The things that were tables that had to do with things we could count and we looked at, in some instances we put our own numbers in as opposed to the numbers submitted by the applicants.

Q Were forest impacts among those that you independently inserted into the EIS, or were those in reliance on the applicants' numbers?

A That was relying on the applicants' and the GIS layer could be clearly computated from the acreage shown on that.

MS. SILVER KARSH: Just one quick
interruption for clarification. In your previous answer to Ms. Westerberg's question, you said I believe and we substitute our judgment for theirs. Is that what you mean? Or do you mean we substitute their judgment for ours in talking about DNR, DATCP and DOT?

THE WITNESS: DNR's values were used in areas of wetlands and waterways if they differed from the application information. DATCP's values were substituted for the applicants' where they had the expertise.

MS. SILVER KARSH: Thank you for the clarification. Sorry for the interruption.

MS. WESTERBERG: No problem. That's all I have. Thank you.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Other cross?

MS. KUNZE: Your Honor.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Before you start, because it's connected to the last line of questions, I was getting hungry when you were speaking, could you explain what you mean by spaghetti.

THE WITNESS: Marinara sauce.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Not that.

THE WITNESS: Do you want me to answer?
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Yeah, because it's confusing on the record.

THE WITNESS: Okay. That's a professional term.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Oh, it is?

THE WITNESS: Spaghetti is what we call the original almost all possible routes that the applicants usually go through before they start winnowing it down to the fewer routes that are presented in the application.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: When you pick another strand out of the spaghetti like you said, it's picking out one of the original routes that they
were investigating.
THE WITNESS: Right.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. And the other one was, there was kind of a compound question once where it talked about the springs and where -- that Segment $O$ had the most springs on the route. And I think you answered it affirmatively, but also that question included that it had the most springs in Wisconsin. I don't know that you agreed to both of those.

THE WITNESS: The information for the springs came from the Wisconsin geological survey. And, let's see, this is only to the project area, not to Wisconsin.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. So --
THE WITNESS: We did not review beyond the scope of the project area.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
BY MS. WESTERBERG:
Q Then the line -- if I may clarify, a line in the EIS then, it states on page 32 the area of Wisconsin with the highest concentration of springs is in the southwest, the Driftless Area. So that is what I was referring to when $I$ said in Wisconsin.

A Okay. Sorry, it's a big document and it's been a
very long year.
Q Understood.
A Yeah, and that's cited too and that's -- yes.
Q So you have no reason to dispute the accuracy of that statement?

A No, no, no. That statement from the geological survey and their database.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Ms. Kunze. Go ahead.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. KUNZE:
Q Good afternoon, Ms. Weiss. I'm Laura Kunze, self-representing. In your direct, page 2, you testify that it was your responsibility to organize and coordinate preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement. I want to make sure that I'm directing questions appropriately. Are the questions regarding the airstrips and airports better addressed to you or Ms. Zuelsdorff?

A Kathy Zuelsdorff.
Q Thank you. Is the ERF'd notice for the PSC meetings after the release of the draft Environmental Impact Statement part of the record?

A I'm sorry, could you repeat the question.
Q Sure. Is the ERF'd -- if that's a proper term in
this context.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: It is here.
BY MS. KUNZE:
Q Notice for the -- I've been using it, I just didn't know if it was. Is the ERF'd notice for the PSC meetings after the release of the draft EIS part of the record?

A I don't think so.

Q Would you please explain the PSC's process for selecting locations for the post-released draft EIS meeting locations.

A We didn't have any meetings. We had public hearings and we had scoping meetings which were before the draft to determine -- to get input from the public for the draft EIS, we call those scoping meetings. But we had no meetings after the draft EIS was published.

Q Would you explain, please, the PSC process for selecting -- did you select -- how did you select locations for other meetings?

A What meetings are you referring to?
Q The -- I think more the public outreaches.
A The scoping meeting?
Q Um-hmm.
A We tried -- I tried to find places that were -- where
nobody was driving more than 30 minutes on highways. We looked for places that had large enough venues to support it and had WiFi for people to -- so computer systems and mapping could be made -- could be accessed out in the field. I tried to find places that didn't cost the taxpayers too much money. That was about it. The scoping meetings were -- I think nobody was more than 30 minutes driving away to get there.

Q Thank you. Are the comments on the -- actually on the DEIS, the draft Environmental Impact Statement handled by the PSC? Comments regarding the draft.

A Are they handled, yes, we receive them.
Q And are they made available for public review?
A Those that are ERF'd were ERF'd. I think people who wrote in postal -- and sent them through the postal mail, I don't think those were ERF'd. And e-mails were not ERF'd. And phone calls were not ERF'd. We receive comments in all formats.

Q In Ms. Justus' rebuttal beginning on page 5, line 17, she discusses undergrounding of the distribution line that is under-built on the 138 kilovolt line in Segment A. What are the anticipated impacts of this undergrounding?

A I'm not a construction engineer. But $I$ can
understand that undergrounding a distribution line has -- is a commonplace -- is not that unusual and the impacts are minimal.

Q Can you show me where this specifically is addressed in the final EIS?

A I think in the beginning. It is not something -- the other thing is on this project, the movement of the distribution lines would be handled by the local electric distribution company and not by the applicants. So it was not reviewed to the same standard as the things that were applicant responsibilities. I'm under the -- I believe that in each chapter section, there is a section on distribution lines.

Q I believe the same.
A The impacts and the method by which distribution lines will be relocated is not discussed in the EIS, either the draft or the final; but in the final there is an accounting of those lines that would be slated for relocation and -- but their location is not known because that would be handled not by the applicants.

Q So the impacts of undergrounding would not be considered?

A Of distribution lines.
Q Okay. So EIS page 359, 11.3.4.

MS. SILVER KARSH: On page?

MS. KUNZE: Page 359.

MS. SILVER KARSH: I don't think that's the right page number.

MS. KUNZE: It's not?
THE WITNESS: Section 11.1.3 is the electric distribution line.

MS. SILVER KARSH: 11.3 .4 is public lands and recreation on page 381.

MS. KUNZE: Right.

Q And I'm -- I just wanted to get you there.
A To which page?

Q It's a known fact, it's stated and so -- in the interest of time, you don't need to pull this up unless you'd like to confirm it. It simply states that, it's page 359, that no known recreational paths are identified on Segment A.

A Kathy Zuelsdorff is the one that wrote the public land section.

Q Okay. Thank you.

MS. SILVER KARSH: Just to clarify for the record, it is page 381 that you're referring to.

MS. KUNZE: It is?

MS. SILVER KARSH: You're talking about public lands and recreation.

MS. KUNZE: Thank you.

MS. SILVER KARSH: You're welcome.

BY MS. KUNZE:

Q And Ms. Weiss, I hope I haven't transposed lots of numbers on here, it got late.

A If you just give me the section topic, I'll find it.

Q Perfect. So are you the proper person to talk about residential property owners and visual impact?

A No. That would be Kathy Zuelsdorff.
Q Did you deal at all with the Public Service Commission's use of appraisers on property value, et cetera? Have you dealt with the PSC's employment of appraisers to calculate property values? Was that you or was that Ms. --

A We don't have any appraisers, nor do we get involved with the discussions, negotiations between utility companies and private landholders. By "we," I mean the Commission.

Q Absolutely. So the EIS Section 4.5-- 11.2-4 addresses some property values within the EIS. Is that something that Ms. Zuelsdorff would --

A I'm sorry, I'm confused about what you're looking at.

Q It is Section 11.2-4 --
A What is the header of the section?

Q It will be -- I didn't write it down -- it will be
residential impacts if $I$ had to guess.

A Okay. And what's -- I don't think we talk about the financial impact.

MS. SILVER KARSH: I believe it's 11.3.2.

A Maybe share her EIS. That will help a lot.
BY MS. KUNZE:

Q Is Ms. Zuelsdorff going to be dealing with proximity to potentially sensitive populations?

A Yes.
Q Have you read public comments from residents in Segment A?

A Yes.

Q Have the residents expressed concern about the negative effect on property value?

A Yes.
Q How are public comments considered by the PSC?

A We read them, we look for information that can help describe impacts we're not aware of or new information that would help make a more reasonable route alternative.

Q Has anyone informed you that they have been unable to sell their homes in this area due namely to the buyer's aversion to the proposed transmission line?

A Yes.

Q EIS page 355 indicates a deviation would place a
right-of-way about 10 feet and the centerline about 70 feet from the front of a home. So it is at the bottom of that page still. And would you agree that the -- this is a very close proximity to a high voltage transmission line? Ten feet?

A It is, ten feet, yes.
Q And do you agree that this might significantly impact this residence?

A Transmission line will cause impacts, yes.
Q How has the resident been made aware of this change and the impact?

A The -- everybody within -- we've done to the best of our ability, sent letters out, the notice, and maps for everybody within 300 feet of the proposed line and anybody who has expressed an interest to be included in our mailing list, providing phone numbers of staff where they can talk to us, going out into the public with ArcReader projects where they can see their own property and the dimensions of the right-of-way. That's how we've done -- we've done everything through many media to allow them to know who to contact to get more information.

Q Would you have included the outreach to this particular case when there is a deviation, has the landowner been notified of --

A There hasn't been a deviation yet. It's one of the options that has been discussed. Until the Commission chooses a route, there is no deviation that's been approved.

Q Are you aware of $I$ think something that is being referred to as a deviation on Bronner Road? It should be in here.

A This was in response to a landowner -- if you're talking about the property at the corners of Airport and Bronner Road, this is a result of a comment from a landowner who lived on the corner of Airport and Bronner Road. He asked why is it then towards his property and we asked that question of the applicants.

Q And the action taken was -- ?
A We asked them to evaluate the reasons behind that deviation. There's no action to be taken, only analyze and supply information.

Q Okay.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: What page of the EIS was that?

THE WITNESS: 377, I believe. The map -the figure that is referred to is on page 378, shows the location of the homes and the deviation from the existing transmission line.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's just -- go ahead.

THE WITNESS: That the proposed route would take of Segment A5 and A6a, subsegment.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: And off the record. (Discussion off the record.)

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's get on the record.

BY MS. KUNZE:

Q Would a question about diminution of property also be best addressed to Ms. Zuelsdorff?

A Sure.
Q Or would you be able to answer something like that? Let me ask the question --

MS. ZUELSDORFF: I knew you were going to say that.

BY MS. KUNZE:
Q Let me ask you a question and you tell me if it pertains to you. Did the PSC obtain a diminution appraisal for any property or properties in preparing the Environmental Impact Statement?

A No, it's not something we review.
Q The EIS cites a report by the EPRI. Is EPRI a real property expert?

A I'm sorry, what?
Q There is -- it cites a report by E-P-R-I. Is that a
property expert or is it an electric industry entity?

A It's EPRI.

Q Thank you. It's EPRI.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's go off the
record.
(Discussion off the record.)

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Back on the record.

BY MS. KUNZE:

Q So based on your work on this project, how will the property value aesthetic impact and other impacts raised by the EIS be mitigated?

A Not everything can be mitigated. Building a big project like this, there will be impacts.

Q Meaning --
A Somebody will experience impacts somewhere somehow in some value. I think I can go on the record and say that.

Q By impact, do you mean losses that cannot be recovered?

A I mean impacts, whether it's -- it can be any number of different way -- everybody defines impacts differently, and there will be impacts.

Q Are you meaning that impacts are not always compensable?

A Yes.

MS. KUNZE: Thank you. No further questions, Your Honor.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Other cross? Go ahead.

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. SILVER KARSH:
Q I just have a couple quick questions for you. Earlier Mr. Oliveira was asking you questions about socioeconomic factors.

A Yes.
Q And would you be able to tell me, where is socioeconomic factors such as effects on tourism or property values discussed in the EIS?

A They are discussed in a general way. It's the study that no specific study was done on any particular location.

Q And there were no monetary values assigned to those?
A No.

MS. SILVER KARSH: Thank you. I have no further questions.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Thank you, ma'am. You're excused.
(Witness excused.)
Zuelsdorff to the stand.

KATHLEEN ZUELSDORFF, STAFF WITNESS, DULY SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. SILVER KARSH:
Q Good afternoon. Would you please state your name for the record.

A It's Kathleen Zuelsdorff.
Q And what is your position at the Commission?
A I am an environmental analyst in the gas and energy division, and I am also the WEPA coordinator for the agency.

Q And did you submit direct, rebuttal and surrebuttal testimony and five exhibits?

A Yes, I did.
Q And you also filed an errata sheet and uploaded that to ERF this morning; is that correct?

A Yes.

Q If I were to ask you the same questions today on the stand, would your answers be the same as they are in your testimony?

A Yes.
Q And is all the information in your exhibits true and correct to the best of your knowledge?

A Yes.

MS. SILVER KARSH: I have no additional questions. Ms. Zuelsdorff is available for cross-examination.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Questions?
MR. POTTS: Sorry, we need to object to the errata that Ms. Zuelsdorff is filing because we think it will make the testimony confusing and we would rather do it on cross-examination because our -- the applicants' rebuttal responds to the MRA assertion, and so we would need to somehow correct our testimony and we think it would be a lot easier to just not do it via errata and just do it on the stand.

MS. SILVER KARSH: Why don't I just ask her that.

MR. POTTS: That's fine.
BY MS. SILVER KARSH:
Q Ms. Zuelsdorff, would you please clarify your surrebuttal testimony when you were discussing a change by use of a minor route modification process or MRA.

A Yes. I think it's in my surrebuttal testimony on page 4, lines 19 through 21, and I refer to a possible alternative alignment that needs further investigation. It was raised at the public hearings
in Warrens, and so we took that information in and I included it in my testimony. It needs further investigation because it's -- it involves new landowners and potentially new impacts that are not discussed in EIS. And so if that alternative alignment is found to be reasonable and possibly superior to the existing alignment, it would actually require reopening the docket to have that segment approved.

Q And I believe you had one additional clarification to make to your surrebuttal. I believe it's on page 8, lines 4 through 5, where you refer to a Federal Highway Administration document.

A Yes. It's actually a book that was written by two engineers at Purdue for transportation decision making.

MS. SILVER KARSH: Thank you. Now the witness is available for cross-examination.

MR. OLIVEIRA: I have one question, Your Honor.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Let's just go off the record for a minute.
(Discussion off the record.)
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Any cross?
MR. POTTS: We don't have any cross.

MR. OLIVEIRA: I have one question.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. OLIVEIRA:
Q For the record, Marcel Oliveira, CETF and SOUL.
Ms. Weiss testified that a project of this magnitude will invariably cause impacts. Would you agree that the purpose of an EIS is to identify as many of those as possible?

A Yes.

MR. OLIVEIRA: No further questions.
EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Redirect? Oh, I'm sorry. Right. I forgot.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. KUNZE:

Q Good afternoon, Ms. Zuelsdorff.
A Good afternoon.
Q Laura Kunze, self-representing. To what extent did your drafting of the EIS rely on the agricultural impact statement?

A Not really -- not to any extent. I did not draft that section.

Q In your direct testimony, page 2, lines 6 through 7, you state that you were responsible for drafting sections of the EIS regarding, among other subjects, airports and airstrips.

A Yes.

Q Have you reviewed the notice of hazard communications from the FAA contained in the application Appendix $H$ ?

A Yes.

Q Would you agree that there are over 1,300 pages of FAA communications in that appendix?

A Yes.
Q Is this a normal amount of notices or is this a significant number of notices and issues raised?

A I'm afraid I can't answer that question. This is a very lengthy project and there are a number of small airports and several larger airports along the project, and so I guess I'm not surprised that there are a number of determinations by the FAA.

Q The final EIS Appendix 11.3.5, airports and airstrips, did not reference Appendix $H$ nor did it address the impacts on the airport if mitigation was necessary based on the issues raised in the notice of hazard. Will the PSC correct this?

A Can I turn to 11 --

Q Absolutely.
MS. WEISS: Page 382.
MS. KUNZE: Thank you.
A We did not reference Appendix $H$ because it's a very lengthy and sort of complicated appendices. So
basically I took a lot of the wording that was actually in the applicants' text part of their application, the technical support document, and then some verbiage off of the FAA's sheet in Appendix $H$ and just used the wording in this section. I am not an expert in airports and airstrips.

Q Okay. If we could refer to PSC reference 226545 which I can hand to you. Are you familiar with my data request to the PSC with regard to Morey Field in Middleton?

A I guess not specifically.
Q Do you remember our conversation about it?

A I remember speaking with you on the phone, yes.
Q Have you seen PSC reference number 266545, it's Howe Exhibit 1 I believe it is. Is it appropriate now, Judge, to discuss those issues raised in that discovery request?

EXAMINER NEWMARK: I guess so. I mean, I don't know where you're going exactly.

A I would need a copy of that document or information. BY MS. KUNZE:

Q I can simply ask you the question because $I$ can't find it.
(Document tendered to the witness.)

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's go off the
record.
(Discussion off the record.)
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's get back on the record.

BY MS. KUNZE:
Q So in this document -- actually, Judge, it was on Wednesday I believe now. In this document, I've asked to provide topographical study as to Segment A as it pertains the height limitation ordinance for Morey Field due to the FAA's expression of concern for this area. Has a topographical study been conducted for this area of the project?

A To my knowledge, it has not. Could I clarify, are you talking about with respect to placement of transmission line structures?

Q Within specifically a height limitation ordinance zone.

A I don't believe the applicants have completed a topographical study within that airport limitation zone.

Q The FAA expressed concern about the instrumentation and low flight. What will the PSC do to understand the potential recommendations by the FAA?

MS. SILVER KARSH: I'd like to object. I think those might be questions better asked of the
applicants because they will be the ones to comply with FAA regulations or have discussions about what mitigations need to be conducted. I don't believe that's Ms. Zuelsdorff's expertise.

MS. KUNZE: Fair enough. I'll explain how it pertains to where I'm going, if that's okay.

Q So it is stated that the FAA has had some concerns, and the EIS goes on to explain that those concerns by the FAA will be allayed through studies conducted by the applicant when the route is chosen. The concern here is that might the FAA require a variance or lighting or markings because this location Segment A is within -- is 1.8 miles into this three-mile limitation zone?

A It's possible.
Q And might those recommendations affect the environment with lighting, markings, different pole structure affect the environment in the Segment $A$ ?

A Yes, it's possible it would.
Q So therefore to provide a more thorough analysis of the impact of that area, should we not investigate what the FAA might stipulate for that area?

A I believe the hazard sheets mention structure height limitations or lighting as possible mitigation measures.

Q And would possible lighting and other mitigation measures differently affect the environment of that area other than what's been detailed in this report for Segment A?

A Yes.
Q Were you here for Mr. Lorenz's testimony the other day?

A I listened to most of it, I believe.
Q Did you hear that he had mentioned that there are poles near Morey Field currently for transmission lines?

A Yes. I know there are.
Q Do you remember how tall those poles were around the airport, Morey Field?

A No, I do not.
Q I believe he said the poles were 65 feet. But the objective was to point out that lighting isn't always required, that sometimes other measures are required, and this one was a height requirement. Are these 65-foot poles and something of this structure listed in Appendix A as a possible pole structure for Segment $A$ or for any of this project?

A I wouldn't know without consulting Appendix A.
Q The presence of a transmission line changes then the inherent and continued operation at Morey Field.

There are mitigation impacts and impacts not subject to mitigation that can alter the use and character of the airport. Where in the EIS are these potential impacts considered?

A I guess I don't understand the question. I don't know if -- the statement you read, where that came from.

Q I guess in speaking to -- well, even just listening and speaking to the Department of Transportation, aeronautic engineer, I can represent that I had that conversation and it's not uncommon for a variance to be filed --

MR. POTTS: I guess I'm going to object to that. I think we've been over this before. Ms. Kunze can't introduce technical evidence from someone she talked to that we can't cross-examine. EXAMINER NEWMARK: Sustained.

BY MS. KUNZE:

Q Hypothetically could a variance be filed to mitigate the pole issue such that the flight approach and departure of aircraft would be changed, made safer?

A It's possible.
Q And might that change affect potentially pilots who desire to use that airport?

A It's possible.

Q If they choose not to use that airport, could that not affect the business at Morey Field, a/k/a Middleton Municipal Airport?

A It could.

Q Were those impacts on business considered and analyzed in the EIS?

A No, they were not.

Q Give me a moment, please, to figure out where I'm at.
A Sure.

Q If we can switch to page 381 in the Environmental Impact Statement. It states that no known recreational paths are identified on Segment A.

A Yes.

Q I don't know if you were here earlier, are you familiar with an exhibit that was distributed yesterday which detailed a DNR-coordinated conservation area and nature segment in Segment $A$ ?

A I'm not aware of that from yesterday.
MS. KUNZE: Should I distribute that or do we rely on future reference to that document, Judge? I don't know how to proceed.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Well, I can show you your Exhibit 2. This is what you're talking about, right?

MS. KUNZE: Um-hmm. Thank you.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: That's got the reference in it.
(Document tendered to the witness.)
BY MS. KUNZE:
Q It for all intents and purposes detailed that the DNR was involved in coordinating a prairie conservation segment within the subdivision. Was that included in the Environmental Impact Statement?

A No, it was not. But we actually rely on local landowners to inform us of smaller properties that may be being specially managed. I don't know if this information came in prior to the drafting of the EIS or if this is the first time that this information has been brought forward, but we rely on local landowners to provide information such as this as early in the process as possible.
(Discussion off the record.)
Q How do you express that information then from the -you're relying on people to come to you. How would residents know that they are supposed to come to you for this type of information?

A We send a number of mailings. We had -- we send -EXAMINER NEWMARK: This has been covered, our public participation process.

A Through our public participation process. We sent
letters to everybody regarding the public scoping meetings. We were at the meetings, basically trying to interact with local landowners. And then after the draft EIS was presented and published, again, we solicited another letter telling people that it was available and requesting comments on the draft EIS to clarify or tell us of any incompletenesses or -- so, and then the final EIS. So we try to communicate with the public at several opportunities and then we also hold the public hearings.

BY MS. KUNZE:
Q Are you aware of the many public comments stating -from the residents in that area stating that the residents in the neighborhood used the path and the road along Bronner and Koch as a regularly traveled jogging and walking and biking path?

MR. POTTS: Objection, can you point to the specific comments you're talking about? MS. KUNZE: Do I have to -EXAMINER NEWMARK: Just -- let's let the question stand. I'm sure there are some. MS. KUNZE: Several.

A I mean, I remember many comments about people walking, hiking, pushing strollers and biking on Bronner Road in that area.

Q Thank you. Are you aware that these residents expressed specific health and other concerns related to walking, biking, jogging, directly under the proposed line?

A Yes.
Q EIS page 380 states that residential property owners will experience the greatest visual impact associated with the new transmission line on Segment A. But the presence of existing transmission lines in the immediate area mitigate this adverse impact to some extent. How have you arrived at that conclusion?

A Because there is an existing transmission line there, they are used to seeing the poles and the conductors and some semblance of cleared right-of-way beneath the line. Whereas on a brand new right-of-way, it would be -- this would be a -- it's viewed as an incremental impact rather than constructing a transmission line on a brand new right-of-way which would be a new impact.

Q Have the public comments you have read on that topic indicated that they would be used to and accepting of seeing the high voltage lines in place of the 138 kilovolt lines?

A No.

Q Same question in reference to the double circuiting
of the existing 138 kilovolt with the proposed 345. While taller and more visible on the landscape, the straighter alignment and relocation farther away from the homes would improve the overall aesthetic experience of these homeowners. Is that something they determined, that it would improve their overall experience?

A
I said it could improve the overall experience. Because the 138 jogs off of a line and goes west and then south and then back east again, I assumed that a straighter line could improve the aesthetics of the area.

Q Might you also agree conversely that the replacement of a lower voltage, lower visibility, lower impact 138 kV line is very different than that of a much larger, much more obtrusive 345 kV line that hums and crackles, will there be a difference?

A Yes.

Q Have the other comments you've read indicated an acceptance and approval of the high voltage 345 replacement?

A No.

Q How are property owners compensated for their loss or potential loss of property value?

A That's through an appraisal and easement process that
the utility conducts with the affected landowner. So I'm not directly involved in that process and I'm not informed on all aspects of that acquisition process.

Q Are there times when the differences in property value cannot be, hypothetically, appropriately mitigated or compensated?

A Yes.
MS. SILVER KARSH: I'm going to object because I think that again is out of Ms. Zuelsdorff's area.

BY MS. KUNZE:
Q Overall, Ms. Zuelsdorff, your analysis and your thorough reading of public input, would you say that the residents, the densely populated, more densely populated area have welcomed the opportunity of this 345 kilovolt line?

A No, they did not.
Q Would you say they are very much against the proposed Badger Coulee line in Segment A in their highly densely populated area?

A Yes.
MS. KUNZE: Thank you. I have no further questions, Your Honor.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Redirect.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. SILVER KARSH:

Q Just a question or two. How did the impacts differ between Segments $A$ and $B$ ?

A The two segments are quite different. Segment $A$ mostly follows an existing transmission line right-of-way. It's more densely populated than Segment B. But there are actually fewer homes within 300 feet of the centerline. The line would likely be more visible to more people on Segment $A$ versus Segment B. But there are more homes within close proximity to the line on Segment $B$ and Segment $B$ would be mostly new right-of-way that would be cut through hilly topography and through a mostly wooded landscape. There are very clear differences between the segments and the EIS is just trying to present those differences.

Q So you wouldn't say that one has necessarily greater impacts than another, their impacts are different?

A Their impacts are very different, right. MS. SILVER KARSH: I don't have any further questions. EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Thank you, ma'am. You're excused.

MR. POTTS: I have an administrative item. The prehearing conference memo requires all of us to file within three days of receiving the transcript corrections. Could we change that to five days after the hearing?

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Yes. You beat me to that.

MR. POTTS: Because some of them have already come in.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Right.
(Discussion off the record.)
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's put that on the record. We'll change the deadline for transcript corrections to three days after the last transcript is served on the parties. Let's go off the record.
(Discussion off the record.)
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's get on the record. Let's say if there is a request for expanding the reply brief page limits from 30 pages, that the response to that motion would be two business days, okay, and then do we need reply to the motion as well? Let's make that one day if you need to reply. Okay. And if you want to speed up that process, just get the brief in earlier so we know what your take is on that.

MR. POTTS: We can assume under the prehearing conference memo if no one responds within two days then it's granted?

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Then it's granted, yeah. Well, I'll -- okay, yeah, if I don't... Let's go off the record.
(Discussion off the record.)
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let me say on the record we'll deal with whether -- we'll deal with granting that motion when it comes. So it won't be automatically granted.

MS. JACKSON: Your Honor, I'm Amanda Jackson for the City of Onalaska. I had some transportation issues on the first day and I didn't get my appearance entered.

EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's go off the record.
(Discussion off the record.)
EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's get on the record. Thanks, everybody, for your participation and your patience and the hard work. I appreciate it. I think the record has benefitted greatly. So we'll look forward to seeing your briefs.
(The hearing adjourned at 3:00 p.m.)
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