PSC REF#:230602

5-CE-142

Transcript of Proceedings

Volume 11

Technical Session

January 9, 2015



ORIGINAL *

1 }

800.899.7222 • www.GramannReporting.com

 MILWAUKEE
 414.272.7878
 • FAX:
 414.272.1806
 • 740 North Plankinton Ave, Suite 400, Milwaukee, WI 53203

 MADISON
 608.268.0435
 • FAX:
 608.268.0437
 • 14 West Mifflin Street, Suite 311, Madison, WI 53703

	1/9/2015 Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 1	1 Page 1
1	BEFORE THE	
2	2 PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF WIS	CONSIN
3	3	
4	4 JOINT APPLICATION OF AMERICAN) TRANSMISSION COMPANY LLC and NORTHERN)	
5	5 STATES POWER COMPANY-WISCONSIN, AS)	Docket No.
6		
7		
8		
9	9	
10	D EXAMINER MICHAEL NEWMARK, PRES	IDING
11	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS	
12	2 VOLUME 11	
13 14	UKIGINAI	
15	Reported By:	
16	5 LYNN M. BAYER, RPR, RMR, JENNIFER M. STEIDTMANN, RPR, CRR	
17		
18	3	
19	9	
20) HEARING HELD: TRANSCRIPT	PAGES:
21	L January 9, 2015 1 - 184, I	ncl.
22	Madison, Wisconsin	
23	9:30 a.m. Weiss 3	
24		
25	5	

	1/9/2015 Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 2
1	APPEARANCES
2	
3	ON BEHALF OF ATC MANAGEMENT, INC.
4	FOLEY & LARDNER LLP, by Mr. Trevor Will and
5	Mr. Brian Potts, 777 East Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, WI
6	53202-5306.
7	
8	ON BEHALF OF XCEL/NSPW
9	BRIGGS & MORGAN PA, by Ms. Lisa M. Agrimonti and
10	Valerie Herring, 80 South 8th Street, Suite 2200,
11	Minneapolis, MN 55402.
12	
13	ON BEHALF OF SAVE OUR UNIQUE LANDS OF WISCONSIN (SOUL) and
14	CITIZENS ENERGY TASK FORCE (CETF)
15	REYNOLDS OLIVEIRA LLC, by Mr. Marcel S. Oliveira,
16	407 East Main Street, Madison, WI 53703.
17	
18	ON BEHALF OF CLEAN WISCONSIN
19	MCGILLIVRAY WESTERBERG & BENDER LLC, by
20	Ms. Christa O. Westerberg, 211 South Paterson Street,
21	Suite 320, Madison, WI 53703.
22	
23	ON BEHALF OF CONCERNED CITIZENS OF HIGHWAY 33
24	EMINENT DOMAIN SERVICES LLC, by Mr. Erik S. Olsen,
25	131 West Wilson Street, Suite 304, Madison, WI 53703.

```
1/9/2015
                      Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11
                                                                Page 3
      A P P E A R A N C E S: (Continued)
 1
 2
 3
      ON BEHALF OF DANE COUNTY
 4
            DANE COUNTY CORPORATION COUNSEL, by Mr. Carlos
      Pabellon, 210 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, Room 419,
 5
 6
      Madison, WI 53705.
 7
 8
      ON BEHALF OF ENVIRONMENTAL LAW & POLICY CENTER (ELPC)
 9
            ENVIRONMENTAL LAW & POLICY CENTER, by
10
      Ms. Stephanie K. Chase and Mr. Justin Vickers, 222 South
11
      Hamilton Street, Suite 14, Madison, WI 53703.
12
13
      ON BEHALF OF THE TOWN OF HOLLAND
14
            PROGRESSIVE LAW GROUP LLC, by Mr. Frank Jablonski,
15
      354 West Main Street, Madison, WI 53703.
16
17
      ON BEHALF OF LAURA KUNZE
18
            Ms. Laura Kunze, 7628 Koch Road, Middleton, WI
19
      53562.
20
21
      ON BEHALF OF DAIRYLAND POWER COOPERATIVE
22
            WHEELER, VAN SICKLE & ANDERSON, S.C., by
23
      Mr. Vincent M. Mele, 25 West Main Street, Suite 801,
24
      Madison, WI 53703.
25
```

	1/9/2015Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11Page 4
1	APPEARANCES: (Continued)
2	
3	ON BEHALF OF SOUTHERN MINNESOTA MUNICIPAL POWER AGENCY
4	(SMMPA)
5	DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP, by Mr. Joseph Hall, 1801 K
6	Street NW, Suite 750, Washington, DC 200006.
7	
8	ON BEHALF OF BUSINESS AND LABOR INTERVENOR GROUP
9	CULLEN WESTON PINES & BACH LLP, by Ms. Susan M.
10	Crawford, 122 West Washington Avenue, Suite 900, Madison,
11	WI 53703.
12	
13	ON BEHALF OF DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
14	STATE OF WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES,
15	by Ms. Megan E. Correll, 101 South Webster Street, P.O.
16	Box 7921, Madison, WI 53707.
17	
18	ON BEHALF OF CITY OF ONALASKA
19	O'FLAHERTY HEIM EGAN & BIRNBAUM, LTD., by Ms. Amanda
20	Halderson Jackson, 201 Main Street, 10th Floor, La Crosse,
21	WI 54601.
22	
23	(Continued)
24	
25	

	1/9/2015 Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11	Page 5
1	APPEARANCES: (Continued)	
2		
3	OF THE COMMISSION STAFF	
4	JOHN LORENCE, Legal Counsel	
5	ARIELLE SILVER KARSH, Legal Counsel	
6	JAMES LEPINSKI	
7	SCOT CULLEN	
8		
9		
10	(FOR INDEX SEE BACK OF PUBLIC TRANSCRIPT.)	
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 6
1		(Transcript of Proceedings, 9:30 a.m.)
2		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's get on the record
3		and deal with any housekeeping matters.
4		MR. POTTS: We would we've had some
5		discussions with staff, and one of the new exhibits
6		we filed with Mr. Holtz's surrebuttal I'm trying
7		to find the number of it right now.
8		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
9		MR. POTTS: We think it would be easier
10		for the Commission and everyone if we added a column
11		that showed the costs of the different re-routes.
12		So that exhibit is an exhibit of all the different
13		re-routes that have been proposed by staff or the
14		applicants that the applicants are have found
15		acceptable, and we would propose to add a column of
16		the cost differences and then add on the bottom of
17		that table the other items that have been raised
18		that would have cost impacts, like the bird study
19		and the estimated cost impact, which we would just
20		use the cost of from the Crane Foundation and any
21		others. Obviously parties could object afterwards.
22		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Right. So that would
23		be Holtz 1?
24		MR. POTTS: I think it's Holtz 1, yes.
25		EXAMINER NEWMARK: So the Crane Foundation

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 7
1		1, that would be just based on the data request
2		response figures?
3		MR. POTTS: It's actually in the FEIS.
4		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Oh, is it? Okay. But
5		it's those numbers you're talking about?
6		MR. POTTS: I think it's about 140,000.
7		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
8		MR. POTTS: So it would just be easier for
9		the Commission.
10		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Sure.
11		MR. POTTS: And the Commission staff I
12		think is in agreement with it.
13		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. That works. So
14		it will just be considered a late exhibit. We can
15		apply the three day
16		MR. POTTS: We'll just file a revised
17		Exhibit 1 for Holtz.
18		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Right. And we'll just
19		apply three-day filing deadline, three day right to
20		object.
21		MR. POTTS: It may take a couple days to
22		pull.
23		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Well, how much time you
24		need, that's fine. Week?
25		MR. POTTS: Yeah, we'll file it next week.

¢

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11	Page 8
1		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. That's fine.	
2		All right. Let me just note that on my anything	
3		else housekeeping related?	
4		(No response.)	
5		EXAMINER NEWMARK: I think it's agency	
6		witness day, my favorite day. So I'm going to leave	Э
7		it up to staff to propose or to call the witnesses	
8		in the order they wish. I know we started the	
9		other party intervenors went with need and then	
10		routing, so I'm assuming we'll take that tack here	
11		but	-
12		So this is Ms. Halpin.	
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

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?		1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 9
3 DIRECT EXAMINATION 4 BY MR. LORENCE: 5 Q Could you state your name for the record, please. 6 A Alice Halpin. 7 Q And where do you work? 8 A The Wisconsin Department of Agricultural, Trade & Consumer Protection. 9 Q And in preparation for today's hearing, did you file direct testimony and 10 Q And in preparation for today's hearing, did you file direct testimony and 11 A And rebuttal. 12 A And rebuttal. 13 Q and rebuttal testimony and one exhibit, correct? 14 A Yes, I did. 15 Q And if I asked you the questions in your direct and rebuttal testimony today, would your answers be the same? 18 A Yes, they would. 19 MR. LORENCE: I believe her testimony is already into evidence, and she's available for cross. 12 EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. That's right. 13 Yeah. Any questions? 14 Any questions?	1		ALICE HALPIN, WDATCP WITNESS, DULY SWORN
 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. 	2		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
 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. 	3		DIRECT EXAMINATION
 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. 	4	ву м	R. LORENCE:
 7 Q And where do you work? 8 A The Wisconsin Department of Agricultural, Trade & Consumer Protection. 9 And in preparation for today's hearing, did you file direct testimony and 14 And rebuttal. 13 Q and rebuttal testimony and one exhibit, correct? 14 A Yes, I did. 15 Q And if I asked you the questions in your direct and rebuttal testimony today, would your answers be the same? 18 A Yes, they would. 19 MR. LORENCE: I believe her testimony is already into evidence, and she's available for cross. 20 EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. That's right. 21 Yeah. Any questions? 24 MR. WILL: Nothing from ATC. 	5	Q	Could you state your name for the record, please.
 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. 	6	A	Alice Halpin.
 Gonsumer 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. 	7	Q	And where do you work?
 10 Q And in preparation for today's hearing, did you file 11 direct testimony and 12 A And rebuttal. 13 Q and rebuttal testimony and one exhibit, correct? 14 A Yes, I did. 15 Q And if I asked you the questions in your direct and 16 rebuttal testimony today, would your answers be the 17 same? 18 A Yes, they would. 19 MR. LORENCE: I believe her testimony is already into evidence, and she's available for 20 cross. 21 EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. That's right. 23 Yeah. Any questions? 24 MR. WILL: Nothing from ATC. 	8	A	The Wisconsin Department of Agricultural, Trade &
11 direct testimony and 12 A And rebuttal. 13 Q and rebuttal testimony and one exhibit, correct? 14 A Yes, I did. 15 Q And if I asked you the questions in your direct and rebuttal testimony today, would your answers be the same? 18 A Yes, they would. 19 MR. LORENCE: I believe her testimony is already into evidence, and she's available for cross. 20 EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. That's right. 23 Yeah. Any questions? 24 MR. WILL: Nothing from ATC.	9		Consumer Protection.
 12 A And rebuttal. 13 Q and rebuttal testimony and one exhibit, correct? 14 A Yes, I did. 15 Q And if I asked you the questions in your direct and rebuttal testimony today, would your answers be the same? 18 A Yes, they would. 19 MR. LORENCE: I believe her testimony is already into evidence, and she's available for cross. 20 EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. That's right. 23 Yeah. Any questions? 24 MR. WILL: Nothing from ATC. 	10	Q	And in preparation for today's hearing, did you file
 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. 	11	-	direct testimony and
 14 A Yes, I did. 15 Q And if I asked you the questions in your direct and rebuttal testimony today, would your answers be the same? 18 A Yes, they would. 19 MR. LORENCE: I believe her testimony is already into evidence, and she's available for cross. 20 EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. That's right. 23 Yeah. Any questions? 24 MR. WILL: Nothing from ATC. 	12	A	And rebuttal.
 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. 	13	Q	and rebuttal testimony and one exhibit, correct?
16 rebuttal testimony today, would your answers be the 17 same? 18 A Yes, they would. 19 MR. LORENCE: I believe her testimony is already into evidence, and she's available for 21 cross. 22 EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. That's right. 23 Yeah. Any questions? 24 MR. WILL: Nothing from ATC.	14	A	Yes, I did.
 17 same? 18 A Yes, they would. 19 MR. LORENCE: I believe her testimony is already into evidence, and she's available for 21 cross. 22 EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. That's right. 23 Yeah. Any questions? 24 MR. WILL: Nothing from ATC. 	15	Q	And if I asked you the questions in your direct and
 18 A Yes, they would. 19 MR. LORENCE: I believe her testimony is 20 already into evidence, and she's available for 21 cross. 22 EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. That's right. 23 Yeah. Any questions? 24 MR. WILL: Nothing from ATC. 	16		rebuttal testimony today, would your answers be the
19 MR. LORENCE: I believe her testimony is 20 already into evidence, and she's available for 21 cross. 22 EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. That's right. 23 Yeah. Any questions? 24 MR. WILL: Nothing from ATC.	17		same?
20 already into evidence, and she's available for 21 cross. 22 EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. That's right. 23 Yeah. Any questions? 24 MR. WILL: Nothing from ATC.	18	A	Yes, they would.
<pre>21 cross. 22 EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. That's right. 23 Yeah. Any questions? 24 MR. WILL: Nothing from ATC.</pre>	19		MR. LORENCE: I believe her testimony is
 22 EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. That's right. 23 Yeah. Any questions? 24 MR. WILL: Nothing from ATC. 	20		already into evidence, and she's available for
 23 Yeah. Any questions? 24 MR. WILL: Nothing from ATC. 	21		cross.
24 MR. WILL: Nothing from ATC.	22		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. That's right.
	23		Yeah. Any questions?
25 EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Anyone else?	24		MR. WILL: Nothing from ATC.
	25		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Anyone else?

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 10
1		MS. KUNZE: Your Honor, I have some
2		questions.
3		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Come on up.
4		CROSS-EXAMINATION
5	BY M	S. KUNZE:
6	Q	Thank you. Good morning, Ms. Halpin.
7	A	Good morning.
8	Q	I'm Laura Kunze, self-representing.
9	A	Okay.
10	Q	Ms. Halpin, your direct testimony, page 2, lines 10
11		through 23, and the AIS refers to land surveys and
12		charts. I note that input data are not from
13		responses to survey and comments by farmland owners
14		and are not totals but do provide an indication of
15		the degree of impact. Does that mean that the data
16		provided in the survey responses was not
17		independently verified?
18	A	No. It means that we didn't survey every single
19		farmland owner who would be affected, we only
20		surveyed where they might have four acres or more
21		potentially acquired as easements. So any any
22		acquisition or any easement acquisition less than
23		four acres we didn't survey.
24	Q	Okay. And does it mean that the Department of
25		Agriculture did not gather information and relied

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 11
1		only on survey responses? You didn't do outreach?
2	A	We relied on our surveys. We looked at the some
3		of the public comments as they came through. I
4		didn't read every single public comment that came
5		through, but I did try to read as many as I could.
6		We were at the original public meetings that the PSC
7		held, and we gathered information there.
8	Q	Okay. So the information was voluntary?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	Your testimony states that it is valuable to
11		recognize that this is page 3, lines 1 through 5.
12		It is valuable to recognize that these three
13		responses do not include all landowners who are
14		concerned about the four impacts along the proposed
15		route. How were impacts on landowners not surveyed
16		taken into account?
17	A	Our survey was generally to gather the types of
18		concerns people had, not to not to do a complete
19		summary of all of them. So it's we didn't the
20		concerns that people had from the larger acquisitions
21		we assumed would also be concerns that smaller
22		people having smaller acquisitions would have.
23	Q	So how were were the landowners that were not
24		surveyed taken into account at all?
25	A	They were in the totals of acres affected.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 12
1	Q	Even if they had not replied to the survey?
2	А	Right.
3	Q	So how did you tally that information? How did you
4		gather that if it wasn't via survey? And I'm
5		referring also to those parcels under four acres.
6	A	The ATC, the applicants, provided information to
7		us about their corridor and their anticipated
8		impacts, and then we received that in a GIS in
9		several GIS layers, and we had a GIS analyst who also
10		reviewed that and totaled the summaries for cropland,
11		pasture, other agricultural lands like oat fields and
12		specialty crop farmland.
13	Q	Would you agree that the AIS is not a complete
14	:	analysis of all farmland and farm operations in the
15		project area?
16	A	I would agree.
17	Q	And are you aware of the Town of Springfield's
18		comprehensive land use plan in which an
19		agricultural long-term agricultural preservation
20		area is listed?
21	A	I have not reviewed that.
22		MS. KUNZE: May I please submit an
23		exhibit, please?
24		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's see. Distribute
25		copies, and I'll need a copy.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 13
1		MS. KUNZE: May I approach?
2		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Yes. Just make sure
3		everyone has copies.
4		MS. KUNZE: Sorry for the delay.
5		EXAMINER NEWMARK: We can mark this
6		Halpin 1 (sic).
7		(Exhibit Halpin 2 marked for identification.)
8		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Can you just describe
9		where this is from?
10		MS. KUNZE: Town of Springfield website.
11		MR. LORENCE: It will be Halpin 2.
12		EXAMINER NEWMARK: You're right, Halpin 2.
13		MR. POTTS: Your Honor, this may already
14		be in the record, the application, its map.
15		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Well, I guess the
16		application is big enough. We're going to speak to
17		it directly
18		MS. KUNZE: Thank you. Unless you can
19		point it out where it is in the record already.
20		MR. POTTS: We're trying. It's a big
21		record.
22		MS. KUNZE: Yes, it is. Thank you.
23		EXAMINER NEWMARK: We'll just put this in.
24		Well, go ahead with your questions.
25		MS. KUNZE: Thank you.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 14
1	ву м	S. KUNZE:
2	Q	So how might pole positions, just moving on, and the
3		120-foot right-of-way affect contour farming?
4	A	It could interfere with a farmland owner's pattern of
5		cropping his field, which in turn would interfere
6		with the contours.
7	Q	And
8	A	It could be an obstacle I guess would be the best way
9		to say it.
10	Q	It could be I couldn't hear, I'm sorry.
11	A	It could be an obstacle for the person farming.
12	Q	Okay.
13	A	And so they wouldn't be able to cover their fields in
14		the same pattern, crop their fields in the same
15		pattern as they had in the past.
16	Q	Thank you. And what is the purpose of contour
17		farming?
18	A	To minimize erosion.
19	Q	Uh-huh. How could this detour and obstacle issue be
20		mitigated?
21	A	I believe the applicants have some leeway along the
22		centerline of their easement for moving poles, and so
23		it's my understanding that it's their intention to
24		work with landowners where possible if they needed to
25		move the poles a few feet. You know, tens of feet,
		Perperting (td (200) 200-7222

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 15
1		not certainly not hundreds of feet. So moving a
2		pole may help a farmer if they have issues of access
3		or moving around fields, that sort of thing.
4	Q	Would they still have to steer around that pole
5		within the contour?
6	A	If it's in their field.
7	Q	Have you read the public comments from farmers from
8		Segment A?
9	A	I've read many of the public comments. I haven't
10		read all of them. I've read many of them.
11	Q	Are you aware of a farmer who has sustained a serious
12		physical injury that makes excessive steering of farm
13		equipment difficult?
14	A	I'm not.
15	Q	Would you agree that placement of transmission poles
16		on his land could create additional steering issues
17		and undue hardship?
18	A	It could.
19	Q	And how could those issues be mitigated?
20	A	I'm not an expert in adjusting equipment, but I
21		assume there may be adjustments to the equipment that
22		could be made to make it easier to steer or a re
23		as I was saying earlier, if the pole could be moved
24		to a location that is causes less steering issues,
25		that could be a solution.

1QIn your in the AIS, page 58 to 59, reports only2three questionnaires were sent and that there were3two farmland replies. My farm was not included. The4concerns I have regarding my farm operations are not5addressed in the AIS, and I have concerns about6specifically EMF, how that affects the cortisol level7in cattle and how that might affect cattle8insemination and weight gain rates.9A10QAnd I would also be concerned about11cross-contamination of crops and pesticides from the12neighboring nonorganic farm onto my principally13organic-run farm due to complete removal of a14tree-lined wind break, loss of hay crops from15construction and future losses, potential invasion of16pasture, animal containment areas due to fence loss17on line during construction phase and potential18future loss, minimum number of animals raised due to19pasture and animal containment area reductions20potentially. How would these concerns be addressed21going forward?22AIt is my understanding that once if the project is23approved and route is selected, that it's our24recommendation to the applicants that they contact25each farm operation individually and survey them for		1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 16
3two 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.9A10QAnd 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?24A24It 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	1	Q	In your in the AIS, page 58 to 59, reports only
 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 	2		three questionnaires were sent and that there were
5addressed in the AIS, and I have concerns about6specifically EMF, how that affects the cortisol level7in cattle and how that might affect cattle8insemination and weight gain rates.9A10QAnd I would also be concerned about11cross-contamination of crops and pesticides from the12neighboring nonorganic farm onto my principally13organic-run farm due to complete removal of a14tree-lined wind break, loss of hay crops from15construction and future losses, potential invasion of16pasture, animal containment areas due to fence loss17on line during construction phase and potential18future loss, minimum number of animals raised due to19pasture and animal containment area reductions20potentially. How would these concerns be addressed21going forward?22AIt is my understanding that once if the project is23approved and route is selected, that it's our24recommendation to the applicants that they contact	3		two farmland replies. My farm was not included. The
 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 	4		concerns I have regarding my farm operations are not
 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 	5		addressed in the AIS, and I have concerns about
 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 	6		specifically EMF, how that affects the cortisol level
 9 A Uh-huh. 10 Q And I would also be concerned about 11 cross-contamination of crops and pesticides from the 12 neighboring nonorganic farm onto my principally 13 organic-run farm due to complete removal of a 14 tree-lined wind break, loss of hay crops from 15 construction and future losses, potential invasion of 16 pasture, animal containment areas due to fence loss 17 on line during construction phase and potential 18 future loss, minimum number of animals raised due to 19 pasture and animal containment area reductions 20 potentially. How would these concerns be addressed 21 going forward? 22 A It is my understanding that once if the project is 23 approved and route is selected, that it's our 24 recommendation to the applicants that they contact 	7		in cattle and how that might affect cattle
 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 	8		insemination and weight gain rates.
11cross-contamination of crops and pesticides from the12neighboring nonorganic farm onto my principally13organic-run farm due to complete removal of a14tree-lined wind break, loss of hay crops from15construction and future losses, potential invasion of16pasture, animal containment areas due to fence loss17on line during construction phase and potential18future loss, minimum number of animals raised due to19pasture and animal containment area reductions20potentially. How would these concerns be addressed21going forward?22AIt is my understanding that once if the project is23approved and route is selected, that it's our24recommendation to the applicants that they contact	9	A	Uh-huh.
12 neighboring nonorganic farm onto my principally 13 organic-run farm due to complete removal of a 14 tree-lined wind break, loss of hay crops from 15 construction and future losses, potential invasion of 16 pasture, animal containment areas due to fence loss 17 on line during construction phase and potential 18 future loss, minimum number of animals raised due to 19 pasture and animal containment area reductions 20 potentially. How would these concerns be addressed 21 going forward? 22 A It is my understanding that once if the project is 23 approved and route is selected, that it's our 24 recommendation to the applicants that they contact	10	Q	And I would also be concerned about
13 organic-run farm due to complete removal of a 14 tree-lined wind break, loss of hay crops from 15 construction and future losses, potential invasion of 16 pasture, animal containment areas due to fence loss 17 on line during construction phase and potential 18 future loss, minimum number of animals raised due to 19 pasture and animal containment area reductions 20 potentially. How would these concerns be addressed 21 going forward? 22 A It is my understanding that once if the project is 23 approved and route is selected, that it's our 24 recommendation to the applicants that they contact	11		cross-contamination of crops and pesticides from the
14tree-lined wind break, loss of hay crops from15construction and future losses, potential invasion of16pasture, animal containment areas due to fence loss17on line during construction phase and potential18future loss, minimum number of animals raised due to19pasture and animal containment area reductions20potentially. How would these concerns be addressed21going forward?22AIt is my understanding that once if the project is23approved and route is selected, that it's our24recommendation to the applicants that they contact	12		neighboring nonorganic farm onto my principally
15 construction and future losses, potential invasion of 16 pasture, animal containment areas due to fence loss 17 on line during construction phase and potential 18 future loss, minimum number of animals raised due to 19 pasture and animal containment area reductions 20 potentially. How would these concerns be addressed 21 going forward? 22 A It is my understanding that once if the project is 23 approved and route is selected, that it's our 24 recommendation to the applicants that they contact	13		organic-run farm due to complete removal of a
16 pasture, animal containment areas due to fence loss 17 on line during construction phase and potential 18 future loss, minimum number of animals raised due to 19 pasture and animal containment area reductions 20 potentially. How would these concerns be addressed 21 going forward? 22 A It is my understanding that once if the project is 23 approved and route is selected, that it's our 24 recommendation to the applicants that they contact	14		tree-lined wind break, loss of hay crops from
 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 	15		construction and future losses, potential invasion of
18 future loss, minimum number of animals raised due to 19 pasture and animal containment area reductions 20 potentially. How would these concerns be addressed 21 going forward? 22 A It is my understanding that once if the project is 23 approved and route is selected, that it's our 24 recommendation to the applicants that they contact	16		pasture, animal containment areas due to fence loss
19 pasture and animal containment area reductions 20 potentially. How would these concerns be addressed 21 going forward? 22 A It is my understanding that once if the project is 23 approved and route is selected, that it's our 24 recommendation to the applicants that they contact	17		on line during construction phase and potential
20 potentially. How would these concerns be addressed 21 going forward? 22 A It is my understanding that once if the project is 23 approved and route is selected, that it's our 24 recommendation to the applicants that they contact	18		future loss, minimum number of animals raised due to
21 going forward? 22 A It is my understanding that once if the project is 23 approved and route is selected, that it's our 24 recommendation to the applicants that they contact	19		pasture and animal containment area reductions
22 A It is my understanding that once if the project is 23 approved and route is selected, that it's our 24 recommendation to the applicants that they contact	20		potentially. How would these concerns be addressed
23 approved and route is selected, that it's our 24 recommendation to the applicants that they contact	21		going forward?
24 recommendation to the applicants that they contact	22	A	It is my understanding that once if the project is
	23		approved and route is selected, that it's our
25 each farm operation individually and survey them for	24		recommendation to the applicants that they contact
	25		each farm operation individually and survey them for

.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 17
1		potential concerns and then deal with those concerns
2		individually.
3	Q	Were these concerns taken into effect before the
4		route has been chosen?
5	A	That would be the Commissioners who would do that.
6	Q	The first page of the AIS states that the AIS offers
7		applicants practices and techniques to avoid or
8		mitigate damages to farmland and farm operations, and
9		that information in an AIS cannot stop a project.
10		What if impacts cannot be mitigated?
11	A	The actual loss of land, the land that's used for the
12		pole foundation, any that's any impacts due to
13		the pole's location, that farm is cannot adjust
14		to, I guess that would be it.
15	Q	Well, what if the concerns and issues and impacts
16		cannot be addressed and mitigated by the applicant or
17		other agency, what happens to the farmer?
18	A	I would assume the compensation for that, any things
19		that cannot be mitigated for, would be part of the
20		easement compensation that the landowner receives.
21	Q	If the easement compensation plan states that only
22		compensation is given for land value, would these
23		other issues that would impact the farmer be
24		addressed?
25	A	That would be a question for ATC. It would be up to

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 18
1		them.
2	Q	For the purpose of AIS, how is farm defined?
3	A	I believe it's any operation that can produce \$1,000
4		worth of produce or income in one year or 3,000 over
5		three years. 3,000, it's over three years.
6	Q	Most farmers live on their land. How does the AIS
7		take this inherent impact into account?
8	A	We do through the concerns that they raise. If they
9		raise concerns about living there, we try to list
10		those in their comments.
11	Q	So if a farmer were not aware of this project fully
12		and they had not received a survey, would they know
13		how to contact you ahead of time to help work through
14		this issue and mitigate any potential impact?
15	A	They might not.
16	Q	I raise horses and train, and I require a substantial
17		number of outbuildings, corrals, pastures where
18		horses are housed, bed, trained and intense human
19		presence would be in these areas, and for these
20		reasons my farm is vulnerable to the encroachment of
21		a transmission line, and I expect to lose pasture and
22		working area and suffer animal and human health
23		impacts related to living and working in this area.
24		Would you would this be regarded as a unique
25		agricultural type in the AIS?

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 19
1	A	There are other livestock owners along the routes and
2		others who use outbuildings and pastures, so I would
3		think it would be in addition to the existing to
4		any of the land farmland owners and farm
5		operations along the routes.
6	Q	How is the encroachment of transmission addressed in
7		the AIS?
8	A	I don't understand your question.
9	Q	Is it do they address how the impact of these
10		lines on the land of the farmers at all, limiting
11		work, operations, et cetera?
12	A	That's the full scope of the Ag Impact Statement is
13		describing the impacts, yes.
14	Q	Is the scope complete?
15	A	We didn't as we discussed before, we didn't survey
16		every landowner, so every landowner's concerns are
17		not included, but we feel the the breadth of the
18		impacts are complete.
19	Q	How could this be mitigated? How could we have a
20		more complete statement and analysis?
21	A	We could survey every single landowner, but that
22		would increase the cost and the time and would
23		we'd have to spend more time processing the surveys
24		rather than looking into concerns that people had.
25	Q	But would you be aware of the concerns if they had

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 20
1		not been contacted?
2	A	If someone has concerns that weren't addressed, I
3		would assume we would then be aware if we contacted
4		everyone.
5	Q	I guess I'm sorry, I didn't quite understand your
6		reply.
7	A	The if we had the contacts we made were to get
8		an overall view of the potential impacts. They
9		weren't to get everybody's concerns. So if if we
10		contacted everyone, they would have that opportunity
11		to express their concerns.
12	Q	If you had contacted everybody, you would know the
13		concerns, did I understand that correctly?
14	A	If they chose to reply.
15	Q	If they chose to reply. The AIS states that there
16		are specific considerations to assess route segment
17		decisions and degree of impacts. It goes on to
18		mention total agriculture land across a segment
19		corridor where a fence, pasture or paddock is
20		affected. How are the impacts on a larger area
21		within the fenced area evaluated?
22	A	We describe how fencing could be affected. We
23		describe potential loss of land for cropland, not so
24		much for pasture because the animals still would have
25		access, except for the areas of the foundation, so

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 21
1		those impacts are.
2	Q	And the new versus existing right-of-way on
3		agricultural land, where new right-of-way will be
4		taken to expand an existing easement, how is that
5		evaluated?
6	A	We compare the numbers.
7	Q	And the right-of-way in comparing, is it listed in a
8		table?
9	A	I believe so.
10	Q	Would that be page 3? We'll get to that.
11		The right-of-way, let's see, on AIS
12		page 66 does not address the new land to be taken
13		from for the easement that is to be added. It's
14		not clear that that map is done, I guess, is what
15		I'm saying. So I wonder where that is recorded.
16		I'm talking about the difference. Do you know what
17		I'm asking, the difference between the smaller
18		right-of-way for a lower voltage and then between
19		the larger right-of-way, is that accounted for in
20		here?
21	A	You're talking about the new versus existing?
22	Q	Yes. Uh-huh. That difference in acreage between the
23		right-of-way easements.
24	A	It will take me some time.
25	Q	Is it just a simple math calculation, Ms. Halpin?

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 22
1	A	It's in our table at the beginning. It's simple math
2		calculation, yes.
3	Q	Okay.
4	A	I'm looking at the NSP versus O in the executive
5		summary.
6	Q	Uh-huh.
7	A	The tables there, they have right-of-way.
8	Q	Yes, on page the third page of the summary. So is
9		the there's existing row and there's new row.
10	A	Right-of-way.
11	Q	Right-of-way, sorry. Thank you. Is there a
12		differentiation in are you accounting for the
13		difference in the acreage?
14	A	Existing right-of-way is where there's any existing
15		easement along an existing transmission line or
16		existing road right-of-way. New right-of-way is
17		where there's no existing easement.
18	Q	But where the existing easement is less than the
19		proposed new easement, is that difference accounted
20		for?
21	A	I don't understand what you mean by accounted for. I
22		mean, it's there in the table.
23		EXAMINER NEWMARK: It's included in the
24		new right-of-way acreage, the expansion of an
25		existing easement?

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 23
1		THE WITNESS: Well, there's new and
2		there's existing.
3		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. So it is part of
4		the new exist part of the new
5		THE WITNESS: The new plus the existing
6		would be the total.
7	BY M	S. KUNZE:
8	Q	So I guess is the expanded portion of the easement on
9		an existing corridor included in the new right-of-way
10		number?
11	A	If there's acreage that is part of an existing
12		easement, that would be existing right-of-way. If
13		there's acreage that is not does not have an
14		existing easement, that would be new right-of-way.
15	Q	Okay. The right-of-way extends on is on the prime
16		and other highly productive farmland classes. AIS
17		page 66 does not address the new land to be taken
18		with easement that's to be addressed and use what
19		we're talking about, existing right-of-way, that was
20		provided. Do we know how many required acres are we
21		referring to with the new easement?
22		For the sake of time, I'm going to move on.
23		One moment, please.
24		Did you or another contributing member look
25		at surveys to determine land divisions and property
		Paparting 1td (800) 800-7222

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 24
1		boundaries?
2	A	In the GIS layer, there is owner-owned parcel level
3		data that identifies owners so, yes.
4	Q	Aerial map. So the actual property lines are
5		visible, not or are you relying on visual cues
6		from the from the GIS?
7	A	I wasn't the person who did the GIS in that analysis,
8		but I believe there are property lines visible.
9	Q	I can represent to you that my property extends
10		beyond the fence and tree line. Was that factored
11		in? Was that considered?
12	A	Your individual property?
13	Q	Uh-huh.
14	A	I did not look at your individual property on its
15		own, no.
16	Q	Then there's the number and type of agricultural
17		operations impacted. There's dairy, organic,
18		specialty, row crop, et cetera. Why tally the
19		different types of ag operation? What does that
20		accomplish?
21	A	To give an idea of what types of farm operations are
22		being affected. It's just to give another factor
23		that can be considered when analyzing the project.
24	Q	And do some types of agricultural operations have a
25		greater weight than others?

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 25
1	A	No.
2	Q	Is why is prime agriculture and agriculture land
3		of statewide importance broken out?
4	A	Because prime farmland is more productive than other
5		types of farmland.
6	Q	So would you say that prime farmland and farmland of
7		statewide importance would have a greater weight than
8		others?
9	A	It's just pointing out that they are more productive.
10		It's not giving them a weight.
11	Q	Would a more productive property add more value in
12		terms of farm productivity?
13	A	Presumably.
14	Q	The second page of the AIS states that the applicants
15		and the affected landowners should be aware of and
16		prepared to mitigate the major potential impacts to
17		agriculture, including impacts on crop production,
18		topsoil, and mixing soil compaction, erosion control
19		during construction and restoration, impacts on
20		drainage and irrigations system, impacts on
21		residences, affects on property value, impacts on
22	,	farm viability and future farm expansions. For each
23		of these, how might they be mitigated?
24	A	You want to go through the list one by one or
25	Q	Can they all be mitigated? In the interest of time,
	Gramana	Peparting 1td (800) 899-7222

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 26
1		would you like to detail those that
2	А	I think
3		MR. LORENCE: Your Honor, I'm going to
4		interject here and object. Her testimony is to
5		describe the impact statement, not the mitigation
6		of. Those are questions better addressed to the
7		applicants.
8		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
9		MS. KUNZE: To the applicants?
10		MR. LORENCE: Uh-huh.
11		MS. KUNZE: Thank you, Mr. Lorence.
12		EXAMINER NEWMARK: And were covered to a
13		large extent in the hearing already.
14		MS. KUNZE: Okay.
15	BY M	S. KUNZE:
16	Q	So in the AIS there is talk about the potential of
17		hiring an independent agricultural monitor and
18		inclusions of this requirement as an order point. Is
19		this a foregone conclusion, or is this something that
20		would require further effort?
21	A	If it were ordered, then it would have to that
22		person would need to be hired, and I'm not sure what
23		you mean by further effort. Presuming to be hired
24		and learn about the project.
25	Q	Who would order that?

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 27
1	A	Commissioners.
2	Q	Okay. Let's see. In looking at that same table that
3		we were looking at earlier, page 3, in looking at the
4		table, where is farmland of statewide importance
5		included?
6	A	I don't believe it's included in that table.
7	Q	Would you agree that due to its shortest length, that
8		Segment A has the lower total right-of-way area?
9	A	Versus B?
10	Q	Yeah, versus the two Bs.
11	A	Yes.
12	Q	Would you agree that despite the shortest distance,
13		Segment A has the highest number of poles in
14		agricultural land?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	Would you agree that Segment A has the highest
17		percentage of right-of-way land in agriculture at
18		61.9 percent versus 38.6 and 35.5 percent in the
19		others?
20	A	Yes.
21	Q	Would you agree that Segment A has the highest number
22		of prime farmland acres in the right-of-way?
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	Appendix 3 to the AIS is the full Landowners Bill of
25		Rights, and that's attached to the Ag Impact
	L	

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 28
1		Statement as Exhibit A. Should the entire 182.017 be
2		incorporated and not just Subdivision 7?
3	A	Incorporated into?
4	Q	Into the AIS.
5	A	In the future we could do that, yes.
6	Q	Is the Landowner Bill of Rights made part of the
7		utility's permit?
8	A	I don't know.
9	Q	How does a landowner assure compliance with the
10		Landowner Bill of Rights?
11	A	The Commission monitors the project after it's
12		ordered, so that would be beyond my expertise.
13	Q	Will a drain tile inventory be gathered prior to
14		construction on the land?
15	A	As I've said before, we've part of our request is
16		that the applicants contact each farmland owner
17		individually if the route if the project is
18		approved and question them about their concerns, and
19		one of the questions we would ask them to pursue
20		would be drainage and drain tiles.
21	Q	The crop damage compensation takes three forms. Is
22		damage to crops growing at the time of construction
23		compensable?
24	A	Yes.
25	Q	Is damage to crops due to compaction where soils take

1 2 3 A 4 Q 5 6 7	<pre>time to recover from compaction compensable, excuse me? I don't know. 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? I believe our analysis is thorough. It may not be</pre>
3 A 4 Q 5 6 7	I don't know. 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?
4 Q 5 6 7	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?
5 6 7	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?
6 7	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?
7	prudent, would you agree, to weigh in on those concerns to make a complete analysis prior to decision of the route?
	concerns to make a complete analysis prior to decision of the route?
	decision of the route?
8	
9	I believe our analysis is thorough. It may not be
10 A	
11	it may not touch on every single landowner, but it is
12	thorough.
13 Q	The Landowner Bill of Rights states that the
14	landowner shall not be responsible for injury to
15	persons or property caused by the design construction
16	or upkeep of the high voltage lines or the towers.
17	If the landowner is not, who is?
18	MR. WILL: Your Honor, that's really sort
19	of a legal hypothetical because it would depend on
20	the circumstances and all sorts of other things, and
21	I don't really think that's an appropriate question
22	for this particular witness.
23	EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Yeah, we're
24	going to we'll have to skip that question.
25	MS. KUNZE: All right. Fair enough.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 30
1		EXAMINER NEWMARK: I think as it relates
2		to the Landowner Bill of Rights, there is a process
3		with Commission review of all complaints.
4		MS. KUNZE: Commission review.
5		EXAMINER NEWMARK: So I think it would
6		probably be a Commission Commission would be
7		involved in that type of matter.
8	BY M	S. KUNZE:
9	Q	So Exhibit C is a certificate of compensation, and
10		after a party is compensated for perpetual easement,
11		where is that filed?
12	A	That's beyond my area of expertise.
13	Q	Okay. And at the end of the AIS, a mailing list is
14		included. How was that determined? How would you
15		determine who's on that mailing list?
16	A	There are some statutory requirements about who's on
17		the mailing list, so that would include the Governor
18		and the chairs of the Assembly and Senate Ag
19		Committees. The AIS is also supposed to be available
20		for public viewing, so we included libraries and
21		county and town clerks so they could put it out for
22		public viewing.
23		MS. KUNZE: Thank you, Ms. Halpin. No
24		further questions, Your Honor.
25		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. I just wanted to

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 31
1		make sure the Town of Springfield comprehensive
2		plan, how were we what was the purpose of
3		introducing that at this point?
4		MS. KUNZE: That there is an agricultural
5		preservation area within the Town of Springfield
6		that should be considered within AIS.
7		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
8		MR. POTTS: Your Honor, and I have found
9		it. It is in the application. It's in Appendix A,
10		figure 8-B, page 10 of 12.
11		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
12		MR. POTTS: But we have no objection if
13		you want to enter it twice. I just want to note
14		that for the record.
15		MS. KUNZE: Thank you. I guess it just
16		reflects back on my cross-exam just now in which I
17		asked if it was considered, if they were aware of
18		it.
19		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. We'll leave it
20		in as Halpin 2. You'll just need to file it on ERF.
21		MS. KUNZE: Thank you.
22		(Exhibit Halpin 2 received.)
23		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Other questions,
24		cross questions?
25		MS. WESTERBERG: I have actually one brief

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 32
1		question.
2		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Go ahead.
3		CROSS-EXAMINATION
4	BY M	S. WESTERBERG:
5	Q	Ms. Halpin, Christa Westerberg from Clean Wisconsin.
6		I see in your prefiled testimony you mentioned that
7		organic farms can be affected by the project, and you
8		list some that have been identified by your agency
9		and you state that the applicants should work with
10		the certifiers of any organic property that is
11		crossed so that procedures can be followed that would
12		ensure the farm would maintain certification. Do you
13		recall that testimony you filed?
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	Okay. Would you agree that if herbicide applications
16		occur on properties adjacent to an organic farm, that
17		could affect the organic farm certification
18		potentially?
19	A	Yes.
20	Q	Do you know if there is a procedure in place for
21		notification to the organic farmer prior to
22		herbicides being sprayed in a right-of-way property
23		adjacent to that farm?
24	A	No, I don't know if that is.
25	Q	Would you agree that something like that would be

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 33
1		appropriate in this case to avoid impacts to organic
2		farms?
3	A	Yes, I would agree.
4		MS. WESTERBERG: Nothing further.
5		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Other cross?
6		(No response.)
7		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Redirect?
8		MR. LORENCE: Is there anything else you'd
9		like to add?
10		THE WITNESS: No.
11		MR. LORENCE: No redirect.
12		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Thanks. You're
13		excused.
14		(Witness excused.)
15		EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Who's next?
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	<u> </u>	Poporting 1td (200) 200 7222

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 34
1		ROBERT FASICK, Wisdot WITNESS, DULY SWORN
2		EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right.
3		DIRECT EXAMINATION
4	ву м	R. LORENCE:
5	Q	Can you state your name for the record.
6	A	Robert Fasick.
7	Q	And where do you work, sir?
8	A	Wisconsin Department of Transportation.
9	Q	In preparation for today's hearing, did you prepare
10		direct and rebuttal testimony?
11	A	That is correct.
12	Q	And did you also file six exhibits?
13	A	Yes.
14	Q	And if you were asked the same questions as in your
15		testimony, would your answers be the same today?
16	A	Yes, they would.
17	Q	And do you have any corrections to your testimony and
18		exhibits?
19	A	I'm sorry, no.
20	Q	Okay. Have you listened to any of the testimony this
21		week?
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	Is there anything you'd like to add before you're
24		available for cross?
25	А	No. Most of it was on need and other things that

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 35
1	1	weren't pertaining to my part of it, which is
2		routing.
3		MR. LORENCE: Okay. Mr. Fasick's
4		available for questions.
5		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
6		CROSS-EXAMINATION
7	BY M	R. WILL:
8	Q	Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Fasick. Trevor Will.
9		I have a couple questions for you.
10	A	You said three.
11	Q	I know. But I mean three cubed.
12		In your direct testimony, you identified
13		three locations where the DOT had particular
14		concerns, one was Segment P-East at U.S. Highway 53,
15		County Highway MH interchange. A second one was at
16		the County Highway CS/I-90 interchange between there
17		and the rest area near the Town of Poynette, and the
18		third one was the Fairfield Marsh area, correct?
19	А	Correct.
20	Q	And your rebuttal testimony addresses discussions
21		that were had and an alternative arrangement that was
22		made with the applicants in the Fairfield Marsh area
23		that's now acceptable to the DOT?
24	А	Correct.
25	Q	Have you also had further discussions with the

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 36
1		applicants about the U.S. Highway 53/County Highway
2		MH interchange on Segment P-East?
3	A	Correct.
4	Q	And were the applicants able to propose a realignment
5		there that meets the DOT's concerns?
6	A	Correct. Just at the interchange itself.
7	Q	Yes. Also with respect to the County Highway CH area
8		in the Town of Poynette up to the rest area on the
9		interstates, have you had further discussions with
10		the applicants about the routing in that area?
11	A	Correct. In CS, by the way.
12	Q	I'm sorry, I thought
13	A	That's all right.
14	Q	Yeah, it is CS.
15	A	I think it's the Town of Dekorra.
16	Q	Yes. Poynette is on the interchange?
17	A	Yes.
18	Q	I apologize. It says Poynette on the signs when you
19		get off the expressway of the interstate at County
20		Highway CS, yes.
21		All right. In that area, have you had
22		discussions with the applicants about an alternative
23		routing that addresses the DOT's concerns as
24		expressed in your direct testimony?
25	A	Correct.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 37
1	Q	And has there been an alternative proposed that would
2		meet the DOT's concerns?
3	A	Yes, there has been.
4		MR. WILL: That's all I have for you.
5		Thanks very much, Mr. Fasick.
6		THE WITNESS: Sure.
7		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Let's go off the
8		record a minute.
9		(Discussion held off the record.)
10		EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Get back on
11		the record. More questions?
12		MS. WESTERBERG: I do have some.
13		CROSS-EXAMINATION
14	BY M	S. WESTERBERG:
15	Q	Good morning, Mr. Fasick. Christa Westerberg
16		representing Clean Wisconsin. You mentioned you had
17		been here for some of the prior testimony. Were you
18		here for any testimony regarding potential bird
19		collision in the Leopold-Pine Island Important Bird
20		Area?
21	A	I was online watching everything as much as I could.
22	Q	Okay.
23	A	I heard some of the conversations.
24	Q	Okay. And I want to focus our my questions on
25		Segment H adjacent to I-94.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 38
1	A	Okay.
2	Q	Your understanding is that that segment uses at least
3		some Department of Transportation right-of-way,
4		correct?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	And would it be your understanding that the Badger
7		Coulee line, if Segment H is selected, will be
8		visible from the interstate in that stretch?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	And you're aware that this Leopold-Pine Island
11		Important Bird Area is this large wetland complex to
12		the north of the interstate there?
13	A	Yes.
14	Q	Okay. Has there been any discussion among Department
15		of Transportation personnel about potential
16		collisions of large bodied birds like cranes with the
17		Badger Coulee line in that area?
18	A	I haven't had anything directly with other staff.
19	Q	Okay. Well, as you may have heard over the last few
20		day, witnesses have testified that that area is
21		frequently used by migratory birds and large volumes
22		of migratory birds in the fall when cranes congregate
23		there, and other witnesses have testified in their
24		prefiled or live that collisions with the lines are
25		likely. Would you have any concern that collisions

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 39
1		between birds in that area in the power line would
2		create a distraction for drivers on the interstate?
3		If those if those collisions were to occur, would
4		you have a concern about there being a distraction
5		issue?
6	A	There's so many different distractions that could
7		happen. Car-deer collisions, there could be
8		collisions between semis and birds. I don't know.
9		There are people texting when there shouldn't be, so
10		I really can't say one way or the other. A lot of
11		things are distractions out there, let's just put it
12		that way.
13	Q	Okay. Yeah. And I'm not asking you to compare this
14		as a potential distraction issue to other issues, but
15		if it occurred do you know whether let me
16		rephrase.
17		If those distractions occurred, would
18		they if those collisions occurred, would they
19		create a distraction? You don't know?
20	A	I can't answer that because that's up to every human
21		being who's out there driving. I could be out there
22		and doing some driving going straight ahead and not
23		notice something, and then another day it could
24		happen and I could notice it. So I think that's
25		every human being's reaction would either notice it

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 40
1		or not notice it.
2		MS. WESTERBERG: Okay. I just wanted to
3		note whether that had been discussed. Thank you.
4		THE WITNESS: Sure.
5		EXAMINER NEWMARK: That's it. More cross?
6		CROSS-EXAMINATION
7	BY M	S. KUNZE:
8	Q	Good morning, Mr. Fasick.
9	A	Good morning.
10	Q	I'm Laura Kunze, self-representing. I just have a
11		few questions. What is the relationship between DOT
12		and FAA and jurisdictions in matters of siting
13		transmission near airports?
14	А	I can't answer that. That's not my area of
15		expertise. I only deal with the highways.
16	Q	Only, okay. So
17	А	We do have let me just explain. My area is with
18		Bureau of Highway Maintenance, and I handle the
19		permitting aspect.
20	Q	Okay.
21	A	And we have our own Bureau of Aeronautics that
22		handles matters with FAA.
23	Q	And that was the Bureau of
24	А	Aeronautics.
25	Q	So is there a situation where you might not be able

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 41
1		to or it might not be prudent to proceed with
2		permitting before a situation is resolved?
3		MR. LORENCE: Your Honor, could I ask for
4		more clarification?
5		THE WITNESS: I was going to ask the same
6		thing. What's the situation that's resolved?
7	ву м	S. KUNZE:
8	Q	In your direct, page 4, for example on lines 12
9		through 14, you state that the DOT will not issue a
10		permit and that the line is too close to the
11		northbound structure. Describe a meeting with ATC
12		where they are working on the realignment with this
13		one.
14	A	I'm sorry, which page again?
15	Q	Page 4.
16	A	Okay. Let me get there. 12 to 14?
17	Q	Uh-huh.
18	A	Right. That particular issue was just discussed.
19		That particular issue involved we have the CapX
20		line that is already on Highway 53 southbound, and
21		the proposal was to put P-East real close to the
22		northbound structure, which would prevent us from
23		getting a crane in there to rebuild the bridge,
24		re-deck it, things of that nature. So we work with
25		the applicants to try to get them to realign that

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 42
1		particular segment such that we could get a park a
2		crane in a spot. And I would have to then, which I
3		did, go to our bridge maintenance folks and our
4		bridge design folks and say is this acceptable
5		alignment. So those are the types of issues that
6		come up in these types of transmission line
7		proceedings.
8	Q	Have you reviewed FAA comment and/or review of the
9		project in relation to the airports in the protected
10		area?
11	A	FAA is not my area.
12	Q	Okay, okay. Is there potential for the Department of
13		Transportation denial of permits for structures based
14		on department jurisdiction over airspace?
15	A	Possibly. Again, that's not my area.
16	Q	Possibly, okay. And that would also be the Bureau of
17		Aeronautics, sir?
18	A	Correct.
19	Q	And how would those issues then be discussed or
20		analyzed within the Environmental Impact Statement
21		and other issues?
22	A	I only comment on what affects the highways. And
23		with regards to airports, I'm sure there's there's
24		federal and other and ATC also probably works with
25		the our own Bureau of Aeronautics, and I thought

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 43
1		there was some discussion about our Bureau of
2		Aeronautics being involved. But again, my area is
3		pretty segmented as far as relationship to the
4		highways.
5		MS. KUNZE: Okay. Thank you for your
6		time, sir.
7		THE WITNESS: Sure.
8		MS. KUNZE: No further questions, Your
9		Honor.
10		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Other questions?
11		(No response.)
12		EXAMINER NEWMARK: No. Just something
13		that came up during the course of the hearing
14		regarding Fort McCoy. I just wanted to make sure we
15		clear up for the record on that. Do you know if
16	:	Route 90 as it goes through Fort McCoy, is that
17		Department of Transportation easement, or is there
18		some portion that's a permit from the Department of
19		Defense?
20		THE WITNESS: I actually was paying
21		attention during that part.
22		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Wow. Okay. Someone's
23		paying attention.
24		THE WITNESS: I e-mailed our bureau our
25		real estate person in our Southwest Region La Crosse
	Gramann	Reporting, Ltd. (800) 899-7222

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 44
1		office. He has yet to respond. When I do get an
2		answer he's going to check on it.
3		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
4		THE WITNESS: But that is a good question
5		because sometimes we're only there by permit, and
6		that's the case in some Indian territories as well.
7		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Uh-huh. So just inform
8		staff of that.
9		THE WITNESS: Sure.
10		EXAMINER NEWMARK: And if well, I'll
11		leave it up to staff if they want to supplement the
12		record with that.
13		THE WITNESS: Do you want me to send
14		something to Mr. Lorence?
15		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Yeah. Mr. Lorence or
16		Ms. Silver Karsh.
17		MR. LORENCE: Send it to her.
18		EXAMINER NEWMARK: I don't know where your
19		e-mails will go, John.
20		MR. WILL: Could I have a follow-up on
21		that?
22		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Yeah.
23		CROSS-EXAMINATION
24	BY M	R. WILL:
25	Q	Mr. Fasick, are you aware whether the applicants

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 4	5
1		studied whether the transmission line could fit	
2		within the highway right-of-way through Fort McCoy?	
3	A	Yes.	
4	Q	And then that route was considered and then	
5		ultimately not put forward?	
6	A	Yes.	
7		MR. WILL: Thank you.	
8		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Uh-huh. All right.	
9		Any redirect?	
10		MR. LORENCE: I don't believe, unless you	
11		want to add anything.	
12		THE WITNESS: The one thing that's in my	
13		testimony that the department is still has	
14		heartburn with is the segments of P-East coming out	
15		of the Briggs Substation heading towards MH. If we	
16		get hemmed in on both sides, it prevents a big	
17		conflict for us if we have to expand 53 in that	
18		area. So the interchange issue has been resolved,	
19		but, you know, having transmission lines on both	
20		sides is really a tough bind for us. We can handle	
21		it on one side. It's very you know, we can	
22		expand to the other side if necessary.	
23		So that's the only thing that is still of	
24		concern for us, but if we had to go with it, we	
25		would work with it as much as we could.	

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 46
1		MR. LORENCE: Okay. Thank you.
2		EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Thanks.
3		You're excused.
4		(Witness excused.)
5		MR. WILL: Excuse me, Your Honor. Could I
6		have just a second off the record.
7		(Brief break taken.)
8		MR. POTTS: I think we're finished with
9		you.
10		EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Thank you
11		very much.
12		MR. WILL: Your Honor, we have a witness
13	:	or two witnesses that can elaborate on your question
14		about the Fort and the analysis of the interstate
15		right-of-way if you want that information on the
16		record. We can put them up on the stand and
17		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Well, let's go off the
18		record.
19		(Discussion held off the record.)
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 47
1		TERENCE HENN, APPLICANT WITNESS, DULY SWORN
2		EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right.
3		DIRECT EXAMINATION
4	BY M	R. WILL:
5	Q	Mr. Henn, you've been asked to come to the stand to
6		address one specific issue. Did the applicants study
7		the possibility of routing the Badger Coulee line
8		along the Interstate 90 right-of-way through Fort
9		McCoy?
10	A	Yes. On both sides in fact.
11	Q	And what did that analysis show?
12	A	The analysis showed that the existing right-of-way
13		where we would need to put the locations of the
14		structures relative to the edge of the pavement,
15		there are rules that we have to follow with the DOT,
16		it's referred to as a clear zone, safety of traffic
17		on the interstate, where the poles would need to be
18		located, the distance away, then the extent of the
19		right-of-way would exceed the available right-of-way
20		that is either owned by easement or permit by the
21		Department of Transportation. So regardless, we
22		would we would need rights from the Fort as well.
23	Q	So regardless of whether the DOT owns or is there by
24		permit, the right-of-way is too narrow to locate the
25		transmission line there?

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 48
1	A	Completely within the DOT right-of-way, correct.
2		MR. WILL: Thank you.
3		MS. WESTERBERG: I do have one follow-up
4		on that then. Thanks, Judge.
5		CROSS-EXAMINATION
6	ву м	S. WESTERBERG:
7	Q	Are you talking about, Mr. Henn Christa
8		Westerberg, Clean Wisconsin a specific portion of
9		the right-of-way around Fort McCoy just are you
10		talking about just on the portion of the property
11		that is actually owned by Fort McCoy where that would
12		need to happen?
13	A	Primarily for the duration of I-90. Typically
14		unless unless the highway right-of-way is
15		extremely wide because there was some anticipated
16		expansion plans in the future, just the extents of
17		the DOT right-of-way is insufficient to contain the
18		required easement for the structures. Especially on
19		an interstate highway because of the speeds of the
20		highway, the clear zone is wider, therefore the poles
21		have to be further from the edge of the pavement, and
22		the right-of-way that we need would extend onto
23		onto private property.
24	Q	And you in fact ran into this issue also at the Camp
25		Douglas Airport; is that true?
	C	Penarting 1td (800) 899-7222

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 49
1	A	Volk Field?
2	Q	Yes.
3	А	Yes.
4	Q	Okay. And in that case, isn't it true that the
5		applicants departed from existing right-of-way to
6		route around the airport and the clear zones?
7	A	The the principle reason for departing the
8		interstate in the vicinity of Volk Field was the
9		accident potential zone associated with the airfields
10		at Volk Field as well and our interactions with air
11		operations representatives at various open houses
12		from Volk Field indicating the presence of the
13		accident potential zone and that there would be no
14		overhead lines permitable within the accident
15		potential zone.
16	Q	Right. So if you had wanted to route in the area of
17		Fort McCoy along the interstate, you would
18		essentially need to have done what you did at Volk
19		Field to route around the clear zones there, correct?
20	A	Meaning the accident potential zone?
21	Q	Yes.
22	A	But to route around the accident potential zone at
23		Fort McCoy would involve still going on Fort McCoy
24		property in another location.
25	Q	And you stay on did you stay off Volk Field

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 50
1		property on that routing?
2	A	We are not on Volk Field property at all to the best
3		of my knowledge.
4		MS. WESTERBERG: Okay. Thank you.
5		EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right.
6		MR. LORENCE: I have just one follow-up
7		question.
8		CROSS-EXAMINATION
9	BY M	R. LORENCE:
10	Q	You just discussed about the problems of using the
11		DOT right-of-way along the interstate and the
12		distance that you would have to keep away from the
13		interstate and that there wasn't enough easement,
14		correct?
15	A	Yes, sir.
16	Q	And so you would have to go partially into extend
17		the transmission easement into the private property
18		next to the highway, correct?
19	A	That is correct.
20	Q	And that would be the same whether it was Fort McCoy
21		or an individual landowner, correct?
22	A	That's correct.
23		MR. LORENCE: Thank you.
24		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Great. Any
25		redirect I guess?

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 51
1		MR. WILL: No.
2		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Thanks. You're
3		excused.
4		(Witness excused.)
5		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Who's next?
6		MS. CORRELL: I think we agree that the
7		Department of Natural Resources would proceed next.
8		EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right.
9		MS. CORRELL: I'm used to the microphones
10		that don't amplify but record very well. So I'll
11		try to not shout.
12		EXAMINER NEWMARK: I don't think we'll
13		have a problem with your voice.
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	O	

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 52
1		MS. CORRELL: Ben Callan.
2		BENJAMIN CALLAN, WDNR WITNESS, DULY SWORN
3		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Go ahead.
4		DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	BY M	S. CORRELL:
6	Q	Good morning, Mr. Callan.
7	A	Good morning.
8	Q	Sorry. Just a second here. You provided direct
9		testimony and sur-surrebuttal, prefiled written
10		testimony in this proceeding; is that correct?
11	A	No. I provided direct testimony and surrebuttal.
12	Q	Oh, excuse me. Thank you for the clarification.
13		And if you provided the testimony that you
14		submitted in writing here today, would your testimony
15		be any different?
16	A	To my direct, there would be a couple of changes. To
17		my surrebuttal, I would not change anything.
18	Q	Could you clarify what what additions you might
19		like to have on the record here today?
20	A	Sure. On page 10 of my direct testimony, lines 9 and
21		10, I indicate in my direct that the in-lieu fee
22		program is currently not an option for mitigation,
23		and that is no longer the case. In other words, it
24		is an option for mitigation.
25		And then there are three similar questions

1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 53
1	and answers regarding the process to grant the
2	utility easement across state property. The first
3	one on page 11. The answer is lines 19 through 22.
4	I would change that answer to read, Since federal
5	money through the National Park Services Land and
6	Water Conservation Fund was used in acquiring Mirror
7	Lake State Park, the DNR works directly with the
8	National Park Service and the applicants to ensure
9	that the project will minimize and mitigate any
10	conversion of recreational use on Mirror Lake State
11	Park.
12	A similar response would be provided on
13	page 12, lines 13 through 16: Since federal money
14	through the National Park Service Land and Water
15	Conservation Fund was used in acquiring these
16	trails, the DNR works directly with the National
17	Park Service and applicants to ensure that the
18	project minimizes and mitigates any conversion of
19	recreational use.
20	And then the similar response, page 13,
21	lines 10 through 13: Since federal money through the
22	National Park Service Land and Water Conservation
23	Fund was used in acquiring Black River State Forest,
24	the DNR works directly with the National Park
25	Service and the applicants to ensure that the
	Penarting 1td (200) 200 722

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 54
1		project minimizes and mitigates any conversion of
2		recreational use on the Black River State Forest.
3	Q	Do you have anything else you want to add at this
4		time on direct?
5	A	No.
6		MS. CORRELL: I tender the witness for
7		cross-examination.
8		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Questions?
9		CROSS-EXAMINATION
10	BY M	R. POTTS:
11	Q	Mr. Callan, my name is Brian Potts. I represent
12		American Transmission Company. I just have one line
13		of questioning. Are you I believe in your
14		testimony you referenced the Mirror Lake State Park
15		re-route that was was entered into the record by
16		the applicants?
17	A	Yes.
18	Q	And does the DNR support that re-route?
19	А	In my discussions with the superintendent for Mirror
20		Lake State Park, they've indicated a preference to
21		locate the line such that it would maintain buffer
22		between the transmission line and the interstate.
23	Q	And so does the DNR have any opinion on that
24		specifically?
25	A	As you'll note, there's some criteria or conditions

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 55
1		associated with that, including the potential
2		relocation of the state trail or a trail that's on
3		the state park property. If those criteria are met
4		and the applicant the project's approved and
5		the that route is selected, then and the
6		applicants are willing to accommodate those other
7		provisions regarding that relocation, then yes.
8		MR. POTTS: Okay. Thanks.
9		THE WITNESS: You're welcome.
10		CROSS-EXAMINATION
11	ву м	S. WESTERBERG:
12	Q	Good morning, Mr. Callan. Christa Westerberg, Clean
13		Wisconsin. Have you reviewed the testimony of
14		Mr. Henn on behalf of the applicants?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	Okay. And do you recall the portion on page 7 of his
17		rebuttal testimony where he stated that the
18		applicants are would like the Commission to order
19		that they only need to obtain permits for the portion
20		of the line that they're working on rather than
21		ordering that all permits be obtained before
22		construction can commence? Does that ring a bell?
23	A	It sounds familiar. I can't say it's very clear in
24		my head, but yeah.
25	Q	Yeah, okay. And Mr. Henn testified on Tuesday that

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 56
1		by portion of the line they're working on, he meant
2		construction segment, the segments the applicants
3		have designated for construction, grouping portions
4		of the existing routes within those segments. I can
5		show you. It's been marked as Exhibit 5 for
6		Mr. Henn.
7		May I, Judge?
8		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Yes.
9	BY M	S. WESTERBERG:
10	Q	So you should be looking at the chart on Exhibit 5 of
11		mister of Henn Exhibit 5 indicating the
12		construction segments. Have you seen those before?
13	A	Yes.
14	Q	Okay. And have the applicants discussed with you the
15		possibility of getting permits segment by segment
16		rather than in advance of construction of the entire
17		line?
18	A	No, I wouldn't say permits.
19	Q	Can you explain your answer?
20	A	When if the Commission orders a route, and the
21		Department is responsible for issuing a permit by law
22		within 30 days of that order, that's our permit
23		decision. There may be additional requirements of
24		that permit for information to be submitted and
25		approved by the Department at a later date, and that

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 57
1		would be my understanding of those construction and
2		mitigation plan approvals being segmented after a
3		permit decision is made.
4	Q	Okay. So to the extent we're talking about a
5		Chapter 30 permit or a wetland permit, it should be
6		addressed within 30 days of the order anyway; is that
7		your testimony?
8	A	That's a requirement.
9	Q	Yeah. And then to the extent there are other
10		approvals or reviews required by the DNR, they would
11		be done at the time of the construction segment; is
12		that your understanding?
13	A	When when the project is ordered, it's my
14		understanding that the applicants then spend their
15		time and effort going through final design and
16		construction planning, including erosion control
17		planning, potentially addressing any other sensitive
18		species habitat issues. What I deal with is issuance
19		of the waterway and wetland permit, and the permit
20		that I issue comes out 30 days after the order is
21		issued, and those other decision-making documents may
22		come at a later date and then supplement
23		supplemental to the Chapter 30 and wetland permit
24		would be the submittal of construction and mitigation
25		plans, which would also require approval from the

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 58
1		Department.
2	Q	Does the Department have any position on whether all
3		of those approvals should be issued prior to
4		construction commencing on any portion of the line
5		versus by construction segment, or can you say that
6		sitting here today?
7	A	I I don't know if I don't have an opinion
8		specifically on that question. I mean, I'm very
9		familiar with the waterway and wetland component of
10		it. Areas beyond that, other DNR staff can can
11		help later in today's proceedings. But regarding
12		what you've handed me and the schedule that's laid
13		out there, I don't know if there are other concerns
14		or issues with approvals beyond what I'm directly
15		involved in.
16	Q	I want to direct your attention to your prefiled
17		testimony on page 2 where you state on line 9 that
18		you participated in pre-application meetings.
19		MS. CORRELL: You're looking at the direct
20		testimony I assume?
21		MS. WESTERBERG: Yes. Thank you.
22	BY M	S. WESTERBERG:
23	Q	And can you just describe for me at the time you
24		participated in those pre-application meetings, were
25		the proposed routes that we see now, the northern and

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 59
1		southern routes, more or less identified by the
2		applicants?
3	A	And it depends on when we talk about the
4		pre-application. I believe at some point the study
5		area for the project expanded, so I would say that
6		the northern segments of N and P may not have been on
7		those earlier pre-application meetings, but at some
8		point those corridors were refined to routes, yes.
9	Q	Okay. And was the Department consulted on
10		essentially the best ways to get from Point A, being
11		La Crosse, to Point B, being Middleton?
12	A	I wouldn't characterize the inquiries in that way. I
13		would say that corridors were identified that were
14		being presented by the applicants for feedback from
15		the Department, but generally those are on a higher
16		level. You don't get down to a lot of detail. There
17		was no inquiry, to the best of my knowledge, about,
18		you know, how would you get from Point A to Point B
19		or B-1, B-2, B-3.
20	Q	Okay. Was a routing option presented to you that
21		traveled more directly from essentially the Onalaska
22		area to Tomah like we see in Mr. Mosca's Exhibit 8?
23	A	I would have to look at some of those earlier maps,
24		but I believe that there were corridors identified in
25		those areas.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 60
1	Q	Did the Department at that time present an opinion
2		about whether that would be a good route option as
3		opposed to something that goes as far south as
4		Segment O?
5	A	I don't specifically recall providing feedback like
6		that.
7	Q	Okay. Ms. Parrett I believe mentioned in her
8		sur-surrebuttal testimony that in NR 216, the
9		applicants will follow NR 216 for storm water
10	-	purposes. Do you recall that testimony?
11	A	Yes.
12	Q	Okay. And under NR 216, can you briefly describe
13		what the reseeding requirements are for disturbed
14		areas?
15	A	It's a little beyond my area of expertise since I do
16		waterway and wetland permitting, and there is a
17		separate erosion control permitting process for a
18		project like this, but I believe there are technical
19		standards, best management practices, for
20		re-vegetation that could be applied. And in general,
21		when an area has the potential to affect the waterway
22		or wetland, we include specific conditions in our
23		waterway and wetland permit to address those erosion
24		concerns.
25	Q	Okay. We're in an area that is not a wetland, a more

L

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 61
1		upland area. Do you know under NR 216 how long the
2		area is required to be monitored for an erosion
3		control permit?
4	A	I believe it's until it's re-vegetated to a density
5		of 70 percent.
6	Q	And that could happen in a matter of months in
7		certain areas, correct?
8	A	Potentially.
9	Q	Yeah. Once the 70 percent cover is obtained, does
10		the DNR have any continuing oversight over
11		re-vegetation efforts in those upland areas?
12	A	There's a number of factors in upland areas that
13		could come into play in a scenario like that. If
14		it's on state property, yes. If there's a state
15		easement in an area, yes. If there's some other,
16		maybe. And there will be additional DNR staff that
17		may address this. If there's a requirement under an
18		incidental take authorization, then there may be
19		additional requirements beyond just meeting that
20		70 percent threshold.
21	Q	So other than those three situations you just
22		identified, DNR would not have any continuing
23		oversight over reseeding efforts in upland areas?
24	A	I can't say that.
25	Q	Okay. You just don't know one way or the other?

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 62
1	A	I mean, I imagine that there's other factors that
2		could come into play that just aren't coming to mind
3		right now.
4	Q	Okay. So suffice it to say, there will be areas
5		where the DNR does not have continuing oversight over
6		reseeding areas once that 70 percent cover is
7		obtained, fair?
8		MR. POTTS: I guess I'll object. He just
9		testified that he doesn't really know. I mean, he's
10		not he's the wetland and waterway permitting guy,
11		and she's asking about reseeding.
12		EXAMINER NEWMARK: He seems to know a lot
13		anyway, so let's let him answer.
14		MS. CORRELL: And I think you also, just
15		for clarification, on the record misspoke because
16		you said he wasn't the wetland
17		MR. POTTS: He is the wetland and waterway
18		permitting, he's not the storm water expert. Thank
19		you.
20		EXAMINER NEWMARK: To the extent you know.
21		THE WITNESS: I'd just agree with what the
22		judge said, I know a lot.
23		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
24		THE WITNESS: Could you please repeat the
25		question?

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 63
1		MS. WESTERBERG: Yes. Could you read it
2		back, please.
3		(RECORD READ.)
4		THE WITNESS: Yes.
5	ву м	S. WESTERBERG:
6	Q	Does the DNR require native seeding as part of storm
7		water as part of the storm water permit
8		re-vegetation?
9	A	That's beyond my permitting authority.
10	Q	Okay. Did the DNR assign a permit a storm water
11		permit specialist to this case?
12	А	Yes.
13	Q	And have they been in well, strike that.
14		What have they done so far?
15	A	They've received a preliminary application, which is
16		essentially on hold until a route decision is made by
17		the Commission. And if it's approved, then the route
18		is selected, and then once the final erosion control
19		plans are developed, they would provide their
20		feedback on that before issuing a decision.
21	Q	All right. Have you been here for the discussions
22		you reviewed the prefiled testimony of Mr. Mosca and
23		Dr. Howe for Clean Wisconsin?
24	А	Yes.
25	Q	Okay. Do you recall, I think Dr. Howe in particular

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 64
1		is concerned that there will be a high risk of
2		sediment runoff into streams in the Coulee area where
3		there is ground disturbance. Does that ring a bell?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	Okay. Will and that primary concern there being
6		the topography being so steep and the presence of a
7		lot of streams at the in the valleys between the
8		hills. Do you recall that?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	Okay. And you would agree that it would be a concern
11		if sediment did make its way into those waterways?
12	A	Absolutely.
13	Q	Okay. Is the primary regulatory tool that the DNR
14		has to deal with that issue the storm water permit?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	Okay. And will the primary means to address that
17		issue the primary way the storm water permit will
18		address that issue, will that be through the use of
19		best management practices?
20	A	That would be the main mechanism. That's not the
21		only mechanism. Part of that process does require
22		the submission of or development of an erosion
23		control plan, and a plan is required to meet the
24		minimum standards but they often exceed those minimum
25		standards.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 65
1	Q	Would you foresee the need for the plan to exceed the
2		minimum standards in this case given the topography?
3	A	I think that's beyond my area of authority.
4	Q	As the storm water management specialist assigned to
5		this case, have you determined what BMPs are
6		appropriate for this area yet?
7	A	I haven't discussed that with them directly.
8	Q	So you couldn't say right now whether the DNR will
9		require any specific measures to address construction
10		water or storm water runoff into the streams in the
11		Coulee area?
12	A	Well, in the waterway and wetland permit where we
13		have authority, if the line is approved and so that
14		route is selected, then we would have conditions in
15		that permit, and then there would also be
16		requirements in the erosion control permit, but I
17		don't know what those necessarily standards would be
18		because I haven't seen their final erosion control
19		plan.
20	Q	The first permit you mentioned would essentially
21		address disturbance that occurs right next to the
22		stream, correct?
23	A	For the most part, correct.
24	Q	I'm going to show you just briefly Howe Exhibit 18.
25		Sorry, not 18, 11.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 66
1		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's go off the
2		record.
3		(Discussion held off the record.)
4	BY M	S. WESTERBERG:
5	Q	And I'll represent this is a photo that Dr. Howe took
6		near an existing new and existing right-of-way
7		near the proposed Segment N. Would you have any
8		concern that that this is basically denuded
9		hillside is not covered in any way?
10	A	Potentially. It's a snapshot so, you know, there are
11		even built into the erosion control standard limits
12		on amount of time an area can be exposed and what the
13		appropriate response is. So depending on factors
14		that you can't tell from the picture, it could be a
15		concern or it might be just one step in the process.
16	Q	Okay. So you would agree that a condition like this
17		would generally need to be addressed under the storm
18		water permit?
19	A	Yeah.
20	Q	I'm going to ask a different question about springs.
21		The final EIS discusses potential impact to springs,
22		primarily around Segment O. Do you recall that
23		discussion?
24	A	Somewhat, yes.
25	Q	Okay. So on page 32. And it mentions that the area

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 67
1		of Wisconsin with the highest concentration of
2		springs is the driftless area, and there are many
3		known springs between the Town of Leon and Elroy in
4		Segment O. Are you geographically with me?
5	A	So far.
6	Q	Okay. Would you agree that springs in this area are
7		the source for a lot of trout streams, do you know?
8	А	In combination with other groundwater discharge,
9		sure.
10	Q	Uh-huh. Okay. And would you agree that construction
11		of, let's say, a large pole for a transmission line
12		could potentially disrupt the streams the springs'
13		hydrology?
14	A	I haven't experienced that in my time working with
15		utility projects.
16	Q	Would you agree there's a possibility that
17		construction of any large project could divert or
18		change direction of a water course that feeds a
19		spring?
20	A	Depending on location, that's possible.
21	Q	Would the change to spring hydrogeology require any
22		sort of permit from the DNR?
23	А	Normally if there's a proposal to place either
24		temporary or permanent fill in a wetland area, which
25		more than likely would apply for an area that has a
	L	

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 68
1		spring or groundwater discharge, then there are
2		conditions that we implement in our permit decision
3		to minimize the long-term deleterious effects from
4		that project.
5	Q	So in that in that so you can think of one
6		situation where it would require a permit and that
7		being the wetland fill situation?
8	A	Yes.
9	Q	Okay. Otherwise does the DNR have any oversight over
10		that issue that you're aware of?
11	A	It's possible. Off the top of my head I can't give
12		you an answer to that.
13	Q	Okay. Mr. Mosca in his testimony discussed the use
14		of CECPs. Are you familiar with that term?
15	A	I recall reading it in his testimony.
16	Q	Are you familiar with the use of CECPs in the CapX
17		case?
18	A	I was
19		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Can you just explain
20		what that is for the record.
21		MS. WESTERBERG: Oh, acronym.
22		Construction Erosion Compliance Plan, I believe.
23		Let me double-check that. I had a note, and I can't
24		find it. Construction Environmental Compliance
25		Plans.

1 BY MS. WESTERBERG: 2 Q Is that your understanding of the acronym? 3 A Yes. 4 Q Okay. And did do you recall whether those 5 Construction Environmental Compliance Plans were used 6 for to ensure compliance with regulatory 7 requirements for wetlands in the CapX case? 8 A I wasn't directly involved with the CapX project from 9 the Department's perspective. 10 Q Okay. Do you understand that the applicants will be 11 submitting some form of detailed assessment plan 12 detailed assessment and plan for construction for 13 each wetland involved in this case once a route is 14 chosen? 15 A I would say for each wetland that's affected by the 16 project, those plans would be compiled into, you 17 know, a certain number of distinct documents, and we 18 anticipate that for this project should it get 19 approved. 20 Okay. One second. So even if it's not called a 21 CECP, the DNR will require preparation of some		1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 69
 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 	1	BY M	IS. WESTERBERG:
 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 	2	Q	Is that your understanding of the acronym?
 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 	3	A	Yes.
 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 	4	Q	Okay. And did do you recall whether those
 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 	5		Construction Environmental Compliance Plans were used
 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 	6		for to ensure compliance with regulatory
 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 	7		requirements for wetlands in the CapX case?
 10 Q Okay. Do you understand that the applicants will be 11 submitting some form of detailed assessment plan 12 detailed assessment and plan for construction for 13 each wetland involved in this case once a route is 14 chosen? 15 A I would say for each wetland that's affected by the 16 project, those plans would be compiled into, you 17 know, a certain number of distinct documents, and we 18 anticipate that for this project should it get 19 approved. 20 Q Okay. One second. So even if it's not called a 21 CECP, the DNR will require preparation of some 22 similar document for Badger Coulee? 23 A Absolutely. 24 Q Okay. In portions of wetlands that are not directly 	8	A	I wasn't directly involved with the CapX project from
 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 	9		the Department's perspective.
 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 	10	Q	Okay. Do you understand that the applicants will be
 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 	11		submitting some form of detailed assessment plan
 14 chosen? 15 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. 20 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? 23 A Absolutely. 24 Q Okay. In portions of wetlands that are not directly 	12		detailed assessment and plan for construction for
 15 A I would say for each wetland that's affected by the project, those plans would be compiled into, you 17 know, a certain number of distinct documents, and we 18 anticipate that for this project should it get 19 approved. 20 Q Okay. One second. So even if it's not called a 21 CECP, the DNR will require preparation of some 22 similar document for Badger Coulee? 23 A Absolutely. 24 Q Okay. In portions of wetlands that are not directly 	13		each wetland involved in this case once a route is
 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 	14		chosen?
 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 	15	A	I would say for each wetland that's affected by the
 18 anticipate that for this project should it get 19 approved. 20 Q Okay. One second. So even if it's not called a 21 CECP, the DNR will require preparation of some 22 similar document for Badger Coulee? 23 A Absolutely. 24 Q Okay. In portions of wetlands that are not directly 	16		project, those plans would be compiled into, you
 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 	17		know, a certain number of distinct documents, and we
 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 	18		anticipate that for this project should it get
 21 CECP, the DNR will require preparation of some 22 similar document for Badger Coulee? 23 A Absolutely. 24 Q Okay. In portions of wetlands that are not directly 	19		approved.
22 similar document for Badger Coulee? 23 A Absolutely. 24 Q Okay. In portions of wetlands that are not directly	20	Q	Okay. One second. So even if it's not called a
 23 A Absolutely. 24 Q Okay. In portions of wetlands that are not directly 	21		CECP, the DNR will require preparation of some
Q Okay. In portions of wetlands that are not directly	22		similar document for Badger Coulee?
	23	A	Absolutely.
25 impacted by, say, placement of a pole but are used	24	Q	Okay. In portions of wetlands that are not directly
	25		impacted by, say, placement of a pole but are used

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 70
1		for construction access, will the DNR require
2		restoration of those areas, for example if there's
3		rutting or some other impact?
4	A	Once an order is made and permit is issued, we would
5		have authority over all of the wetlands that are
6		affected by the project. So whether it's primary
7		impact of fill or secondary impact of driving through
8		it to access a location, and if there's disturbance
9		associated with the construction in those areas, then
10		it would there would be some requirement to ensure
11		that it's restored to the previous locations.
12	Q	Is that considered a temporary or permanent impact or
13		neither?
14	A	What impact?
15	Q	The construction access.
16	A	It it in general is considered a temporary impact
17		unless we're talking about forested wetlands. Then
18		we consider that a conversion, more of a permanent
19		impact.
20		MS. WESTERBERG: Okay. Thank you.
21		Nothing else, Judge.
22		EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Other
23		questions?
24		(No response.)
25		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Redirect?

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 71
1		MS. CORRELL: Yeah, I just have a couple
2		questions on redirect.
3		REDIRECT EXAMINATION
4	ву м	S. CORRELL:
5	Q	You were asked a few questions by counsel from Clean
6		Wisconsin regarding, you know, for lack of a better
7		term, a more direct route or a more central route to
8		the northern and southern routes in this proceeding,
9		something maybe not specifically the modified
10		Route O provided by Mosca, but loosely something in
11		that general vicinity. I just wanted to clarify a
12		little bit further what your personal knowledge and
13		experience was in regards to preliminary routing
14		plans. So if you could, just explain what your
15		involvement was in terms of plans that included
16		routes in the areas that we've been discussing.
17	A	From the pre-application perspective?
18	Q	Correct.
19	A	In those situations, the applicant or applicants
20		could bring information to a meeting with state
21		agencies generally describing some of the areas that
22		we're looking at. I believe they referred to them as
23		corridors at that point, fairly high-level overview,
24		and there it's my understanding they're taking
25		into account many of the factors that go beyond the

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 72
1		environmental issues associated with siting
2		transmission lines and putting those corridors
3		together and either determining whether or not
4		they're viable routes for an application.
5		So during those pre-application meetings,
6		they're fairly broad view, high-level maps and
7		information. There aren't a lot of details regarding
8		specific locations or routes in regard to many of the
9		issues beyond just environmental. So we take that
10		opportunity to provide what information we can as an
11		agency to help try and guide the applicants to
12		presenting something that would be permitable in
13		their application.
14	Q	Are you provided the maps prior to the
15		pre-application meetings typically?
16	A	Generally not.
17	Q	In this particular case were you provided maps prior
18		to the meeting?
19	A	I don't recall seeing maps before we actually sat
20		down at meetings.
21	Q	Did you have information I guess just to be a
22		little more specific on what you mean by not
23		detailed, did you have sufficient information to
24		analyze whether or not routes would either raise
25		concerns raise DNR concerns or permitability

1 issues? 2 A I wouldn't say we had the level of detail we need to 3 make those decisions. During the pre-application 4 process, it's not quite that detailed. The 5 discussions, it's bigger-picture items, large 6 environmental environmentally sensitive areas, 7 large complex state parks, state trails, those kinds 8 of things. 9 Q And then following the type of pre-application 10 meeting that you've described, would the Department 11 then have additional time to review those maps and	
3 make those decisions. During the pre-application 4 process, it's not quite that detailed. The 5 discussions, it's bigger-picture items, large 6 environmental environmentally sensitive areas, 7 large complex state parks, state trails, those kinds 8 of things. 9 Q And then following the type of pre-application 10 meeting that you've described, would the Department	
4 process, it's not quite that detailed. The 5 discussions, it's bigger-picture items, large 6 environmental environmentally sensitive areas, 7 large complex state parks, state trails, those kinds 8 of things. 9 Q And then following the type of pre-application 10 meeting that you've described, would the Department	
5 discussions, it's bigger-picture items, large 6 environmental environmentally sensitive areas, 7 large complex state parks, state trails, those kinds 8 of things. 9 Q And then following the type of pre-application 10 meeting that you've described, would the Department	
<pre>6 environmental environmentally sensitive areas, 7 large complex state parks, state trails, those kinds 8 of things. 9 Q And then following the type of pre-application 10 meeting that you've described, would the Department</pre>	
<pre>7 large complex state parks, state trails, those kinds 8 of things. 9 Q And then following the type of pre-application 10 meeting that you've described, would the Department</pre>	
 8 of things. 9 Q And then following the type of pre-application 10 meeting that you've described, would the Department 	
9 Q And then following the type of pre-application 10 meeting that you've described, would the Department	5
10 meeting that you've described, would the Department	
11 then have additional time to review those maps and	
12 provide feedback?	
13 A I my recollection is that we don't keep the	
14 information at that point because it's all	
15 preliminary draft, and I think that it's just a	
16 matter of waiting until the next opportunity to see	
17 how things change or how corridors get refined.	
18 MS. CORRELL: Okay. Thank you.	
19 THE WITNESS: Sure.	
20 MS. CORRELL: I have nothing further.	
21 EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Now let's go off	
22 the record.	
23 (Discussion held off the record.)	
24 EXAMINER NEWMARK: So let's get back on	
25 the record. Let me make sure we're all on the same	

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 74
1		page in terms of the corrections Mr. Callan offered
2		to his direct testimony. Are there any objections?
3		(No response.)
4		EXAMINER NEWMARK: No, okay. We'll expect
5		those corrections in as a new version of his direct.
6		Okay.
7		MR. POTTS: Your Honor, we did have just a
8		little bit of cross in response.
9		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Go ahead.
10		RECROSS-EXAMINATION
11	ву м	R. POTTS:
12	Q	Mr. Callan, I'm Brian Potts. I represent American
13		Transmission Company. You just had a discussion with
14		your counsel about the pre-application meetings, and
15		I think you were also asked by Clean Wisconsin's
16		counsel. Do you remember those discussions?
17	A	I do.
18	Q	There were multiple meetings, pre-application
19		meetings with the applicants; isn't that right?
20	A	Absolutely.
21	Q	And there were also discussions with the applicants
22		about the routing that were outside of the meetings
23		as well?
24	А	Correct.
25	Q	And the applicants in fact changed their routing
	L	Peparting 1td (200) 200-7222

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 75
1		based on some of the DNR's comments, correct?
2	A	Pre-application?
3	Q	Yes.
4	A	It's possible. I I don't recall the extent of all
5		of the discussions that took place and all of the
6		different variations of corridors and routes.
7	Q	Well, let me give you an example. For example, in
8		the area around the Elroy-Sparta Trail, do you know
9		which area I'm referring to?
10	A	Yes, I do.
11	Q	And did the DNR have concerns with routing in that
12		area?
13	A	Yes, we did.
14	Q	And did the applicants remove those corridors from
15		consideration after those discussions with the DNR?
16	A	Yes. Those those segments were dropped. I don't
17		recall when, if that was you know, what point
18		during the process that the applicants dropped those
19		proposals.
20		MR. POTTS: Okay. We have nothing
21		further.
22		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
23		MS. WESTERBERG: Can I have one
24		clarification also?
25		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Sure, why not.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 76
1		MS. WESTERBERG: I'm sorry.
2		RECROSS-EXAMINATION
3	BY M	IS. WESTERBERG:
4	Q	Mr. Callan, I just want to make sure I understand
5		your testimony. So you're saying that the
6		pre-application process, DNR staff are invited to a
7		meeting and presented with some maps for the first
8		time showing potential routes; is that essentially
9		the first step?
10	А	It's part of the pre-application process. I don't
11		know if it's the first step.
12	Q	Okay. And so at those meetings you're then asked
13		essentially for your opinion on the routes that have
14		been presented?
15	А	It's a little more than that. It's an explanation of
16		why these segments or corridors are on the map and
17		why some are not, and a whole group of reasoning to
18		support that, and kind of an update or a narrative
19		process of where we are in that in their planning
20		process.
21	Q	Okay. But you were not as I understand it, you
22		were not asked your opinion you were not asked for
23		your opinion on possible other routes such as a more
24		direct route between the Sparta and Tomah areas?
25	A	I wouldn't say I'm not asked my opinion. I think

1 there's an opportunity to provide feedback. Whe 2 or not there's a specific question of what's you 3 opinion of how to get here, I don't know that the 4 true. 5 MS. WESTERBERG: Okay. That's all I h 6 EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Anythin	ur
 opinion of how to get here, I don't know that the true. MS. WESTERBERG: Okay. That's all I here EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Anythin 	
4 true. 5 MS. WESTERBERG: Okay. That's all I M 6 EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Anythin	hat's
5 MS. WESTERBERG: Okay. That's all I h 6 EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Anythin	
6 EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Anythin	
	have.
	ng
7 else?	
8 MS. CORRELL: No.	
9 EXAMINER NEWMARK: Thanks. You're	
10 excused.	
11 (Witness excused.)	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 78
1		MS. CORRELL: Stacy Howe Stacy Rowe.
2		STACY ROWE, WDNR WITNESS, DULY SWORN
3		DIRECT EXAMINATION
4	BY M	S. CORRELL:
5	Q	You provided written testimony in this proceeding. I
6		believe you only provided direct?
7	А	Correct.
8	Q	Is that correct?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	And would your testimony be the same here today if
11		you were to present oral testimony?
12	А	Yes.
13	Q	Do you have any corrections to that testimony that
14		you'd like to
15	А	No, I do not.
16	Q	Were you present yesterday for the testimony of
17		Dr. Howe?
18	A	Yes, I was.
19	Q	And would you concur with his statement that the
20		Commission should provide an order point to for
21		the applicants to conduct additional rare species
22		surveys?
23	А	Yes, I would agree with that, especially where we do
24		not have rare species data currently.
25		MS. CORRELL: I would tender the witness

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 79
1		for cross-examination.
2		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. I just want to
3		make sure, you're Stacy Howe?
4		THE WITNESS: Rowe.
5		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Rowe, okay.
6		THE WITNESS: R-O-W-E.
7		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Now I'm confused.
8		R-O-W-E, okay.
9		Questions?
10		MS. WESTERBERG: I have a couple. Do
11		you
12		MR. POTTS: I don't have any.
13		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Go ahead.
14		CROSS-EXAMINATION
15	BY M	S. WESTERBERG:
16	Q	Good morning, Ms. Rowe. I am Christa Westerberg with
17		Clean Wisconsin.
18	А	Hi.
19	Q	I was wondering, on page 14 of your direct testimony
20		you indicate that surveys will likely be needed for
21		the Northern Long-Eared Bat, Eastern Massasauga
22		Rattlesnake, and Bullhead?
23	А	Correct.
24	Q	And the Eastern Massasauga is state-endangered?
25	А	Currently, yes.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 80
1	Q	And you mentioned it's about to be federally listed
2		this year?
3	A	Correct.
4	Q	You said a federal Incidental Take Permit would be
5		required for construction of the line that the
6		species is found as part of the surveys, right?
7	A	That would be dependent on what Fish and Wildlife
8		Service says.
9	Q	Sure. Not your call, understood.
10	A	Yep.
11	Q	Can the state issue its own Incidental Take Permit if
12		it's found?
13	A	Not if it's a federal-listed species. We would go to
14		the Fish and Wildlife Service for that.
15	Q	Okay. So basically once the is it your testimony
16		that once it's federally listed, the U.S. Fish and
17		Wildlife Service takes over?
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	Okay. Assuming it is not listed by the federal
20	1	government and it is remains a state endangered
21		species, could the state issue its own Incidental
22		Take Permit for that species?
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	Okay. That I had a question about that. Isn't it
25		true under the state's protocol for the Eastern

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 81
1		Massasauga that the species is so endangered that an
2		Incidental Take Permit can't be granted?
3	A	It could be granted assuming that the entire or
4		the population of the Eastern Massasauga is not going
5		to be threatened because of the current project
6		that's being proposed.
7		MS. WESTERBERG: Okay. May I approach,
8		Judge?
9		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Yep.
10		MS. WESTERBERG: I unfortunately don't
11		have these stapled.
12	BY M	S. WESTERBERG:
13	Q	Okay. I've just handed you what's titled Protocol
14		For Incidental Take Authorization, Eastern Massasauga
15		Rattlesnake, dated June of 2011.
16	A	Uh-huh.
17	Q	Do you recognize this document?
18	A	Yes. And I should clarify that this protocol is
19		for is the grassland/savanna protocols, and it's
20		only specific for certain grassland/savanna
21		management activities.
22	Q	Okay. And are any of those environments present on
23		the Badger Coulee route?
24	A	The habitats you mean?
25	Q	Yes.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 82
1	A	Yes.
2	Q	Okay. And at the top on the third page of this
3		document, the it states, since there are no
4		apparently stable Massasauga populations in Wisconsin
5		and each individual is deemed critically important to
6		species survival, no incidental take is allowed. Do
7		you see that?
8	A	No, I do not. At the top of the document?
9	Q	Page 3.
10	A	Oh.
11	Q	My apologies.
12	A	That would be for incidental take. They would allow
13		for an incidental take, in this case an
14		authorization, not a permit, because it's being
15		authorized by a state agency. So my understanding
16		I'm not the incidental take coordinator for the
17		Department, but my understanding is that we would
18		allow for an install take authorization for the
19		species.
20	Q	Can you explain why that I'm not understanding
21		your answer. Why that would be in light of what the
22		guidance says?
23	А	I guess I wouldn't have that information because I'm
24		not the incidental take coordinator.
25	Q	Okay. So sitting here today, you can't tell me

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 83
1		whether incidental take would be allowed for the
2		Eastern Massasauga in this situation?
3	A	I could say I've had discussions with both the
4		species expert and the incidental take coordinator
5		for the Department, and I have no reason to believe
6		why an incidental take authorization would not be
7		allowed.
8	Q	Okay. Did you specifically discuss this language
9		with them in the protocols?
10	A	No. We did not look at the grass and savanna
11		protocols because the activities that are being
12		proposed do not fall under these protocols.
13	Q	And why is that?
14	A	For the construct, because they're it's specific
15		to grasslands/savanna management, and my
16		understanding is it's for the a construction of a
17		utility line.
18	Q	Okay. And do you know whether similar protocols
19		would occur for well, let me back up.
20		Do you know whether similar protocols would
21		apply for this line?
22	A	We don't have any standard protocols for
23		construction. It all is very project specific.
24	Q	Okay. And regardless of what kind of project we're
25		discussing, I mean, the fact is still that there are
		Penarting 1td (800) 800-7222

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 84
1		no apparently stable Massasauga populations in
2		Wisconsin, and each individual is deemed critically
3		important. I mean, that's true whether that's
4		grassland/savanna management or a power line?
5	A	Yes, that's correct.
6	Q	The so in light of that fact, you think an install
7		take permit would still be granted for this power
8		line?
9	A	It would really depend on the activities where the
10		poles are being placed, the specific habitat on the
11		ground, time of year. It would really depend. It
12		would be very site specific.
13	Q	Okay. And does that further re-enforce the need for
14		survey of that species?
15	A	Correct. Yes.
16	Q	I'm going to show you Henn Exhibit 5. I'll represent
17		that these are the construction segments proposed by
18		the applicant, essentially the month and year the
19		applicants intend to construct the routes depending
20		on which route is selected. Are you with me on that?
21	А	Yes.
22	Q	Okay. Have the applicants discussed those
23		construction segments with you or with anyone in the
24		natural resources department?
25	А	I am aware of that timeline, yes.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 85
1	Q	Okay. Have you discussed with the applicants whether
2		these the time periods planned for construction
3		conflict with avoidance periods for any endangered
4		resources along the route?
5	A	We have not had those discussions until the project
6		has been approved and a route has been selected.
7	Q	Okay. So it could be that the time periods for
8		construction will in fact conflict with the avoidance
9		periods for some species?
10	A	There's potential, yes.
11		MS. WESTERBERG: Okay. That's all I've
12		got. Thanks, Judge.
13		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Nothing? Anyone
14		else with cross?
15		(No response.)
16		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Redirect.
17		REDIRECT EXAMINATION
18	BY M	S. CORRELL:
19	Q	I guess I'd just like to clarify with regard to the
20		Incidental Take Permits. To the best of your
21		ability, since as you've already testified you're not
22		the permitter for Incidental Take Permits, when would
23		those permits be issued?
24	A	We would want them issued probably the same year that
25		the project's going to start.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 86
1	Q	Okay. And as you were just asked, if you can answer
2		this question, if there were a conflict regarding
3		avoidance, are there mechanisms in the Incidental
4		Take Permit to address conflicts with construction
5		schedule and seasonal concerns for specific species,
6		be it the Eastern Massasauga or other rare species?
7	A	Yes. There are mechanisms within the permit and
8		authorization to do it, whether it's time of day
9		restrictions or if we need to mitigate for the
10		species. There's a variety of mechanisms to do that.
11	Q	So it's fair to say then it's possible that, if
12		necessary, slight deviations from the construction
13		schedule would be required by the Department?
14	A	Correct.
15		MS. CORRELL: Okay. That's all I have on
16		redirect. Thank you.
17		EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. You're
18		excused.
19		(Witness excused.)
20		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's go off the
21		record.
22		(Discussion held off the record.)
23		
24		
25		

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 87
1		EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Let's take
2		Ms. Steele.
3		YOYI STEELE, WDNR WITNESS, DULY SWORN
4		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Have a seat.
5		DIRECT EXAMINATION
6	BY M	S. CORRELL:
7	Q	Good morning, Ms. Steele.
8	A	Good morning.
9	Q	You've provided both direct and surrebuttal prefiled
10		written testimony in this proceeding?
11	A	That's correct.
12	Q	And with respect to that testimony, would you provide
13		the same testimony here today?
14	A	Yes, I would.
15	Q	Do you have any other clarifications that you'd like
16		to add to your testimony?
17	A	I do have one clarification to surrebuttal. This
18		would be on page 3 of my surrebuttal, lines 6 through
19		14 regarding use of H-frame structures on the portion
20		of subSegment H5 that is directly west of where
21		Leopold-Pine Island Important Bird Area begins.
22		So in this when I answered this
23		question in surrebuttal, I said that we would
24		recommend the use of H-frame structures along that
25		portion, and I just want to clarify that we would

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 88
1		like those structures to begin where the interstate
2		crosses County Highway A, so just to be clear.
3	Q	And those structures then would strike that.
4		Would it be your recommendation for those
5		structures to continue for additional segments of H?
6	A	Just from so from the subsegment of H5 that begins
7		where the interstate crosses Highway A then to
8		proceed as has already been where the applicants
9		have already expressed a willingness to employ them
10		throughout where the route would fall adjacent to the
11		Leopold IBA.
12	Q	And to clarify that section for the record, could I
13		have you refer to what's been marked PSC reference
14		number 201149, please?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	Is this what I'm referring to what's been marked
17		201149.
18		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let me just interrupt a
19		second. Is there an exhibit number for that?
20		MS. CORRELL: It is an attachment to a
21		response, data response, which is
22		THE WITNESS: That's 201143?
23		MS. CORRELL: Yes. PSC Reference No.
24		201143.
25		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's go off the

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 89
1		record.
2		(Discussion held off the record.)
3		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's get on the
4		record. We'll refer to it as Henn 2 and then the
5		response number, which is?
6		MR. POTTS: 01.52.
7		THE WITNESS: 1.52.
8		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
9		MS. CORRELL: I'm sorry. So are we
10		referring to the response as Henn 2 or the maps that
11		are attached as Henn 2?
12		MR. POTTS: Henn 2 incorporates all the
13		data request responses, so any time you cite a data
14		request response, you would say Henn 2 and then
15		number of data request response and attachments.
16		MS. CORRELL: Oh, okay.
17		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Thanks. Go ahead.
18	BY M	S. CORRELL:
19	Q	Okay. So to clarify for the record, referred you to
20		a map that's already been marked in the record as
21		Exhibit Henn 2, response to data request 1.52.
22	A	That's right.
23	Q	Do you have that in front of you?
24	A	I do.
25		MS. WESTERBERG: Counsel, I'm sorry. Just

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11	Page 90
1		for clarification, at the top of the map it should	
2		say which it's 01.52 dash	
3		MR. POTTS: 01.520.	
4		THE WITNESS: Dash 5 in this case.	
5		MS. WESTERBERG: Thank you. It's in tiny	
6		letters at the very top of the image.	
7		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. So let's give	
8		the entire citation at least once in one place in	
9		the record.	
10		THE WITNESS: So it would be Henn 2,	
11		Response 01.52, attachment -5. Is that	
12		MS. WESTERBERG: I'm with you. Thank you	•
13	1	MS. CORRELL: I'll trust you. I can't	
14		read that right now. It's too small.	
15		MR. POTTS: Could I ask a clarifying	
16		question? Is the portion we're talking about all	
17		within H5?	
18		MS. CORRELL: It's not. The map that is	r
19		provided that's what I'm going to clarify on the	
20		record.	
21		MR. POTTS: Okay.	
22	BY M	S. CORRELL:	
23	Q	So could you elaborate as to your understanding of	
24		what this map provides?	
25	A	What this map provides?	

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 91
1	Q	Right. In terms of the discussion we were having
2		regarding the location of H-frame structures.
3	A	Sure. My understanding is that that map represents
4		what the applicants indicated would be feasible bird
5		collision mitigation strategies for the Leopold-Pine
6		Island Important Bird Area. So the map contains some
7		color coding along the different segments to
8		represent the different strategies, and along the
9		portion of subSegment H5 that is west of where the
10		IBA begins, they indicated a willingness and
11		feasibility for line marking devices. A little bit
12		to the east where the IBA actually begins they
13		indicated a willingness to employ line marking and
14		avian mitigation structures, so
15	Q	Just to clarify
16	A	that's what the map represents.
17	Q	When you refer to avian mitigation structures, are
18		those the same as the H-frame structures that you
19		said before?
20	А	That is my understanding, yes.
21	Q	Okay.
22	А	So the clarification to my surrebuttal where I said
23		that they should that it's my recommendation that
24		the avian mitigation structures be employed west of
25		where the IBA begins, we would like those to begin

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 92
1		where County Highway A crosses the interstate, or
2		where the interstate crosses County Highway A, from
3		that point to the east.
4	Q	And to the east, what segments does that include?
5	A	So that would include the rest of H5 and then through
6		Segment H7, so to the end of H7.
7	Q	Referring to what's been marked Exhibit Henn 2,
8		Attachment 1.52-9 now, it should be a diagram that's
9		titled Avian Impact Alternatives General Drawings,
10		Badger Coulee, Exhibit 3?
11	A	Too many papers. You said 9?
12	Q	Yes. 1.52-9.
13	A	Okay, okay.
14	Q	Is that is this strike that.
15		What is your understanding of the H-frame
16		structure that's provided on M2, Attachment 1.52-9?
17	А	My understanding is that this is a depiction of a
18		typical H-frame structure.
19	Q	Were you present yesterday in the hearing room to
20		have the opportunity to hear the testimony of
21		Ms. Parrett?
22	А	Yes, I was.
23	Q	And so you heard the dialogue regarding structure
24		height where H-frame structures would be included?
25	А	Was that yesterday or was it the day before? It
	L	

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 93
1		seems like it was maybe the day before, in which case
2		I was watching through the live broadcast but I was
3		not present in the hearing room.
4	Q	Yes, I think you're right. Okay. But you did have
5		the opportunity to hear the entirety of her
6		testimony?
7	A	I did.
8	Q	And you do you are familiar with the discussion
9		that was had regarding the height of structures?
10	A	Yes.
11	Q	Specifically the H-frame structures adjacent or near
12		the Leopold-Pine Island IBA?
13	A	Yes.
14	Q	Do you have an opinion regarding the height of the
15		structures in addition to or to further elaborate
16		upon your testimony you already submitted in writing?
17	А	I guess what I can say is that it's my understanding
18		that 85 feet is the typical height of an H-frame
19		structure. For the purposes of avian mitigation or
20		for collisions, we would our preference is that
21		the structures be as short as they possibly can with
22		the understanding that 85 feet is the typical height,
23		but that there may be modifications. I would say
24		that our request is that they be as short as
25		possible.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 94
1	Q	And do you have any recommendations for the
2		Commission regarding the extent of use of H-frame
3		structures adjacent to this particular IBA?
4	A	Our recommendation to the Commission would be to
5		include in the order that H-frames be employed from
6		the points that I've just described, subSegment H5
7		that's west of the IBA start on County Highway A to
8		end of H7.
9	Q	And do you have any recommendation to the Commission
10		regarding the height of the structure that should be
11		in play?
12	А	That they be as short as possible is my
13		recommendation.
14	Q	And you're not an engineer, right?
15	A	I am not an engineer.
16	Q	So you understand that there are feasibility issues?
17	A	I understand that. I understand that I don't
18		understand everything that goes into tower design and
19		things that may influence tower structure, so it
20		would not be possible for me to say to give a
21		specific height, but merely to say that I understand
22		that 85 feet is a typical height, and that to
23		maximize the mitigation of avian collision, that the
24		structures should be as short as possible.
25	Q	Did you have the opportunity to review the

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 95
1		sur-surrebuttal submitted by ATC Witness Lorenz?
2	A	Yes, I did.
3	Q	Give you a minute to find that.
4	A	I have it.
5	Q	I'll refer you to page 1 at line 15 and to the end of
6		the page, line 24.
7	A	Okay.
8	Q	Did you review this testimony?
9	A	I did.
10	Q	What's your understanding of or could you
11		summarize your understanding of the testimony that's
12		provided?
13	A	By Mr. Lorenz?
14		MS. CORRELL: Yeah.
15		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Could you what?
16		MS. CORRELL: Could you summarize.
17		EXAMINER NEWMARK: No, no. We don't need
18		to summarize.
19		MS. CORRELL: Okay.
20		THE WITNESS: I did review the testimony,
21		yes.
22	BY M	S. CORRELL:
23	Q	Okay. And it's your understanding that not only has
24		ATC provided information that an 85-foot structure is
25		a typical structure, but it is feasible to be built

Ł

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 96
1		in the areas that we've had ongoing conversations
2		about utilizing that mitigation method?
3	A	Yes, that is my understanding.
4	Q	Have you had an opportunity to review a letter
5		submitted by the Leopold-Pine Island Important Bird
6		Area dated January 5, 2015 and PSC Reference
7		No. 229099?
8		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Let's go off the
9		record.
10		THE WITNESS: Yes, I have.
11		(Discussion held off the record.)
12		EXAMINER NEWMARK: That will be eventually
13		made part of Weiss 3. It's probably a good idea
14		just we'll reference it with the PSC number at
15		this point, so that was fine.
16		Go ahead.
17	BY M	S. CORRELL:
18	Q	So you have had the opportunity to review what is now
19		going to be referenced as PSC Reference No. 229099?
20	А	Yes, I have.
21	Q	Do you have an opinion in your role in DNR's
22		regulatory role regarding the requests made in the
23		comment letter?
24	A	It's my opinion that that what the Leopold-Pine
25		Island IBA partnership is requesting to be included

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 97
1		and eliminated, and the order should be included or
2		eliminated.
3	Q	Do you have any recommendations regarding whether or
4		not the Department should be involved in developing
5		an avian mitigation plan?
6	A	Yes, I do. It's my opinion that the Department
7		should be consulted on the avian mitigation plan,
8		that the Leopold-Pine Island IBA partnership should
9		be consulted on the mitigation plan, and that they
10		also approve the mitigation plan.
11	Q	When you say they should approve?
12	A	The Leopold-Pine Island IBA partnership and the DNR
13		as part of that partnership.
14	Q	And what about the DNR as a separate regulatory
15		entity rather than simply a partner within the
16		Leopold-Pine Island Important Bird Area partnership?
17	A	Yes.
18	Q	Could you speak to specific concerns that you think
19		should be addressed in the avian management plan?
20	A	The avian mitigation plan.
21	Q	I'm sorry, avian mitigation plan.
22	A	Yes. The avian mitigation plan should address
23		strategy multiple strategies to mitigate collision
24		risk, including structure height, line height, line
25		configuration, and line visibility.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 98
1	Q	Are there specific areas that you have the most
2		concern regarding a mitigation plan going forward?
3	A	My concerns as I've identified in my testimony would
4		be regarding the Important Bird Areas that are along
5		the proposed routes.
6	Q	Is there anything in the Pine Island Leopold-Pine
7		Island letter that's inconsistent with your opinion?
8	A	No.
9		MS. CORRELL: Just a moment. I think I'm
10		done.
11	BY M	S. CORRELL:
12	Q	I guess one more. The small issue is it sounds like
13		there was agreement from Ms. Parrett as an expert in
14		the field of ornithology as you are that standard
15		guidelines provided by the APLIC are considered best
16		practice in the field of mitigation of avian
17		collisions?
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	Is that correct?
20	А	You're referring to APLIC guidelines?
21	Q	Correct.
22		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's go off the record
23		for a minute.
24		(Discussion held off the record.)
25		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Go ahead.
	<u> </u>	

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 99
1	ву м	S. CORRELL:
2	Q	And do you have any recommendations for the
3		Commission regarding which publication of the APLIC
4		guidelines should be utilized
5	A	Yes, I do.
6	Q	or in this proceeding?
7	A	Regarding mitigation of avian collision, the most
8		recent guidelines were published in 2012, and those
9		should be the ones referred to and utilized. And
10		regarding electrocution mitigation for birds, the
11		2006 are the most recent and are the ones that should
12		be referred to.
13		MS. CORRELL: I would tender the witness
14		for cross-examination.
15		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Let's go off the
16		record for a minute.
17		(Discussion held off the record.)
18		EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. More
19		questions?
20		CROSS-EXAMINATION
21	BY M	R. POTTS:
22	Q	Ms. Steele, my name is a Brian Potts. I represent
23		American Transmission Company in this case. You
24		understand that the Public Service Commission of
25		Wisconsin determines the alignment, structure type,

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 100
1		and location of structures
2	A	Yes.
3	Q	for the route?
4		And so when you a minute ago when your
5		attorney asked you about Segment H and the avian
6		mitigation plan and whether or not the Department and
7		Leopold-Pine Island IBA should have approval
8		authority over that mitigation plan, you were not
9		suggesting that the Department or Leopold-Pine Island
10		would be able to disapprove of the alignment,
11		structure type, or location of the structures,
12		correct?
13	A	I don't I don't think I was saying that. I was
14		saying where where it regards mitigation of avian
15		collision and a plan to to do that, that they be
16		consulted and and that they approve what is
17		included as part of that plan.
18	Q	Okay. But
19	A	And they have recommendations of what should be
20		included. If if you're asking should they approve
21		engineering specifications, I don't think I've
22		represented that.
23	Q	Okay. Well, in this proceeding it's been suggested
24		that the avian mitigation plan should include the
25		mitigation measures that are actually being decided

1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 101
	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
	A Q

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 102
1		Department could still disapprove of that and then
2		the Public Service Commission would no longer or
3		the applicants could no longer build the route?
4	A	No.
5		MS. WESTERBERG: I'm going to object to
6		the characterization of the prior testimony because
7		I don't think there has been a representation that
8		the PSC will approve 85 feet specifically because
9		prior or final engineering has yet to be
10		conducted.
11		EXAMINER NEWMARK: I think we're speaking
12		hypothetically.
13		MR. POTTS: Yeah.
14	BY M	R. POTTS:
15	Q	What I'm trying to get at is can the Department
16		overrule the Public Service Commission's decisions on
17		structure height, location, and type of structure.
18		Is that what you're asking for?
19	A	That is not my understanding of what I'm asking for.
20		MR. POTTS: Okay.
21		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. I mean, if this
22		is still an open issue, I think I guess what
23		we're really talking about is how to word a
24		condition of the order, and if that comes up in
25		briefs, I guess it's a viable question. But, yeah,

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 103
1		you know, we'll leave it at that.
2		MR. POTTS: Okay. We have yeah, we
3		have nothing further.
4		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Uh-huh. Okay. Yeah,
5		go ahead.
6		MS. WESTERBERG: Ms. Kunze, go ahead.
7		MS. KUNZE: Your Honor, you choose.
8		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Come on up.
9		CROSS-EXAMINATION
10	BY M	IS. KUNZE:
11	Q	Good afternoon.
12	A	Good afternoon.
13	Q	I just have a few very general questions about birds
14		and habitat if you don't mind.
15	A	Sure.
16	Q	Would you agree that residential communities that
17		have shrubs and trees provide habitat for birds?
18	A	That's reasonable.
19	Q	And would you agree that agricultural areas with
20		fence rows, wind breaks, and trees provide habitats
21		for birds?
22	A	Yes, some.
23	Q	And would you agree that this residential community
24		and agricultural habitat can be a significantly
25		beneficial source of habitat that encourages local

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 104
1		bird populations?
2	A	It can.
3	Q	And would you agree that if the PSC permitted a route
4		through a residential and agricultural community and
5		construction and operation of this transmission line
6		eliminated shrubs and trees through right-of-way
7		clearing, that that bird habitat would be lost?
8	A	In general I would say that is reasonable. I would
9		qualify it by saying that there are birds that use
10		many different types of habitats. All habitats are
11		used by some birds. So when a habitat conversion
12		takes place, in general some birds benefit and other
13		birds experience loss of habitat. So that's how I
14		would qualify my answer, but in general what you
15		stated is correct.
16	Q	Okay. And would you agree then that if a habitat
17		would be limited or eliminated, that those you
18		just kind of confirmed that really, and I won't worry
19		about that.
20		If a habitat were removed from an area,
21		where would the birds seek food and shelter?
22	A	Well, it would depend on what kind of species we're
23		talking about, what habitats they require, and where
24		those habitats were available elsewhere on the
25		landscape, and the birds' abilities to reach those

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 105
1		other areas if they were present.
2	Q	So in other words, if that habitat were removed, they
3		would need to seek other areas
4	A	That would be reasonable.
5	Q	within the area?
6		MS. KUNZE: Thank you. No further
7		questions.
8		EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Clean?
9		CROSS-EXAMINATION
10	BY M	S. WESTERBERG:
11	Q	Thank you. Ms. Steele, I'm Christa Westerberg with
12		Clean Wisconsin. You've emphasized a few times the
13		need for the avian mitigation plan to include
14		multiple strategies to reduce collision risk?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	And is that one particular mitigation measure
17		we've heard a lot about is line marking devices?
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	And as I read your testimony, line marking devices
20		are only somewhat they're effective to a point?
21	A	Yes, that's correct.
22	Q	So if I thought it was about 10 to 80 percent
23		effective depending on multiple conditions?
24	A	That really depends on the species.
25	Q	Yeah.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 106
1	A	So, yes, they have very a wide range of
2		effectiveness depending on the situation and the
3		species.
4	Q	And so is it your opinion that the avian mitigation
5		plan should emphasize not only bird-marking devices,
6		but other mitigation measures for reducing
7		collisions?
8	A	Absolutely.
9	Q	Okay. And those aren't just structure design and
10		location like we've heard, but also ongoing measures
11		such as vegetation management?
12	А	Yes, that's correct.
13	Q	Okay. And that would be something like planting
14		trees that would help obscure the line outside of the
15		right-of-way?
16	A	It could, yes.
17	Q	And you mentioned that you had aside from the
18		Leopold-Pine Island IBA, you were concerned about the
19		other four Important Bird Areas that are along the
20		proposed routes?
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	But it's not your testimony that the avian mitigation
23		plan should be limited just to the IBA, is it?
24	A	My understanding is that the avian mitigation plan is
25		specific to the project. It's not necessarily my
	•	Poporting 1td (200) 200 7222

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 107
1		understanding that it's only specific to certain
2		segments of the project, but that it's specific to
3		the project, to the Badger Coulee project.
4	Q	Yes. And that's what I meant. Sorry.
5	A	Yeah.
6	Q	But to the extent there are other places where there
7		is a high potential for bird collision such as a
8		river crossing, you would want those addressed in the
9		avian mitigation plan as well?
10	A	Yes.
11	Q	And that's in fact what the applicants have done with
12		the CapX avian mitigation plan?
13	A	That's my understanding.
14	Q	You've reviewed that plan?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	Okay. And is it also your understanding that the
17		applicants will assess those areas for potential
18		collision as part of developing that plan?
19	A	That would be reasonable.
20	Q	Aside from specific areas for bird collisions, are
21		you concerned about the cumulative loss of habitat
22		that will be created by all of the new right-of-way
23		along the route, whichever one is chosen?
24	A	There are some concerns, yes.
25	Q	Okay. And do you believe those impacts of loss of

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 108
1		habitat should be mitigated if possible, such as
2		replanting new vegetation?
3	A	Yes, to the extent possible.
4	Q	Okay. And if the applicants could plant forbs and
5		shrubs within the right-of-way that might provide
6	-	that habitat, you would agree with that mitigation
7		measure?
8	A	I would I would agree that planting as appropriate
9		native species of shrubs and forbs would help to
10		provide some habitat for birds, for a variety of
11		birds.
12	1	MS. WESTERBERG: Okay.
13		EXAMINER NEWMARK: You said forbs. Can
14		you explain that?
15		THE WITNESS: Sorry.
16		MS. WESTERBERG: I think you said for a
17		variety of birds?
18		THE WITNESS: Forbs.
19		MS. WESTERBERG: Okay.
20		THE WITNESS: The plant. It's a type
21		of
22		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Can you just
23	-	spell that for us?
24		THE WITNESS: F-O-R-B-S.
25		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 109
1		THE WITNESS: Sorry. That's a type of
2		plant.
3	:	MS. WESTERBERG: Nothing further. Thank
4		you.
5		EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Any more
6		cross? Assuming someone else is there. Go ahead.
7		MR. POTTS: Sorry. Just a couple
8		questions.
9		RECROSS-EXAMINATION
10	BY M	R. POTTS:
11	Q	So is it is the Department I believe your
12		testimony earlier was that the Department is seeking
13		the applicants to consult with the Leopold-Pine
14		Island IBA and obtain their approval on the portion
15		of the route that's essentially Segment H; is that
16		correct?
17	A	Yes.
18	Q	Okay. But not the rest of the project area?
19	A	Regarding the
20	Q	Leopold-Pine Island IBA.
21	A	That's correct.
22	Q	Okay. And then if the DNR wants the applicants or
23		wants to have the Leopold-Pine Island IBA approve of
24		an avian mitigation plan, couldn't the DNR just
25		decide itself not to approve the avian mitigation

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 110
1		plan until the DNR can obtain Leopold-Pine Island
2		IBA's approval?
3	A	I suppose that's a possibility.
4	Q	So in other words, there would be no real reason for
5		the Public Service Commission's order to require the
6		applicants to obtain the Leopold-Pine Island's
7		approval because the DNR could just do that itself
8		before the DNR gave its approval?
9		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Well, again, this is
10		really just how we would draft the order point. I
11		don't know. It's all just a logical flow, I mean.
12		MR. POTTS: But the DNR is asking
13		specifically for the applicants to obtain the
14		Leopold-Pine Island approval, and I'm just asking
15		her whether
16		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Why that is or
17		MR. POTTS: And whether she can just
18		obtain the order herself or whether the applicants
19		need
20		EXAMINER NEWMARK: To say DNR, yeah.
21		THE WITNESS: I suppose that would be one
22		way to do it.
23		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
24		MR. POTTS: Okay. We have nothing
25		further.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 111
1		EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Any
2		redirect?
3		MS. CORRELL: I just have a little bit of
4		redirect to try to clarify the record.
5		REDIRECT EXAMINATION
6	BY M	S. CORRELL:
7	Q	The line of question regarding whether or not it's
8		DNR your understanding that DNR could require
9		certain structures that were not required by the
10		Public Service Commission
11		EXAMINER NEWMARK: No, no. That's not the
12		issue. The issue is how would the Commission direct
13		DNR's approval authority, so we don't need to go
14		into that.
15		MS. CORRELL: No. That's the most latest
16		detail, but earlier he asked her a question, and
17		maybe it's been sufficiently answered, but I wanted
18		to make sure the record was clear. Maybe I should
19		start out with a foundational question.
20	BY M	S. CORRELL:
21	Q	Is it is it your understanding that the avian
22		mitigation plan has some components that need to be
23		determined before a Commission order and some
24		components that may have to be determined after a
25		Commission order?

ſ	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 112
1	A	Yes, that is my understanding.
2	Q	And with regard to H-frame structures and
3		recommendations about Commission order points, is it
4		your understanding that those types of avian
5		mitigation strategies need to be included on the
6		front end and it's the Commission's authority to make
7		those decisions?
8	A	Yes.
9		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
10	BY M	S. CORRELL:
11	Q	However, there may be other issues. For example,
12		there's been some discussion of bird diverters.
13	А	Right.
14	Q	And in particular swan-type of diverters?
15	А	There are a number of different devices that could be
16		used.
17	Q	Are some of those types of ongoing discussions things
18		that you anticipate could take place following a DNR
19		order I'm sorry following a Commission order
20	A	Yes.
21	Q	on the CPCN?
22	А	Exactly. Definitely.
23		MS. CORRELL: Thank you.
24		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. You're excused,
25		thanks, before anyone else asks anything.

1Let's go off the record.2(Discussion held off the record.)3(Break taken.)4(Change of reporters.)5EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Do we have6who we need? Okay. Great.7MR. LORENCE: Of the need witnesses for8the staff, Don Neumeyer is the only witness9testifying. The rest will submit affidavits.10EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Great.11121314151616171819201212222423242425		1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11	Page 113
3 (Break taken.) 4 (Change of reporters.) 5 EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Do we have 6 who we need? Okay. Great. 7 MR. LORENCE: Of the need witnesses for 8 the staff, Don Neumeyer is the only witness 9 testifying. The rest will submit affidavits. 10 EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Great. 11 EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Great. 12	1		Let's go off the record.	
4 (Change of reporters.) 5 EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Do we have 6 who we need? Okay. Great. 7 MR. LORENCE: Of the need witnesses for 8 the staff, Don Neumeyer is the only witness 9 testifying. The rest will submit affidavits. 10 EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Great. 11 12 13 14 15 16 16 17 18 19 20 21 21 23 22 23 23 24	2		(Discussion held off the record.)	
5EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Do we have6who we need? Okay. Great.7MR. LORENCE: Of the need witnesses for8the staff, Don Neumeyer is the only witness9testifying. The rest will submit affidavits.10EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Great.1112131415161718192021232324	3		(Break taken.)	
6 who we need? Okay. Great. 7 MR. LORENCE: Of the need witnesses for 8 the staff, Don Neumeyer is the only witness 9 testifying. The rest will submit affidavits. 10 EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Great. 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	4		(Change of reporters.)	
7 MR. LORENCE: Of the need witnesses for 8 the staff, Don Neumeyer is the only witness 9 testifying. The rest will submit affidavits. 10 EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Great. 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	5		EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Do we ha	ve
 8 the staff, Don Neumeyer is the only witness 9 testifying. The rest will submit affidavits. 10 EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Great. 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	6		who we need? Okay. Great.	
 9 testifying. The rest will submit affidavits. 10 EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Great. 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	7		MR. LORENCE: Of the need witnesses for	
10 EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Great. 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	8		the staff, Don Neumeyer is the only witness	
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	9		testifying. The rest will submit affidavits.	
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	10		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Great.	
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	11			
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	12			
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	13			
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	14			
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	15			
18 19 20 21 22 23 24	16			
19 20 21 22 23 24	17			
20 21 22 23 24	18			
21 22 23 24	19			
22 23 24	20			
23 24	21			
24	22			
	23			
25	24			
	25			

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 114
1		DONALD G. NEUMEYER, STAFF WITNESS, DULY SWORN
2		DIRECT EXAMINATION
3	ВУ М	R. LORENCE:
4	Q	Can you state your name for the record, please.
5	A	Donald G. Neumeyer, N-E-U-M-E-Y-E-R.
6	Q	And in preparation for today's hearing, did you
7		prepare direct testimony?
8	A	Yes, I did.
9	Q	And you did not have any exhibits, correct?
10	A	That is correct.
11	Q	And you have no corrections to your testimony?
12	A	No, I do not.
13	Q	And if I asked you the questions in your prepared
14		testimony today, would your answers be the same?
15	A	Yes, they would.
16	Q	Mr. Neumeyer, have you been monitoring the witnesses'
17		testimony this week?
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	And have you heard several questions about the
20		possible increased use of transmission structures
21		that carry multiple circuits in order to minimize
22		right-of-way width and environmental impacts?
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	Specifically there has been discussion about placing
25		multiple circuits on a single pole in the area of

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 115
1		the in the area north of the Briggs Road
2		Substation, correct?
3	A	Correct.
4	Q	What standards cover the usage of multiple circuit
5		structures in planning?
6	A	The North American Electric Reliability Corporation,
7		NERC, reliability standards cover this design,
8		specifically the transmission system planning
9		performance requirements standard TPL-001-4 covers
10		the system conditions and contingency analysis. For
11		the purposes of reliability and performance, multiple
12		circuits on a single structure does not violate NERC
13		standards when the cumulative use is one mile or less
14		for the new bulk electric system element. This has
15		typically been used for substation exit and entry and
16		river crossings.
17	Q	So under NERC standards, three circuits on a single
18		pole would be allowable as long as the cumulative
19		length is less than one mile?
20	A	Correct.
21	Q	And from an engineering standpoint, you do not have
22		an objection to such a configuration?
23	A	No, I do not.
24		MR. LORENCE: No further questions.
25		Mr. Neumeyer is available.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 116
1		EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Questions
2		for the witness?
3		CROSS-EXAMINATION
4	BY M	S. AGRIMONTI:
5	Q	Mr. Neumeyer, I just have a question. Would you have
6		any objection if the proposal was to extend the
7		length of co-location for more than a mile?
8	A	Yes, I would.
9	Q	What would be the basis of that objection?
10	A	It would violate the planning standard.
11		MS. AGRIMONTI: Thank you. No further
12		questions.
13		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
14		MR. JABLONSKI: I have a question.
15		CROSS-EXAMINATION
16	BY M	R. JABLONSKI:
17	Q	Can you tell me the planning standard that would be
18		violated?
19		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Introduce yourself.
20	BY M	R. JABLONSKI:
21	Q	I'm sorry. Frank Jablonski for the Town of Holland.
22	A	It is the standard that I just referenced as the NERC
23		planning standard, that was that TPL standard.
24	Q	So is that because it's a category D and creates a
25		category D contingency?

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 117
1	A	It's a little more complex than that. The standards
2		has been some of the older standards have been
3		reconstituted in a new manner, and they use levels
4		like P and tables with extreme events. So the
5		we're very familiar with the terms. So it doesn't
6		isn't classified that way. So it has to do with
7		circuit conditions, structure conditions, incidental
8		events, subsequent events, and the situation with the
9		loss of load or cascading situations.
10	Q	Sure. And has a have you done any analysis of the
11		potential for common source or common source
12		contingency event to take out the transmission lines
13		if they are close to each other as opposed to on the
14		same set of poles?
15	A	My reference was common structure. I was focusing on
16		common structure. There are corridors used which are
17		different.
18	Q	Okay. So you haven't done an analysis as to the
19		relative risk as opposed as between a common
20		structure triple circuited and a common structure
21		double circuited with another structure single
22		circuited on the other side of the highway?
23	A	The standards you take into account, the risks, those
24		are why the standards are there, and the loads you
25		could lose or not lose, firm/not firm situations.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 118
1	Q	So yes, you have done that analysis?
2	A	I have reviewed the analysis where contingencies of
3		multiple circuits on common structures show a
4		collapse of the system which is unacceptable.
5	Q	Okay. If the Commission declines to approve the
6		Badger Coulee proposal, then the common structure
7		there will be a common structure with a 161 kV and a
8		345 kV; is that correct?
9	A	I believe that's correct.
10	Q	And the if that goes down, you will have the exact
11		same situation as if you would have taken out the 161
12		and two 345s?
13	A	Not exactly. Because it's a function of the
14		topology. It's unique to every instance of existing
15		and new topology designs. So it wouldn't be
16		equivalent depending on the design.
17	Q	Depending on the design of what?
18	A	The network.
19	Q	Depending on the design of the network. And so the
20		analysis, the analysis for a commonly caused failure,
21		that has been submitted into the record? Is that in
22		any of your exhibits?
23	A	I have no exhibits.
24		MR. JABLONSKI: Thank you.
25		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Other cross?

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 119
1		No? Redirect?
2		MR. LORENCE: I can safely say I have no
3		further questions.
4		EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Well, the
5		witness is excused.
6		(Witness excused.)
7		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let me take this moment
8		to congratulate Mr. Lorence
9		MR. LORENCE: Off the record.
10		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Off the record? Oh,
11		come on.
12		MR. LORENCE: Thank you.
13		EXAMINER NEWMARK: This is his last
14		hearing, his last witness, and we'd like to thank
15		him for his service.
16		(Discussion off the record.)
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	L	

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 120
1		MS. SILVER KARSH: I'd like to call Paul
2		Rahn to the stand.
3		PAUL RAHN, STAFF WITNESS, DULY SWORN
4		DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	ву м	S. SILVER KARSH:
6	Q	Good afternoon. Would you please state your name for
7		the record.
8	A	Paul Rahn.
9	Q	And what is your position at the Commission?
10	A	I'm the environmental analyst in the energy division.
11	Q	And did you submit direct testimony in this docket?
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	And if I were to ask you the same questions today
14		that were in your direct testimony, would your
15		answers be the same?
16	A	Yes.
17		MS. SILVER KARSH: Thank you. I have no
18	- 	further questions. He's available for
19		cross-examination.
20		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Who has
21		questions?
22		MS. SILVER KARSH: I believe Ms. Kunze had
23		cross of Mr. Rahn.
24		CROSS-EXAMINATION
25	BY M	S. KUNZE:

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 121
1	Q	Thank you. Good afternoon, Mr. Rahn. I'm Laura
2		Kunze, self-representing. I just have a few
3		questions. I'd like to refer to Table 11.1-1 of the
4		EIS. Do you happen to have that?
5	A	Do you have a page number?
6	Q	I did not write it down. I'm sorry. But 11 is right
7		around 360-something. So start there.
8	A	.364? Yes.
9	Q	You do have it?
10	A	Yes, I have it.
11	Q	Thank you. So in that table, the EIS is a comparison
12		of right-of-way characteristics of the A, B and
13		B-north and B and B-south segments. Were comparisons
14		done of the impact of these three segment
15		alternatives in the context of the entire route, for
16		example, north route with B and with A, south route
17		with B and with A?
18	A	B-north is a route using a segment called B-north and
19		the rest of segment B. B-south is B-south with the
20		remainder. So it's the entire route.
21	Q	Did you interchange them and compare?
22	A	They're two different alternatives, and they're
23		comparable to A which connected the route.
24	Q	Well, are you aware down below that B and A can be
25		interchangeable and intersect later with other
	1	

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 122
1	A	They come to the same intersection point.
2	Q	At G. In the context of the entire 160- to 180-mile
3		route, would you agree that an additional three miles
4		is less than a 2 percent difference?
5	A	Of route length? Yes.
6	Q	Where the easement width for the 138 kilovolt line
7		would have to be expanded for a 345 kilovolt line,
8		how many acres per mile would be required?
9	A	I would have to calculate that.
10	Q	Was that included in the EIS?
11	A	It was included in the application of right-of-way
12		required for higher voltage line, yes.
13	Q	Where can that information be found?
14	A	It would be in the application data tables.
15	Q	Data tables. Why wasn't that included in the EIS?
16	A	Those numbers are reflected here.
17	Q	Okay. And the same table, how many of the existing
18		right-of-way shared acres require additional acres of
19		land to expand the easement and what does that
20		acreage total?
21	A	I think you will find that in the text for the
22		various segments how much is expanded.
23	Q	I'm sorry?
24	A	It's in the text.
25	Q	Could you find out where that is in the text.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 123
1	A	At page 362, under 11.2.1.1, first paragraph, where
2		it says agricultural land represents 62.1 percent of
3		the total required right-of-way. New right-of-way,
4		not overlapping any existing facility right-of-way
5		encompasses 29.7 acres of farmland.
6	Q	So that's how you calculated
7	A	Yes.
8	Q	Thank you for clarifying. So in the EIS Section
9		11.1.2, it addresses access where there are natural
10		constraints such as steep hills, large high-quality
11		natural resources, and other limitations where direct
12		access is not possible.
13		Would you agree that all of the Segment A,
14		B and B3a access roads would follow existing lanes or
15		paths, the access roads?
16	A	I don't know at this point without consulting other
17		information.
18	Q	The narrative states that Segment A access road
19		covers an area of wetland. Why isn't this reflected
20		in 11.1-2?
21	A	Where are you referring to?
22	Q	11.1-2, wetlands. The narrative states that there is
23		an area of wetlands, but it's not included.
24	A	I didn't work on that section, so I can't speak to
25		it.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 124
1	Q	Okay. Fine. Regarding the number and length of
2		distribution lines, did staff independently verify
3		that data?
4	A	I did not work with the distribution line
5		information.
6	Q	Were you present for Ms. Parrett's testimony or have
7		you read her direct?
8	A	I read her direct, yes. And listened to most of her
9		testimony, I believe. Not all of it, though, at the
10		end.
11	Q	Well, perhaps you can answer, why is the
12		undergrounding of the distribution line now
13		under-built on the 138 kV line not discussed in
14		Section 11.1.3.1?
15		MS. SILVER KARSH: Your Honor, I'd like to
16		note that these are questions that are more
17		appropriate for Ms. Weiss who will be coming up for
18		testimony. Mr. Rahn did not work on that portion.
19		MS. KUNZE: Thank you.
20	Q	So if I touch upon something that obviously please
21		tell me if somebody else is working on this to save
22		us time. For the Environmental Impact Statement in
23		the section for agriculture, was that something that
24		you could answer to with regard to did you rely on
25		the AIS for acreage figures?
	Gramaca	Reporting 1td (800) 899-7222

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 125
1	A	I used some of their figures and figures from the
2		application, I used both.
3	Q	Would you agree that much of the information in the
4		AIS is obtained from self-reporting survey
5		respondents?
6	A	I couldn't speak to that because the ag. department
7		prepared that.
8	Q	Have you verified the information from the AIS?
9	А	No, I do not verify their information.
10	Q	How does the staff weigh agriculture versus forest in
11		its environmental assessment?
12	А	I think we explained impacts to all areas, but we
13		don't try to emphasize or downgrade
14	Q	Do they weight them differently?
15	A	I don't know that we make a judgment as to various
16		weights.
17	Q	Okay.
18	A	Judgment is up to the Commissioners when they make
19		their decision.
20	Q	EIS Section 11.2.1.1 in one circumstance says under
21		applicants' proposal where property would be bound on
22		three sides by transmission lines.
23	А	What section?
24	Q	11.2.1.1.
25		MR. LORENCE: Page 362.
l		

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 126
1		MS. KUNZE: Thank you.
2	A	What page number?
3		MR. LORENCE: 362.
4		MS. KUNZE: Thank you, Mr. Lorence.
5	A	And the question?
6	Q	Was there property bound on three sides?
7	A	Did we count every situation where that occurred?
8	Q	Did it occur?
9	A	Are you saying whether there is a property
10	Q	Um-hmm.
11	A	with transmission line on three sides?
12	Q	Yes.
13	A	I can't say with certainty.
14	Q	If transmission lines would be placed outside of
15		cultivated fields and would be offset from field
16		edges, how is that not encroaching on land and
17		restricting use?
18	A	In the sense that field edge is a worked area of the
19		field, it's outside their directly on the property
20		line may not affect tillage land.
21	Q	Would a tractor still need to steer around those
22		poles?
23	A	Possibly.
24	Q	And would the area still be disturbed and crops
25		destroyed?

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 127
1	A	Depends what is near it.
2	Q	Potentially if a pole replaced an area of crops,
3		would those crops be destroyed?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	Regarding bird habitat, would you agree that
6		residential communities that have shrubs and trees
7		provide habitat for birds, generally speaking?
8	A	I do not deal with that section.
9	Q	Did you deal with magnetic fields?
10	A	No.
11	Q	Were you present for the testimony of Mr. Lorenz?
12	A	I heard some of his testimony.
13	Q	Are you familiar with Table 81 of Mr. Lorenz?
14	A	No.
15	Q	Do you deal with the amp loads or anything of that
16		nature?
17	A	The what loads?
18	Q	Your amperage loads in your
19	A	No, not normally.
20	Q	Do you deal with aesthetic and visual impacts
21		analysis?
22	A	Not for this project.
23	Q	I'm sorry?
24	А	Not for this project.
25	Q	Were you present for the testimony earlier when the

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 128
1		self-weathering finish on poles was discussed?
2	A	I heard that.
3	Q	Would you agree that a self-weathering brown steel
4		pole has heightened visibility when compared to a
5		galvanized pole or gray or blue painted pole?
6	A	It depends on the surrounding environment.
7	Q	The section states that along the route, Segment A is
8		more densely populated than Segment B. Where in the
9		chart where is the chart that shows the homes
10		within that area referred to in the EIS?
11	A	The section that shows houses?
12	Q	Does it go does that chart include homes within
13		the line of sight?
14	A	I did not work on that section.
15	Q	Is there a map of dots showing the homes and their
16		including their varying distances from the lines in
17		this project?
18	A	There was a GIS layer that indicates where homes are
19		in relation to the lines.
20	Q	Does it include the distances?
21	A	That can be measured on those maps.
22	Q	Were any models or computer [sic] generated before or
23		after visual prepared for the EIS?
24	A	Yes.
25	Q	Where are those located?

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 129
1	A	I did not deal with that section. You should ask
2		somebody else.
3	Q	Who might that be?
4	A	Perhaps Ms. Weiss.
5	Q	Thank you. If homes are in a wooded area, what is
6		the impact of trees on visibility of nearby
7		transmission would you say?
8	A	I would say if there are trees between the home and
9		the transmission line, they often provide screening
10		of the line.
11	Q	And if those screening trees were to be removed for
12		right-of-way, how would that impact visibility on the
13		lines?
14	A	That may increase it.
15	Q	You can move to 11.3.4, public lands and recreation.
16	A	I did not work on that.
17	Q	You did not. Okay. Did you work at all on
18		communication facilities?
19	A	No.
20	Q	And airport and airstrips at all?
21	A	No.
22	Q	I just want to be clear we're covering what we need
23		to, so you understand. Well, I guess that's all I
24		have for you, Mr. Rahn. Thank you so much for your
25		time.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 130
1		EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Other
2		questions?
3		MR. WILL: No.
4		EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Redirect?
5		MS. SILVER KARSH: No.
6		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Nothing? Thanks.
7		You're excused.
8		(Witness excused.)
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	I	

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 131
1		MS. SILVER KARSH: I'd like to call
2		Marilyn Weiss to the stand.
3		MARILYN WEISS, STAFF WITNESS, DULY SWORN
4		DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	BY M	S. SILVER KARSH:
6	Q	Good afternoon. Would you please state your name for
7		the record.
8	A	Marilyn Weiss.
9	Q	And what is your position at the Commission?
10	A	I'm an environmental analyst.
11	Q	And did you submit direct and surrebuttal testimony?
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	And five exhibits?
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	And you filed an errata sheet PSC reference number
16		229437?
17	A	Yes.
18	Q	On page 4 of your direct testimony, beginning at line
19		6, you stated that data request 10 and 11 are still
20		outstanding. Do you have an update to provide?
21	A	Yes. At the time of the writing that was true. That
22		is no longer true. All the data requests have been
23		responded to by the applicants.
24	Q	With this update and the errata sheets, if I were to
25		ask you the same questions today that are in your
	L	

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 132
1		direct and surrebuttal testimony, would your answers
2		be the same?
3	A	Yes.
4	Q	And is the information in your exhibits true and
5		correct to the best of your knowledge?
6	A	Yes.
7		MS. SILVER KARSH: The witness is
8		available for cross-examination.
9		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. I just wanted to
10		double-check with you will be filing Weiss 3, the
11		public comments, right?
12		THE WITNESS: Right. Delayed exhibit.
13		(Exhibit Weiss 3 designated for delayed
14		receipt.)
15		EXAMINER NEWMARK: That hasn't been filed.
16		And since you have more data request responses,
17		we'll need to update Henn 2/Weiss 4.
18		THE WITNESS: Henn 2/Weiss 4 is complete.
19		MR. POTTS: It includes the 10 and 11 that
20		she
21		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Oh, okay, great. Oh,
22		since your testimony. That's fine. Thanks. Well,
23		any questions?
24		MR. OLIVEIRA: Yes, Your Honor.
25		CROSS-EXAMINATION

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 133
1	BY M	R. OLIVEIRA:
2	Q	Good afternoon, Ms. Weiss. My name is Marcel
3		Oliveira. I represent CETF and SOUL. I just have a
4		few questions for you about the EIS. Starting with
5		the goals of the EIS, would you agree that one of the
6		goals in preparing the EIS is to avoid, prevent or
7		mitigate environmental damage? I can repeat the
8		question.
9	A	Please do.
10	Q	Would you agree that one of the goals in preparing an
11		EIS is to avoid, prevent or help mitigate
12		environmental damage?
13	A	Its first order is to enumerate the impacts. It's
14		the review process that we go through including the
15		pre-application process that helps minimize or
16		evaluate the different issues, impacts and mitigation
17		that's potentially possible on the project.
18	Q	And so that review process, would you agree that the
19		goals you just described also go towards preserving
20		natural vistas?
21	A	It is a portion of many resources that are reviewed
22		and analyzed.
23	Q	Yeah. And I'm asking whether these are parts of the
24		overall I'm sure there's several goals to it. I'm
25		asking if these are parts
	6	Penerting 1td (800) 800-7222

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 134
1	A	I wouldn't say it's a goal, but it's one of the
2		things we review.
3	Q	Okay. Is preventing damage to local economies or
4		the damage to local economies that may result from a
5		project something else that's reviewed?
6	A	Perhaps peripherally, but we don't have the expertise
7		to do economic analysis.
8	Q	And what about protecting public health, is that one
9		of the aspects that is reviewed?
10	A	Once again, it's an assessment of the impacts.
11	Q	An impact on public health is included in that
12		assessment?
13	A	Yes.
14	Q	Okay. Are you familiar with the term "precautionary
15	-	principle"?
16	A	No.
17	Q	If I represented to you that precautionary principle
18		stands for caution in deciding whether to recommend a
19		project or assess the impact of a project on the side
20		of not recommending that in case there may be
21		scientific uncertainty over environmental or health
22		impacts I'll ask you this. Do you have any reason
23		to question that definition of precautionary
24		principle?
25	A	Because I'm not familiar with it, I don't have an

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 135
1		opinion whether it's applicable or right or wrong.
2	Q	Sure. Would you agree that under that definition,
3		the precautionary principle is something the
4		Commission takes into account when preparing an EIS?
5		MR. POTTS: Objection.
6		MS. SILVER KARSH: Objection.
7		MR. POTTS: She just said she isn't even
8		aware of what that
9		MR. OLIVEIRA: And that's why I provided
10		the definition.
11		MR. POTTS: Now you're asking her for her
12		opinion on whether the Commission
13		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Just rephrase it using
14		the terms
15		MR. OLIVEIRA: I can withdraw the question
16		and ask a different question.
17	Q	Would you agree that well, instead of asking you
18		whether you agree, I'm going to inquire whether the
19		Commission in preparing an EIS looks into areas where
20		there's scientific uncertainty, so the causal
21		relationship between a component of a project and
22		public health?
23	A	Causal uncertainty sounds like it has some very
24		specific meaning that I'm not familiar with. But I
25		can say we do look at the current research, we are

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 136
1		not experts in everything, and we do make some
2		evaluation as to the current state of the literature
3		on some subjects.
4	Q	And that was the thrust of my question, whether the
5		Commission considers if it's brought up to its
6		attention there is research out there to be reviewed,
7		the Commission will then make an inquiry into the
8		existing research?
9	A	When you say Commission, are you talking about staff
10		or the Commissioners?
11	Q	Yes, I apologize, staff in preparing the EIS.
12	A	We try to be as broad and inclusive as possible.
13	Q	Okay. Were you involved in receiving, reviewing or
14		processing public input into the DEIS from the
15		scoping process through the conclusion of the final
16		EIS?
17	A	Yes.
18	Q	And do you recall receiving public comments, concerns
19		or research citations in the area of EMF?
20	А	Yes.
21	Q	Do you recall receiving the same in the area of
22		corona-based emissions?
23	А	Yes.
24	Q	Do you recall receiving the same in the area of UV
25		emissions? Ultraviolet radiation?
		Penarting 1td (800) 800 7323

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 137
1	A	Yes. Yes.
2	Q	Do you recall receiving public comments, questions or
3		concerns regarding physical or cyber security of
4		transmission lines?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	During the comment process on the draft EIS all the
7		way up to the final EIS being put together, was there
8		additional inquiry by Commission staff of the current
9		research in any of those areas listed?
10	A	Some.
11	Q	And what areas were inquired into?
12	A	We looked at the citations that were contained in the
13		comments. We discussed things with the engineers and
14		experts on staff where it touched on things that were
15		of scientific engineering issues. We consulted with
16		those people in the Commission that had knowledge,
17		spoke to some other departments of the State of
18		Wisconsin to get better insight. And some USGS,
19		talked to some of them for some things.
20	Q	And during that process of inquiry, the sources that
21		were originally cited in the comments were looked
22		into, I take it?
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	And do you recall during this entire process
25		preparing the EIS whether the Commission or staff
		Penarting 1td (800) 800-7222

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 138
1		received a request for socioeconomic cost/benefit
2		analyses?
3	A	Yes.
4	Q	And were those responded to or followed up on?
5	A	I believe in the early stages before we had the
6		application, some letters were written back to those
7		townships that had asked for a reply.
8	Q	Okay. Do you recall what townships were responded
9		to, by any chance?
10	A	Not off the top of my head, no.
11	Q	Do you recall an approximate number of responses?
12	A	Not off the top of my head, no.
13	Q	And do you recall the content of those responses
14		insofar as there was actually a follow-up on the
15		study or whether a response was
16	A	You seem to be asking two separate things. The
17		request for a socioeconomic study is one object. The
18		comments that asked for us to review additional
19		literature is a different issue
20	Q	Yeah, I apologize.
21	A	and the socioeconomic studies were responded to in
22		letters prior to the application coming in before the
23		review process was started. And that's why letters
24		were written back to these people. After the review
25		process started, there was a mechanism to have

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 139
1		comments and participate in the review of the
2		application.
3	Q	And I apologize for not being my question was
4		getting at whether or not the response to the
5		requests for socioeconomic studies actually involved
6		socioeconomic studies that staff conducted?
7	A	We did not conduct any socioeconomic studies.
8	Q	I apologize. That should have been my question. No
9		further questions, Your Honor.
10		EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Other
11		cross?
12		CROSS-EXAMINATION
13	BY M	S. WESTERBERG:
14	Q	Good afternoon, Ms. Weiss. I'm Christa Westerberg
15		with Clean Wisconsin. Your final EIS at page 32
16		discusses impacts to springs. Were you here this
17		morning when I was discussing that issue with Ben
18		Callan for DNR, were you here for that?
19	A	Yes.
20	Q	So I won't belabor that lead-up again. But the EIS
21		indicates that the applicants have stated that prior
22		to construction, if the spring with substantial if
23		a spring with substantial flow is identified on the
24		order route, the applicants state that they will make
25		every effort to adjust the structure locations and

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 140
1		construction access. Do you know what is meant by
2		substantial flow in that sentence?
3	A	No.
4	Q	Okay. Do you yourself have an opinion about whether
5		that would be something like two cubic feet per
6		second, more, less, anything?
7	A	No.
8	Q	So we don't really know what the applicants will
9		do how the applicants will assess the size of the
10		spring relative to making construction decisions?
11	A	No, don't know.
12	Q	They also the final EIS also indicates that if the
13		spring cannot be avoided, the applicants would
14		implement techniques to reduce surface exposure along
15		with mitigation steps to prevent destruction of the
16		flow of water from the spring, but also indicates
17		that details regarding the techniques and mitigation
18		strategies that would be implemented to minimize
19		impacts on unavoidable springs were not provided.
20		And that's provided to the Commission, correct?
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	Okay. Have you ever received that information?
23	A	We haven't received it and we did not issue a
24		follow-up data request.
25	Q	Do you have any concern about whether mitigation
		Poparting 1td (800) 800 7322

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 141
1		measures for springs would actually work?
2	A	No.
3	Q	You don't have any concerns?
4	A	You asked me if they would work.
5	Q	Okay. You don't think they would work?
6	A	No, you asked if I had any please repeat the
7		question.
8		(Requested question read by the reporter.)
9	A	Let me retract that. I heard a different question.
10	Q	It happens.
11	A	Not knowing what mitigation strategies would be used,
12		I have no way of knowing whether they would work.
13	Q	Okay. Do you know if any further follow-up will be
14		required with PSC or DNR on that issue beyond what
15		you heard from Mr. Callan this morning?
16	А	I don't think there will be.
17	Q	The final EIS mentions that the majority of or the
18		highest concentrations of springs on the routes, on
19		the proposed routes well, actually in Wisconsin is
20		on Segment O between the Town of Leon and the City of
21		Elroy; is that right?
22	А	Yes.
23	Q	Is that a factor you think should be considered in
24		making the routing decision?
25	A	I think it goes more to construction practices.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 142
1	Q	How so?
2	A	I think locating structures, talking with landowners,
3		having knowledge of the hydrology of the area, can go
4		a long way to avoid the impact in the first place.
5	Q	Do you think that that has been done to date?
6	A	No. I think it will depend on final engineering as
7		they don't have structure locations at this point and
8		it would require a Commission approval for them to do
9		final engineering.
10	Q	So are you saying that the location of springs should
11		be ascertained and then structure location decisions
12		be made after that?
13	A	I think they'll do final engineering and there will
14		be minor adjustments based on things that they find
15		in the field, and that's typical for most large
16		projects.
17	Q	Okay. So then do you think there should be an order
18		point for the applicants to assess the location of
19		springs in the field before making final structure
20		location decisions?
21	A	I don't know.
22	Q	Do you know of any other way that that would if
23		there were not an order point, would there be any
24		requirement for them to do that?
25	A	I don't know. I feel that it would be to their

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 143
1		benefit not to disrupt the spring because that
2		requires more dewatering and then DNR permits might
3		need to be adjusted for the dewatering. So I think
4		it is in their self-interest to avoid the springs.
5	Q	Okay. But other than that, there would be no
6	A	I don't
7	Q	There would be no requirement to your knowledge,
8		there might be an incentive in another way, but not a
9		requirement?
10	A	It depends on what the Commission orders.
11	Q	Okay. Would you also agree that if there is a route
12		that doesn't impact as many springs, then we won't
13		have as many of these issues?
14		MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection, "these issues,"
15		if you could clarify, please.
16	BY M	S. WESTERBERG:
17	Q	Structure location decisions, engineering,
18		dewatering, all the things you just mentioned.
19	A	There are issues on every project for every location;
20		and springs is just one of many, many subjects.
21	Q	Sure. I understand that. But if we could avoid this
22		concentration of springs in Segment O and find a
23		route without as many springs, at least that
24		particular issue will be somewhat minimized?
25	A	Sure.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 144
1	Q	Have you ever been involved in any discussions with
2		the applicants regarding routing options in the Fort
3		McCoy area?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	Okay. What well, can you describe those
6		discussions to me.
7	A	I think it was an issue that was brought up during
8		the pre-application as we asked for an explanation as
9		to how they arrived out of the original spaghetti
10		with the routes that were being potentially part of
11		the application. We continued with data requests
12		after the application came in.
13	Q	And have you listened to some of the testimony about
14		routing in that area throughout this week?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	And there was discussion about data request response
17		05.17?
18	A	Which one is I
19		MS. WESTERBERG: May I, Judge?
20		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Yes.
21		(Document tendered to the witness.)
22	A	Yes.
23	BY M	S. WESTERBERG:
24	Q	I just handed you at least the attachments to data
25		request response 05.17. Do you recall receiving that

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 145
1		information?
2	A	Yes.
3	Q	And do you recall reviewing the applicants'
4		explanation for the reasons they were limited in
5		their routing decisions in the Fort McCoy area let
6		me strike that.
7		Do you recall the applicants' explanation
8		of their perceived limitations in the Fort McCoy area
9		as described in that document?
10	A	Yes.
11	Q	Okay. Did you ever attempt to independently verify
12		with Fort McCoy the routing limitations as
13		represented by the applicants in their data request
14		response?
15	A	No.
16	Q	Did anybody else at the Commission do that?
17		MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection, lack of
18		foundation.
19		MS. WESTERBERG: I'm asking if she knows.
20	А	I don't know of anybody.
21	Q	And why did the PSC request an explanation PSC
22		staff request an explanation as to why routing
23		couldn't be accomplished through that area through a
24		data request?
25	A	Because we didn't know the answer.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 146
1	Q	What would the benefit have been to a routing
2		through that area have been in staff's view?
3	A	There was a lot of comments that were received where
4		people thought that the extending as far south as
5		they did and going through the Cashton area caused
6		important impacts. And as part of our review, we
7		often try to pull in other aspects of the spaghetti
8		if we think they have value that the Commission
9		should consider. So when in doubt, we ask the
10		question.
11	Q	And this was one of those situations clearly?
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	The final EIS contains many, many tables identifying
14		the impacts to wetlands and forests and other
15		features in terms of acreage.
16	A	Yes.
17	Q	Did the PSC staff attempt to independently well,
18		let me strike that.
19		Where is the source of those numbers in
20		those tables, the applicants' materials?
21	A	The I believe most of that information, but not
22		all, came directly from the applicants in their GIS
23		data that they submitted. Areas that were other
24		state departments' purview, such as Department of Ag.
25		for agriculture and DNR for wetlands and waterway

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 147
1		issues, we substitute our judgment for theirs. The
2		things that were tables that had to do with things we
3		could count and we looked at, in some instances we
4		put our own numbers in as opposed to the numbers
5		submitted by the applicants.
6	Q	Were forest impacts among those that you
7		independently inserted into the EIS, or were those in
8		reliance on the applicants' numbers?
9	A	That was relying on the applicants' and the GIS layer
10		could be clearly computated from the acreage shown on
11		that.
12		MS. SILVER KARSH: Just one quick
13		interruption for clarification. In your previous
14		answer to Ms. Westerberg's question, you said I
15		believe and we substitute our judgment for theirs.
16		Is that what you mean? Or do you mean we substitute
17		their judgment for ours in talking about DNR, DATCP
18		and DOT?
19		THE WITNESS: DNR's values were used in
20		areas of wetlands and waterways if they differed
21		from the application information. DATCP's values
22		were substituted for the applicants' where they had
23		the expertise.
24		MS. SILVER KARSH: Thank you for the
25		clarification. Sorry for the interruption.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 148
1		MS. WESTERBERG: No problem. That's all I
2		have. Thank you.
3		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Other cross?
4		MS. KUNZE: Your Honor.
5		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Before you start,
6		because it's connected to the last line of
7		questions, I was getting hungry when you were
8		speaking, could you explain what you mean by
9		spaghetti.
10		THE WITNESS: Marinara sauce.
11		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Not that.
12		THE WITNESS: Do you want me to answer?
13		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Yeah, because it's
14		confusing on the record.
15		THE WITNESS: Okay. That's a professional
16		term.
17		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Oh, it is?
18		THE WITNESS: Spaghetti is what we call
19		the original almost all possible routes that the
20		applicants usually go through before they start
21		winnowing it down to the fewer routes that are
22		presented in the application.
23		EXAMINER NEWMARK: When you pick another
24		strand out of the spaghetti like you said, it's
25		picking out one of the original routes that they
	Gramann	Reporting, Ltd. (800) 899-7222

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 149
1		were investigating.
2		THE WITNESS: Right.
3		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. And the other
4		one was, there was kind of a compound question once
5		where it talked about the springs and where that
6		Segment O had the most springs on the route. And I
7		think you answered it affirmatively, but also that
8		question included that it had the most springs in
9		Wisconsin. I don't know that you agreed to both of
10		those.
11		THE WITNESS: The information for the
12		springs came from the Wisconsin geological survey.
13		And, let's see, this is only to the project area,
14		not to Wisconsin.
15		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. So
16		THE WITNESS: We did not review beyond the
17		scope of the project area.
18		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay.
19	ву м	S. WESTERBERG:
20	Q	Then the line if I may clarify, a line in the EIS
21		then, it states on page 32 the area of Wisconsin with
22		the highest concentration of springs is in the
23		southwest, the Driftless Area. So that is what I was
24		referring to when I said in Wisconsin.
25	A	Okay. Sorry, it's a big document and it's been a

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 150
1		very long year.
2	Q	Understood.
3	A	Yeah, and that's cited too and that's yes.
4	Q	So you have no reason to dispute the accuracy of that
5		statement?
6	A	No, no, no. That statement from the geological
7		survey and their database.
8		EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Ms. Kunze.
9		Go ahead.
10		CROSS-EXAMINATION
11	BY M	S. KUNZE:
12	Q	Good afternoon, Ms. Weiss. I'm Laura Kunze,
13		self-representing. In your direct, page 2, you
14		testify that it was your responsibility to organize
15		and coordinate preparation of the Environmental
16		Impact Statement. I want to make sure that I'm
17		directing questions appropriately. Are the questions
18		regarding the airstrips and airports better addressed
19		to you or Ms. Zuelsdorff?
20	А	Kathy Zuelsdorff.
21	Q	Thank you. Is the ERF'd notice for the PSC meetings
22		after the release of the draft Environmental Impact
23		Statement part of the record?
24	А	I'm sorry, could you repeat the question.
25	Q	Sure. Is the ERF'd if that's a proper term in

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 151
1		this context.
2		EXAMINER NEWMARK: It is here.
3	BY M	S. KUNZE:
4	Q	Notice for the I've been using it, I just didn't
5		know if it was. Is the ERF'd notice for the PSC
6		meetings after the release of the draft EIS part of
7		the record?
8	A	I don't think so.
9	Q	Would you please explain the PSC's process for
10		selecting locations for the post-released draft EIS
11		meeting locations.
12	A	We didn't have any meetings. We had public hearings
13		and we had scoping meetings which were before the
14		draft to determine to get input from the public
15		for the draft EIS, we call those scoping meetings.
16		But we had no meetings after the draft EIS was
17		published.
18	Q	Would you explain, please, the PSC process for
19		selecting did you select how did you select
20		locations for other meetings?
21	A	What meetings are you referring to?
22	Q	The I think more the public outreaches.
23	A	The scoping meeting?
24	Q	Um-hmm.
25	A	We tried I tried to find places that were where

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 152
1		nobody was driving more than 30 minutes on highways.
2		We looked for places that had large enough venues to
3		support it and had WiFi for people to so computer
4		systems and mapping could be made could be
5		accessed out in the field. I tried to find places
6		that didn't cost the taxpayers too much money. That
7		was about it. The scoping meetings were I think
8		nobody was more than 30 minutes driving away to get
9		there.
10	Q	Thank you. Are the comments on the actually on
11		the DEIS, the draft Environmental Impact Statement
12		handled by the PSC? Comments regarding the draft.
13	A	Are they handled, yes, we receive them.
14	Q	And are they made available for public review?
15	A	Those that are ERF'd were ERF'd. I think people who
16		wrote in postal and sent them through the postal
17		mail, I don't think those were ERF'd. And e-mails
18		were not ERF'd. And phone calls were not ERF'd. We
19		receive comments in all formats.
20	Q	In Ms. Justus' rebuttal beginning on page 5, line 17,
21		she discusses undergrounding of the distribution line
22		that is under-built on the 138 kilovolt line in
23		Segment A. What are the anticipated impacts of this
24		undergrounding?
25	A	I'm not a construction engineer. But I can

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 153
1		understand that undergrounding a distribution line
2		has is a commonplace is not that unusual and
3		the impacts are minimal.
4	Q	Can you show me where this specifically is addressed
5		in the final EIS?
6	A	I think in the beginning. It is not something the
7		other thing is on this project, the movement of the
8		distribution lines would be handled by the local
9		electric distribution company and not by the
10		applicants. So it was not reviewed to the same
11		standard as the things that were applicant
12		responsibilities. I'm under the I believe that in
13		each chapter section, there is a section on
14		distribution lines.
15	Q	I believe the same.
16	A	The impacts and the method by which distribution
17		lines will be relocated is not discussed in the EIS,
18		either the draft or the final; but in the final there
19		is an accounting of those lines that would be slated
20		for relocation and but their location is not known
21		because that would be handled not by the applicants.
22	Q	So the impacts of undergrounding would not be
23		considered?
24	A	Of distribution lines.
25	Q	Okay. So EIS page 359, 11.3.4.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 154
1		MS. SILVER KARSH: On page?
2		MS. KUNZE: Page 359.
3		MS. SILVER KARSH: I don't think that's
4		the right page number.
5		MS. KUNZE: It's not?
6		THE WITNESS: Section 11.1.3 is the
7		electric distribution line.
8		MS. SILVER KARSH: 11.3.4 is public lands
9		and recreation on page 381.
10		MS. KUNZE: Right.
11	Q	And I'm I just wanted to get you there.
12	A	To which page?
13	Q	It's a known fact, it's stated and so in the
14		interest of time, you don't need to pull this up
15		unless you'd like to confirm it. It simply states
16		that, it's page 359, that no known recreational paths
17	:	are identified on Segment A.
18	A	Kathy Zuelsdorff is the one that wrote the public
19		land section.
20	Q	Okay. Thank you.
21		MS. SILVER KARSH: Just to clarify for the
22		record, it is page 381 that you're referring to.
23		MS. KUNZE: It is?
24		MS. SILVER KARSH: You're talking about
25		public lands and recreation.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 155
1		MS. KUNZE: Thank you.
2		MS. SILVER KARSH: You're welcome.
3	ВҮ М	S. KUNZE:
4	Q	And Ms. Weiss, I hope I haven't transposed lots of
5		numbers on here, it got late.
6	A	If you just give me the section topic, I'll find it.
7	Q	Perfect. So are you the proper person to talk about
8		residential property owners and visual impact?
9	A	No. That would be Kathy Zuelsdorff.
10	Q	Did you deal at all with the Public Service
11		Commission's use of appraisers on property value,
12		et cetera? Have you dealt with the PSC's employment
13		of appraisers to calculate property values? Was that
14		you or was that Ms
15	А	We don't have any appraisers, nor do we get involved
16		with the discussions, negotiations between utility
17		companies and private landholders. By "we," I mean
18		the Commission.
19	Q	Absolutely. So the EIS Section 4.5 11.2-4
20		addresses some property values within the EIS. Is
21		that something that Ms. Zuelsdorff would
22	A	I'm sorry, I'm confused about what you're looking at.
23	Q	It is Section 11.2-4
24	А	What is the header of the section?
25	Q	It will be I didn't write it down it will be

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 156
1		residential impacts if I had to guess.
2	A	Okay. And what's I don't think we talk about the
3		financial impact.
4		MS. SILVER KARSH: I believe it's 11.3.2.
5	A	Maybe share her EIS. That will help a lot.
6	BY M	S. KUNZE:
7	Q	Is Ms. Zuelsdorff going to be dealing with proximity
8		to potentially sensitive populations?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	Have you read public comments from residents in
11		Segment A?
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	Have the residents expressed concern about the
14		negative effect on property value?
15	А	Yes.
16	Q	How are public comments considered by the PSC?
17	A	We read them, we look for information that can help
18		describe impacts we're not aware of or new
19		information that would help make a more reasonable
20		route alternative.
21	Q	Has anyone informed you that they have been unable to
22		sell their homes in this area due namely to the
23		buyer's aversion to the proposed transmission line?
24	А	Yes.
25	Q	EIS page 355 indicates a deviation would place a

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 157
1		right-of-way about 10 feet and the centerline about
2		70 feet from the front of a home. So it is at the
3		bottom of that page still. And would you agree that
4		the this is a very close proximity to a high
5		voltage transmission line? Ten feet?
6	A	It is, ten feet, yes.
7	Q	And do you agree that this might significantly impact
8		this residence?
9	A	Transmission line will cause impacts, yes.
10	Q	How has the resident been made aware of this change
11		and the impact?
12	A	The everybody within we've done to the best of
13		our ability, sent letters out, the notice, and maps
14		for everybody within 300 feet of the proposed line
15		and anybody who has expressed an interest to be
16		included in our mailing list, providing phone numbers
17		of staff where they can talk to us, going out into
18		the public with ArcReader projects where they can see
19		their own property and the dimensions of the
20		right-of-way. That's how we've done we've done
21		everything through many media to allow them to know
22		who to contact to get more information.
23	Q	Would you have included the outreach to this
24		particular case when there is a deviation, has the
25		landowner been notified of

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 158
1	A	There hasn't been a deviation yet. It's one of the
2		options that has been discussed. Until the
3		Commission chooses a route, there is no deviation
4		that's been approved.
5	Q	Are you aware of I think something that is being
6		referred to as a deviation on Bronner Road? It
7		should be in here.
8	A	This was in response to a landowner if you're
9		talking about the property at the corners of Airport
10		and Bronner Road, this is a result of a comment from
11		a landowner who lived on the corner of Airport and
12		Bronner Road. He asked why is it then towards his
13		property and we asked that question of the
14		applicants.
15	Q	And the action taken was ?
16	А	We asked them to evaluate the reasons behind that
17		deviation. There's no action to be taken, only
18		analyze and supply information.
19	Q	Okay.
20		EXAMINER NEWMARK: What page of the EIS
21		was that?
22		THE WITNESS: 377, I believe. The map
23		the figure that is referred to is on page 378, shows
24	;	the location of the homes and the deviation from the
25		existing transmission line.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 159
1		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's just go ahead.
2		THE WITNESS: That the proposed route
3		would take of Segment A5 and A6a, subsegment.
4		EXAMINER NEWMARK: And off the record.
5		(Discussion off the record.)
6		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's get on the
7		record.
8	ву м	S. KUNZE:
9	Q	Would a question about diminution of property also be
10		best addressed to Ms. Zuelsdorff?
11	A	Sure.
12	Q	Or would you be able to answer something like that?
13		Let me ask the question
14		MS. ZUELSDORFF: I knew you were going to
15		say that.
16	BY M	S. KUNZE:
17	Q	Let me ask you a question and you tell me if it
18		pertains to you. Did the PSC obtain a diminution
19		appraisal for any property or properties in preparing
20		the Environmental Impact Statement?
21	А	No, it's not something we review.
22	Q	The EIS cites a report by the EPRI. Is EPRI a real
23		property expert?
24	A	I'm sorry, what?
25	Q	There is it cites a report by E-P-R-I. Is that a

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 10	50
1		property expert or is it an electric industry entity?	
2	A	It's EPRI.	
3	Q	Thank you. It's EPRI.	
4		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's go off the	
5		record.	
6		(Discussion off the record.)	
7		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Back on the record.	
8	BY M	S. KUNZE:	
9	Q	So based on your work on this project, how will the	ľ
10		property value aesthetic impact and other impacts	
11		raised by the EIS be mitigated?	
12	A	Not everything can be mitigated. Building a big	
13		project like this, there will be impacts.	
14	Q	Meaning	
15	A	Somebody will experience impacts somewhere somehow in	
16		some value. I think I can go on the record and say	
17		that.	
18	Q	By impact, do you mean losses that cannot be	
19		recovered?	
20	A	I mean impacts, whether it's it can be any number	
21		of different way everybody defines impacts	
22		differently, and there will be impacts.	
23	Q	Are you meaning that impacts are not always	
24		compensable?	
25	A	Yes.	

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 161
1		MS. KUNZE: Thank you. No further
2		questions, Your Honor.
3		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Other cross? Go
4		ahead.
5		REDIRECT EXAMINATION
6	BY M	S. SILVER KARSH:
7	Q	I just have a couple quick questions for you.
8		Earlier Mr. Oliveira was asking you questions about
9		socioeconomic factors.
10	A	Yes.
11	Q	And would you be able to tell me, where is
12		socioeconomic factors such as effects on tourism or
13		property values discussed in the EIS?
14	А	They are discussed in a general way. It's the study
15		that no specific study was done on any particular
16		location.
17	Q	And there were no monetary values assigned to those?
18	А	No.
19		MS. SILVER KARSH: Thank you. I have no
20		further questions.
21		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Thank you, ma'am.
22		You're excused.
23		(Witness excused.)
24		
25		
1		

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 162
1		MS. SILVER KARSH: I'd like to call Kathy
2		Zuelsdorff to the stand.
3		KATHLEEN ZUELSDORFF, STAFF WITNESS, DULY SWORN
4		DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	BY M	S. SILVER KARSH:
6	Q	Good afternoon. Would you please state your name for
7		the record.
8	A	It's Kathleen Zuelsdorff.
9	Q	And what is your position at the Commission?
10	A	I am an environmental analyst in the gas and energy
11		division, and I am also the WEPA coordinator for the
12		agency.
13	Q	And did you submit direct, rebuttal and surrebuttal
14		testimony and five exhibits?
15	A	Yes, I did.
16	Q	And you also filed an errata sheet and uploaded that
17		to ERF this morning; is that correct?
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	If I were to ask you the same questions today on the
20		stand, would your answers be the same as they are in
21		your testimony?
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	And is all the information in your exhibits true and
24		correct to the best of your knowledge?
25	А	Yes.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 163
1		MS. SILVER KARSH: I have no additional
2		questions. Ms. Zuelsdorff is available for
3		cross-examination.
4		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Questions?
5		MR. POTTS: Sorry, we need to object to
6		the errata that Ms. Zuelsdorff is filing because we
7		think it will make the testimony confusing and we
8		would rather do it on cross-examination because
9		our the applicants' rebuttal responds to the MRA
10		assertion, and so we would need to somehow correct
11		our testimony and we think it would be a lot easier
12		to just not do it via errata and just do it on the
13		stand.
14		MS. SILVER KARSH: Why don't I just ask
15		her that.
16		MR. POTTS: That's fine.
17	BY M	S. SILVER KARSH:
18	Q	Ms. Zuelsdorff, would you please clarify your
19		surrebuttal testimony when you were discussing a
20		change by use of a minor route modification process
21		or MRA.
22	А	Yes. I think it's in my surrebuttal testimony on
23		page 4, lines 19 through 21, and I refer to a
24		possible alternative alignment that needs further
25		investigation. It was raised at the public hearings

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 164
1		in Warrens, and so we took that information in and I
2		included it in my testimony. It needs further
3		investigation because it's it involves new
4		landowners and potentially new impacts that are not
5		discussed in EIS. And so if that alternative
6		alignment is found to be reasonable and possibly
7		superior to the existing alignment, it would actually
8		require reopening the docket to have that segment
9		approved.
10	Q	And I believe you had one additional clarification to
11		make to your surrebuttal. I believe it's on page 8,
12		lines 4 through 5, where you refer to a Federal
13		Highway Administration document.
14	A	Yes. It's actually a book that was written by two
15		engineers at Purdue for transportation decision
16		making.
17		MS. SILVER KARSH: Thank you. Now the
18		witness is available for cross-examination.
19		MR. OLIVEIRA: I have one question, Your
20		Honor.
21		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Let's just go
22		off the record for a minute.
23		(Discussion off the record.)
24		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Any cross?
25		MR. POTTS: We don't have any cross.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 165
1		MR. OLIVEIRA: I have one question.
2		CROSS-EXAMINATION
3	BY M	R. OLIVEIRA:
4	Q	For the record, Marcel Oliveira, CETF and SOUL.
5		Ms. Weiss testified that a project of this magnitude
6		will invariably cause impacts. Would you agree that
7		the purpose of an EIS is to identify as many of those
8		as possible?
9	A	Yes.
10		MR. OLIVEIRA: No further questions.
11		EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Redirect?
12		Oh, I'm sorry. Right. I forgot.
13		CROSS-EXAMINATION
14	BY M	S. KUNZE:
15	Q	Good afternoon, Ms. Zuelsdorff.
16	A	Good afternoon.
17	Q	Laura Kunze, self-representing. To what extent did
18		your drafting of the EIS rely on the agricultural
19		impact statement?
20	A	Not really not to any extent. I did not draft
21		that section.
22	Q	In your direct testimony, page 2, lines 6 through 7,
23		you state that you were responsible for drafting
24		sections of the EIS regarding, among other subjects,
25		airports and airstrips.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 166
1	A	Yes.
2	Q	Have you reviewed the notice of hazard communications
3		from the FAA contained in the application Appendix H?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	Would you agree that there are over 1,300 pages of
6		FAA communications in that appendix?
7	A	Yes.
8	Q	Is this a normal amount of notices or is this a
9		significant number of notices and issues raised?
10	A	I'm afraid I can't answer that question. This is a
11		very lengthy project and there are a number of small
12		airports and several larger airports along the
13		project, and so I guess I'm not surprised that there
14		are a number of determinations by the FAA.
15	Q	The final EIS Appendix 11.3.5, airports and
16		airstrips, did not reference Appendix H nor did it
17		address the impacts on the airport if mitigation was
18		necessary based on the issues raised in the notice of
19		hazard. Will the PSC correct this?
20	A	Can I turn to 11
21	Q	Absolutely.
22		MS. WEISS: Page 382.
23		MS. KUNZE: Thank you.
24	A	We did not reference Appendix H because it's a very
25		lengthy and sort of complicated appendices. So

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 167
1		basically I took a lot of the wording that was
2		actually in the applicants' text part of their
3		application, the technical support document, and then
4		some verbiage off of the FAA's sheet in Appendix H
5		and just used the wording in this section. I am not
6		an expert in airports and airstrips.
7	Q	Okay. If we could refer to PSC reference 226545
8		which I can hand to you. Are you familiar with my
9		data request to the PSC with regard to Morey Field in
10		Middleton?
11	A	I guess not specifically.
12	Q	Do you remember our conversation about it?
13	A	I remember speaking with you on the phone, yes.
14	Q	Have you seen PSC reference number 266545, it's Howe
15		Exhibit 1 I believe it is. Is it appropriate now,
16		Judge, to discuss those issues raised in that
17		discovery request?
18		EXAMINER NEWMARK: I guess so. I mean, I
19		don't know where you're going exactly.
20	A	I would need a copy of that document or information.
21	BY M	S. KUNZE:
22	Q	I can simply ask you the question because I can't
23		find it.
24		(Document tendered to the witness.)
25		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's go off the

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 168
1		record.
2		(Discussion off the record.)
3		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's get back on the
4		record.
5	BY M	S. KUNZE:
6	Q	So in this document actually, Judge, it was on
7		Wednesday I believe now. In this document, I've
8		asked to provide topographical study as to Segment A
9		as it pertains the height limitation ordinance for
10		Morey Field due to the FAA's expression of concern
11		for this area. Has a topographical study been
12		conducted for this area of the project?
13	A	To my knowledge, it has not. Could I clarify, are
14		you talking about with respect to placement of
15		transmission line structures?
16	Q	Within specifically a height limitation ordinance
17		zone.
18	A	I don't believe the applicants have completed a
19		topographical study within that airport limitation
20		zone.
21	Q	The FAA expressed concern about the instrumentation
22		and low flight. What will the PSC do to understand
23		the potential recommendations by the FAA?
24		MS. SILVER KARSH: I'd like to object. I
25		think those might be questions better asked of the
		Penarting 1td (800) 800-7222

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 169
1		applicants because they will be the ones to comply
2		with FAA regulations or have discussions about what
3		mitigations need to be conducted. I don't believe
4		that's Ms. Zuelsdorff's expertise.
5		MS. KUNZE: Fair enough. I'll explain how
6		it pertains to where I'm going, if that's okay.
7	Q	So it is stated that the FAA has had some concerns,
8		and the EIS goes on to explain that those concerns by
9		the FAA will be allayed through studies conducted by
10		the applicant when the route is chosen. The concern
11		here is that might the FAA require a variance or
12		lighting or markings because this location Segment A
13		is within is 1.8 miles into this three-mile
14		limitation zone?
15	A	It's possible.
16	Q	And might those recommendations affect the
17		environment with lighting, markings, different pole
18		structure affect the environment in the Segment A?
19	A	Yes, it's possible it would.
20	Q	So therefore to provide a more thorough analysis of
21		the impact of that area, should we not investigate
22		what the FAA might stipulate for that area?
23	A	I believe the hazard sheets mention structure height
24		limitations or lighting as possible mitigation
25		measures.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 170
1	Q	And would possible lighting and other mitigation
2		measures differently affect the environment of that
3		area other than what's been detailed in this report
4		for Segment A?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	Were you here for Mr. Lorenz's testimony the other
7		day?
8	A	I listened to most of it, I believe.
9	Q	Did you hear that he had mentioned that there are
10		poles near Morey Field currently for transmission
11		lines?
12	A	Yes. I know there are.
13	Q	Do you remember how tall those poles were around the
14		airport, Morey Field?
15	A	No, I do not.
16	Q	I believe he said the poles were 65 feet. But the
17		objective was to point out that lighting isn't always
18		required, that sometimes other measures are required,
19		and this one was a height requirement. Are these
20		65-foot poles and something of this structure listed
21		in Appendix A as a possible pole structure for
22		Segment A or for any of this project?
23	A	I wouldn't know without consulting Appendix A.
24	Q	The presence of a transmission line changes then the
25		inherent and continued operation at Morey Field.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 171
1		There are mitigation impacts and impacts not subject
2		to mitigation that can alter the use and character of
3		the airport. Where in the EIS are these potential
4		impacts considered?
5	A	I guess I don't understand the question. I don't
6		know if the statement you read, where that came
7		from.
8	Q	I guess in speaking to well, even just listening
9		and speaking to the Department of Transportation,
10		aeronautic engineer, I can represent that I had that
11		conversation and it's not uncommon for a variance to
12		be filed
13		MR. POTTS: I guess I'm going to object to
14		that. I think we've been over this before.
15		Ms. Kunze can't introduce technical evidence from
16		someone she talked to that we can't cross-examine.
17		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Sustained.
18	BY M	S. KUNZE:
19	Q	Hypothetically could a variance be filed to mitigate
20		the pole issue such that the flight approach and
21		departure of aircraft would be changed, made safer?
22	A	It's possible.
23	Q	And might that change affect potentially pilots who
24		desire to use that airport?
25	A	It's possible.
	L	

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 172
1	Q	If they choose not to use that airport, could that
2		not affect the business at Morey Field, a/k/a
3		Middleton Municipal Airport?
4	A	It could.
5	Q	Were those impacts on business considered and
6		analyzed in the EIS?
7	A	No, they were not.
8	Q	Give me a moment, please, to figure out where I'm at.
9	A	Sure.
10	Q	If we can switch to page 381 in the Environmental
11		Impact Statement. It states that no known
12		recreational paths are identified on Segment A.
13	A	Yes.
14	Q	I don't know if you were here earlier, are you
15		familiar with an exhibit that was distributed
16		yesterday which detailed a DNR-coordinated
17		conservation area and nature segment in Segment A?
18	A	I'm not aware of that from yesterday.
19		MS. KUNZE: Should I distribute that or do
20		we rely on future reference to that document, Judge?
21		I don't know how to proceed.
22		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Well, I can show you
23		your Exhibit 2. This is what you're talking about,
24		right?
25		MS. KUNZE: Um-hmm. Thank you.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 173
1		EXAMINER NEWMARK: That's got the
2		reference in it.
3		(Document tendered to the witness.)
4	BY M	S. KUNZE:
5	Q	It for all intents and purposes detailed that the DNR
6		was involved in coordinating a prairie conservation
7		segment within the subdivision. Was that included in
8		the Environmental Impact Statement?
9	A	No, it was not. But we actually rely on local
10		landowners to inform us of smaller properties that
11		may be being specially managed. I don't know if this
12		information came in prior to the drafting of the EIS
13		or if this is the first time that this information
14		has been brought forward, but we rely on local
15		landowners to provide information such as this as
16		early in the process as possible.
17		(Discussion off the record.)
18	Q	How do you express that information then from the
19		you're relying on people to come to you. How would
20		residents know that they are supposed to come to you
21		for this type of information?
22	A	We send a number of mailings. We had we send
23		EXAMINER NEWMARK: This has been covered,
24		our public participation process.
25	A	Through our public participation process. We sent
	.	Poporting 1td (200) 200-7222

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 174
1		letters to everybody regarding the public scoping
2		meetings. We were at the meetings, basically trying
3		to interact with local landowners. And then after
4		the draft EIS was presented and published, again, we
5		solicited another letter telling people that it was
6		available and requesting comments on the draft EIS to
7		clarify or tell us of any incompletenesses or so,
8		and then the final EIS. So we try to communicate
9	:	with the public at several opportunities and then we
10		also hold the public hearings.
11	BY M	S. KUNZE:
12	Q	Are you aware of the many public comments stating
13		from the residents in that area stating that the
14		residents in the neighborhood used the path and the
15		road along Bronner and Koch as a regularly traveled
16		jogging and walking and biking path?
17		MR. POTTS: Objection, can you point to
18		the specific comments you're talking about?
19		MS. KUNZE: Do I have to
20		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Just let's let the
21		question stand. I'm sure there are some.
22		MS. KUNZE: Several.
23	A	I mean, I remember many comments about people
24		walking, hiking, pushing strollers and biking on
25		Bronner Road in that area.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 175
1	Q	Thank you. Are you aware that these residents
2		expressed specific health and other concerns related
3		to walking, biking, jogging, directly under the
4		proposed line?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	EIS page 380 states that residential property owners
7		will experience the greatest visual impact associated
8		with the new transmission line on Segment A. But the
9		presence of existing transmission lines in the
10		immediate area mitigate this adverse impact to some
11		extent. How have you arrived at that conclusion?
12	A	Because there is an existing transmission line there,
13		they are used to seeing the poles and the conductors
14		and some semblance of cleared right-of-way beneath
15		the line. Whereas on a brand new right-of-way, it
16		would be this would be a it's viewed as an
17		incremental impact rather than constructing a
18		transmission line on a brand new right-of-way which
19		would be a new impact.
20	Q	Have the public comments you have read on that topic
21		indicated that they would be used to and accepting of
22		seeing the high voltage lines in place of the 138
23		kilovolt lines?
24	A	No.
25	Q	Same question in reference to the double circuiting
	L	

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 176
1		of the existing 138 kilovolt with the proposed 345.
2		While taller and more visible on the landscape, the
3		straighter alignment and relocation farther away from
4		the homes would improve the overall aesthetic
5		experience of these homeowners. Is that something
6		they determined, that it would improve their overall
7		experience?
8	A	I said it could improve the overall experience.
9		Because the 138 jogs off of a line and goes west and
10		then south and then back east again, I assumed that a
11		straighter line could improve the aesthetics of the
12		area.
13	Q	Might you also agree conversely that the replacement
14		of a lower voltage, lower visibility, lower impact
15		138 kV line is very different than that of a much
16		larger, much more obtrusive 345 kV line that hums and
17		crackles, will there be a difference?
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	Have the other comments you've read indicated an
20		acceptance and approval of the high voltage 345
21		replacement?
22	A	No.
23	Q	How are property owners compensated for their loss or
24		potential loss of property value?
25	A	That's through an appraisal and easement process that

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 177
1		the utility conducts with the affected landowner. So
2		I'm not directly involved in that process and I'm not
3		informed on all aspects of that acquisition process.
4	Q	Are there times when the differences in property
5		value cannot be, hypothetically, appropriately
6		mitigated or compensated?
7	A	Yes.
8		MS. SILVER KARSH: I'm going to object
9		because I think that again is out of
10		Ms. Zuelsdorff's area.
11	BY M	S. KUNZE:
12	Q	Overall, Ms. Zuelsdorff, your analysis and your
13		thorough reading of public input, would you say that
14	2 - -	the residents, the densely populated, more densely
15		populated area have welcomed the opportunity of this
16		345 kilovolt line?
17	А	No, they did not.
18	Q	Would you say they are very much against the proposed
19		Badger Coulee line in Segment A in their highly
20	i	densely populated area?
21	А	Yes.
22		MS. KUNZE: Thank you. I have no further
23		questions, Your Honor.
24		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Redirect.
25		REDIRECT EXAMINATION

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 178
1	BY M	S. SILVER KARSH:
2	Q	Just a question or two. How did the impacts differ
3		between Segments A and B?
4	A	The two segments are quite different. Segment A
5		mostly follows an existing transmission line
6		right-of-way. It's more densely populated than
7		Segment B. But there are actually fewer homes within
8		300 feet of the centerline. The line would likely be
9		more visible to more people on Segment A versus
10		Segment B. But there are more homes within close
11		proximity to the line on Segment B and Segment B
12		would be mostly new right-of-way that would be cut
13		through hilly topography and through a mostly wooded
14		landscape. There are very clear differences between
15		the segments and the EIS is just trying to present
16		those differences.
17	Q	So you wouldn't say that one has necessarily greater
18		impacts than another, their impacts are different?
19	A	Their impacts are very different, right.
20		MS. SILVER KARSH: I don't have any
21		further questions.
22		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Okay. Thank you,
23		ma'am. You're excused.
24		(Witness excused.)
25		EXAMINER NEWMARK: All right. Yes.

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Pa	ge 179
1		MR. POTTS: I have an administrative item.	
2		The prehearing conference memo requires all of us to	
3		file within three days of receiving the transcript	
4		corrections. Could we change that to five days	
5		after the hearing?	
6		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Yes. You beat me to	
7		that.	
8		MR. POTTS: Because some of them have	
9		already come in.	
10		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Right.	
11		(Discussion off the record.)	
12		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's put that on the	
13		record. We'll change the deadline for transcript	
14		corrections to three days after the last transcript	
15		is served on the parties. Let's go off the record.	
16		(Discussion off the record.)	
17		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's get on the	
18		record. Let's say if there is a request for	
19		expanding the reply brief page limits from 30 pages,	
20		that the response to that motion would be two	
21		business days, okay, and then do we need reply to	
22		the motion as well? Let's make that one day if you	
23		need to reply. Okay. And if you want to speed up	
24		that process, just get the brief in earlier so we	
25		know what your take is on that.	

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11 Page 180
1		MR. POTTS: We can assume under the
2		prehearing conference memo if no one responds within
3		two days then it's granted?
4		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Then it's granted,
5		yeah. Well, I'll okay, yeah, if I don't
6		Let's go off the record.
7		(Discussion off the record.)
8		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let me say on the
9		record we'll deal with whether we'll deal with
10		granting that motion when it comes. So it won't be
11		automatically granted.
12		MS. JACKSON: Your Honor, I'm Amanda
13		Jackson for the City of Onalaska. I had some
14		transportation issues on the first day and I didn't
15		get my appearance entered.
16		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's go off the
17		record.
18		(Discussion off the record.)
19		EXAMINER NEWMARK: Let's get on the
20		record. Thanks, everybody, for your participation
21		and your patience and the hard work. I appreciate
22		it. I think the record has benefitted greatly. So
23		we'll look forward to seeing your briefs.
24		(The hearing adjourned at 3:00 p.m.)
25		

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11	Page 181
1	STATE OF	WISCONSIN)	
2	MILWAUKE	E COUNTY)	
3			
4		We, JENNIFER M. STEIDTMANN, RPR, CRR, an	d LYNN
5	M. BAYER,	, RMR, CM, Reporters with the firm of Grama	nn
6	Reporting	g Company, 740 North Plankinton, Suite 400,	
7	Milwaukee	e, Wisconsin, do hereby certify that we rep	orted
8	the fore	going proceedings, and that the same is tru	e and
9	correct i	in accordance with our original machine sho	rthand
10	notes.		
11	DATED THI	IS 12th DAY OF January, 2015.	
12			
13	Cr	nogel Steedt -	
14			
15	JENNIFER	M. STEIDTMANN, RPR, CRR	
16		mm Bayer	1996ave
17	Lu	MM BAYER, RPR, CM	
18		UNN M. BAYER	\¤i
19	LYNN PEPE	PEY BAYER, RPR, CM	SU-
20		A CONTRACTOR OF CONTRACTOR	*
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

	1/9/2015 Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11	Page 182
1	INDEX	
2	WITNESS EXAMINATION	PAGE
3	ALICE HALPIN, WDATCP WITNESS	
4	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. LORENCE	9
5	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. KUNZE	10
6	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. WESTERBERG	32
7	ROBERT FASICK, WISDOT WITNESS	
8	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. LORENCE	34
9	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WILL	35
10	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. WESTERBERG	37
11	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. KUNZE	40
12	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WILL	44
13	TERENCE HENN, APPLICANT WITNESS	
14	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. WILL	47
15	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. WESTERBERG	48
16	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. LORENCE	50
17	BENJAMIN CALLAN, WDNR WITNESS	
18	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL	52
19	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. POTTS	54
20	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. WESTERBERG	55
21	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL	71
22	RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. POTTS	74
23	RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. WESTERBERG	76
24	STACY ROWE, WDNR WITNESS	
25	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL	78

	1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11		Page 183
1	CROSS-EXAMI	NATION BY MS. WESTERBERG	79	
2	REDIRECT EX	AMINATION BY MS. CORRELL	85	
3	YOYI STEELE, WDN	R WITNESS		
4	DIRECT EXAM	INATION BY MS. CORRELL	87	
5	CROSS-EXAMI	NATION BY MR. POTTS	99	
6	CROSS-EXAMI	NATION BY MS. KUNZE	103	
7	CROSS-EXAMI	NATION BY MS. WESTERBERG	105	
8	RECROSS-EXA	MINATION BY MR. POTTS	109	
9	REDIRECT EX	AMINATION BY MS. CORRELL	111	
10	DONALD G. NEUMEY	ER, STAFF WITNESS, DULY SWORN		
11	DIRECT EXAM	INATION BY MR. LORENCE	114	
12	CROSS-EXAMI	NATION BY MS. AGRIMONTI	116	
13	CROSS-EXAMI	NATION BY MR. JABLONSKI	116	
14	PAUL RAHN, STAFF	WITNESS, DULY SWORN		
15	DIRECT EXAM	INATION BY MS. SILVER KARSH	120	
16	CROSS-EXAMI	NATION BY MS. KUNZE	120	
17	MARILYN WEISS, S'	TAFF WITNESS, DULY SWORN		
18	DIRECT EXAM	INATION BY MS. SILVER KARSH	131	
19	CROSS-EXAMI	NATION BY MR. OLIVEIRA	132	
20	CROSS-EXAMI	NATION BY MS. WESTERBERG	139	
21	CROSS-EXAMI	NATION BY MS. KUNZE	150	
22	REDIRECT EX	AMINATION BY MS. SILVER KARSH	161	
23	KATHLEEN ZUELSDO	RFF, STAFF WITNESS, DULY SWORN		
24	DIRECT EXAM	INATION BY MS. SILVER KARSH	162	
25	CROSS-EXAMI	NATION BY MR. OLIVEIRA	165	
l	Gramann Benarting Itd		(900) 6	

	1/9/2015 Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11	Page 184
1	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. KUNZE	165
2	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. SILVER KARSH	1.77
3		
4	* * * *	
5		
6	EXHIBITS	
7	DESCRIPTION MARKED	ADMITTED
8	Halpin 2 13	32
9	Weiss 3 - designated for delayed receipt	132
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11		Page 1
WORD INDEX	160 122:2	176:1, 16, 20 177:16	<7>
	161 118:7, <i>11</i> 183:22	345s 118: <i>12</i>	7 28:2 55:16 165:22
< \$ >	162 183:24	35 182:9	70 61:5, 9, 20 62:6
\$1,000 18: <i>3</i>	165 183:25 184:1	35.5 27:18	157:2
41,000 10.5	17 152:20	354 3:15	71 182:21
< 0 >	17 132.20	355 156:25	74 182:22
01.52 89:6 90:2, 11	18 65:24, 25		
01.520 90: <i>3</i>		359 153:25 154:2, 16	740 181:6
	1801 4:5	360-something 121:7	750 4:6
05.17 144:17, 25	180-mile 122:2	362 123: <i>1</i> 125:25 126:3	76 182:23
	182.017 28: <i>1</i>	364 121:8	7628 3:18
<1>	184 1:21	37 182:10	777 2:5
1 1:21 6:23, 24 7:1, 17	19 53: <i>3</i> 163:2 <i>3</i>	377 158:22	78 182:25
11:11 13:6 95:5 167:15		378 158:2 <i>3</i>	79 183: <i>1</i>
1,300 166:5	< 2 >	38.6 27:18	7921 4: <i>16</i>
1.52 89:7, 21	2 1:23 10:10 13:7, 11,	380 175:6	
1.52-9 92:8, <i>12</i> , <i>16</i>	12 31:20, 22 58:17	381 154:9, 22 172:10	< 8 >
1.8 169: <i>13</i>	89:4, 10, 11, 12, 14, 21	382 166:22	8 59:22 164:11
10 10:10 31:10 52:20,	90:10 92:7 122:4		80 2:10 105:22
21 53:21 105:22	132:17, 18 150:13	<4>	801 3:2 <i>3</i>
131:19 132:19 157:1	165:22 172:23 184:8	4 41:8, 15 131:18	81 127: <i>13</i>
182:5	200006 4:6	132:17, 18 163:23	85 93:18, 22 94:22
101 4:15	2006 99:11	164:12	101:23 102:8 183:2
103 183:6	201 4:20		
105 183:7		4.5 155:19	85-foot 95:24
	2011 81: <i>15</i>	40 182:11	87 183:4
109 183:8	201143 88:22, 24	400 181:6	8-B 31:10
10th 4:20	201149 88:14, 17	407 2:16	8th 2:10
11 1: <i>12</i> 53: <i>3</i> 65: <i>25</i>	2012 99:8	414 1: <i>17</i>	
121:6 131:19 132:19	2015 1:21 96:6 181:11	419 3:5	<9>
166:20	21 163:23	44 182: <i>12</i>	9 1:21 52:20 58:17
11.1.2 123:9	210 3:5	47 182: <i>14</i>	92:11 182:4
11.1.3 154:6	211 2:20	48 182: <i>15</i>	9:30 1:23 6:1
11.1.3.1 124:14	216 60:8, 9, 12 61:1		90 43: <i>16</i> 47:8
11.1-1 121:3	22 53: <i>3</i>	<5>	900 4:10
11.1-2 123:20, 22	2200 2:10	5 11:11 56:5, 10, 11	99 183:5
11.2.1.1 123: <i>1</i> 125:20,	222 3:10	84:16 90:4, 11 96:6	<i>· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · </i>
24	226545 167:7	152:20 164:12	< A >
11.2-4 155:19, 23	229099 96:7, 19	50 182: <i>16</i>	a.m 1:23 6:1
11.3.2 156:4	229437 131:16	50 132:10 52 182:18	A5 159:3
11.3.4 129:15 153:25	23 10:11		
		53 35:14 36:1 41:20	A6a 159:3
154:8	24 95:6	45:17	abilities 104:25
11.3.5 166:15	25 3:23	53202-5306 2:6	ability 85:21 157:13
111 183:9	266545 167:14	53562 3:19	able 14:13 36:4 40:25
114 183: <i>11</i>	272-7878 1:17	53703 2:16, 21, 25 3:11,	100:10 159:12 161:11
116 183: <i>12</i> , <i>13</i>	29.7 123:5	15, 24 4:11	Absolutely 64:12 69:23
12 31:10 41:8, 16 53:13		53705 3:6	74:20 106:8 155:19
120 183: <i>15</i> , <i>16</i>	<3>	53707 4:16	166:2 <i>1</i>
120-foot 14:3	3 1:23 11:11 21:10	54 182: <i>19</i>	acceptable 6:15 35:23
122 4:10	27:3, 24 82:9 87:18	54601 4:21	42:4
12th 181://	92:10 96:13 132:10, 13	55 182:20	acceptance 176:20
13 53: <i>13</i> , 20, 21 184:8	184:9	55402 2:11	accepting 175:21
131 2:25 183:18	3,000 18:4, 5	58 16: <i>1</i>	access 15:2 20:25 70:1,
132 183:19 184:9	3:00 180:24	59 16: <i>1</i>	8, 15 123:9, 12, 14, 15, 18
138 122:6 124:13	30 56:22 57:5, 6, 20, 23	5-CE-142 1:6	140:1
152:22 175:22 176:1, 9,	152:1,8 179:19		accessed 152:5
15	300 157: <i>14</i> 178:8	< 6 >	accident 49:9, 13, 14, 20,
139 183:20	304 2:25	6 87:18 131:19 165:22	22
14 3:11 41:9, 16 79:19	32 66:25 139:15	61.9 27:18	
87:19	149:21 182:6 184:8		accommodate 55:6
		62.1 123:2	accomplish 24:20
140,000 7:6	320 2:21	65 170:16 65 feat 170:20	accomplished 145:23
15 95:5	33 2:23	65-foot 170:20	account 11:16, 24 18:7
150 183:21	34 182:8	66 21: <i>12</i> 23: <i>17</i>	71:25 117:23 135:4
16 53: <i>13</i>	345 1:6 118:8 122:7		accounted 21:19 22:19,
	ļ		

1/9/2015		eaings, volume 11	Page 2
21	affect 14:3 16:7 32:17	07.04 00.4 00.12 10	Annondin 27.24 21.0
21		27:24 28:4 30:13, 19	Appendix 27:24 31:9
accounting 22:12 153:19	60:2 <i>1</i> 126:20 169: <i>16</i> ,	31:6 124:25 125:4,8	166:3, 6, 15, 16, 24
accuracy 150:4	18 170:2 171:23 172:2	ALICE 9:1,6 182:3	167:4 170:21, 23
acquired 10:21	affidavits 113:9	alignment 42:5 99:25	applicable 135:1
acquiring 53:6, 15, 23	affirmatively 149:7	100:10 101:4, 24	applicant 17:16 47:1
acquisition 10:22, 22	afraid 166:10	163:24 164:6, 7 176:3	55:4 71:19 84:18
177:3	afternoon 103:11, 12	allayed 169:9	153:11 169:10 182:13
acquisitions 11:20, 22	120:6 121:7 131:6	allow 82:12, 18 157:21	
			applicants 6:14, 14 12:6
acreage 21:22 22:13, 24	133:2 139:14 150:12	allowable 115:18	14:21 16:24 17:7
23:11, 13 122:20	162:6 165: <i>15</i> , <i>16</i>	allowed 82:6 83:1,7	25:14 26:7,9 28:16
124:25 146:15 147:10	Ag 19:12 24:19 27:25	alter 171:2	29:4 32:9 35:22 36:1,
acres 10:20, 23 11:25	30:18 125:6 146:24	alternative 35:21 36:22	4, 10, 22 41:25 44:25
12:5 23:20 27:22	agencies 71:21	37:1 156:20 163:24	47:6 49:5 53:8, 17, 25
122:8, 18, 18 123:5	AGENCY 4:3 8:5	164:5	54:16 55:6, 14, 18 56:2,
acronym 68:21 69:2	17:17 32:8 72:11	Alternatives 92:9	14 57:14 59:2, 14 60:9
action 158:15, 17	82:15 162:12	121:15, 22	69:10 71:19 72:11
	ago 100:4		
activities 81:21 83:11		Amanda 4:19 180:12	74:19, 21, 25 75:14, 18
84:9	agree 12:13, 16 15:15	AMERICAN 1:4 54:12	78:21 84:19, 22 85:1
actual 17:11 24:4	27:7, 12, 16, 21 29:7	74:12 99:23 115:6	88:8 91:4 102: <i>3</i>
add 6:15, 16 25:11	32:15, 25 33:3 51:6	amount 66:12 166:8	107:11, 17 108:4
33:9 34:23 45:11 54:3	62:21 64:10 66:16	AMP 101:20 127:15	109:13, 22 110:6, 13, 18
87:16	67:6, 10, 16 78:23	amperage 127:18	125:21 131:23 139:21,
added 6:10 21:13	103:16, 19, 23 104:3, 16	amplify 51:10	24 140:8, 9, 13 142:18
addition 19:3 93:15	108:6, 8 122:3 123:13	analyses 138:2	144:2 145:3, 7, 13
additional 15:16 56:23	125:3 127:5 128:3	analysis 12:14 19:20	146:20, 22 147:5, 8, 9,
61: <i>16</i> , <i>19</i> 73: <i>11</i> 78:2 <i>1</i>			
	133:5, 10, 18 135:2, 17,	24:7 29:8, 10 46:14	22 148:20 153:10, 21
88:5 122:3, 18 137:8	<i>18</i> 143: <i>11</i> 157: <i>3</i> , 7	47:11, 12 115:10	158:14 163:9 167:2
138:18 163:1 164:10	165:6 166:5 176: <i>13</i>	117:10, 18 118:1, 2, 20,	168:18 169:1
additions 52:18	agreed 149:9	20 127:21 134:7	APPLICATION 1:4
address 19:9 21:12	agreement 7:12 98:13	169:20 177:12	13:14, 16 31:9 63:15
23:17 47:6 60:23	Agricultural 9:8 12:11,	analyst 12:9 120:10	72:4, 13 122:11, 14
61: <i>17</i> 64: <i>16</i> , <i>18</i> 65: <i>9</i> ,	<i>19, 19</i> 18:25 21:3	131:10 162:10	125:2 138:6, 22 139:2
21 86:4 97:22 101:15	24:16, 24 26:17 27:14	analyze 72:24 158:18	144:11, 12 147:21
166: <i>17</i>	31:4 103:19, 24 104:4	analyzed 42:20 133:22	148:22 166:3 167:3
addressed 16:5, 20	123:2 165:18	172:6	applications 32:15
17:16, 24 19:6 20:2	Agriculture 10:25	analyzing 24:23	applied 60:20
23:18 26:6 57:6 66:17	20:18 25:2, 2, 17 27:17	ANDERSON 3:22	
			apply 7:15, 19 67:25
97:19 107:8 150:18	124:23 125:10 146:25	animal 16:16, 19 18:22	83:21
153:4 159:10	Agrimonti 2:9 116:4, 11	animals 16:18 20:24	appraisal 159:19 176:25
addresses 35:20 36:23	143: <i>14</i> 145: <i>17</i> 183: <i>12</i>	answer 39:20 40:14	appraisers 155:11, 13, 15
123:9 155:20	ahead 13:24 18:13	44:2 53: <i>3</i> , <i>4</i> 56: <i>1</i> 9	appreciate 180:21
addressing 57:17	32:2 39:22 52:3 74:9	62:13 68:12 82:21	approach 13:1 81:7
adjacent 32:16, 23	79:13 89:17 96:16	86:1 104:14 124:11, 24	171:20
37:25 88:10 93:11 94:3	98:25 103:5,6 109:6	145:25 147:14 148:12	appropriate 29:21 33:1
adjourned 180:24	150:9 159: <i>1</i> 161:4	159:12 166:10	65:6 66: <i>13</i> 108:8
adjust 17:13 139:25	air 49:10	answered 87:22 111:17	124:17 167:15
adjusted 143:3	aircraft 171:21	149:7	appropriately 150:17
adjusting 15:20	airfields 49:9	answers 9:16 34:15	177:5
adjustments 15:27	Airport 48:25 49:6	53:1 114:14 120:15	approval 57:25 100:7
-			
142:14	129:20 158:9, 11	132:1 162:20	101:4, 13, 19 109:14
Administration 164:13	166:17 168:19 170:14	anticipate 69:18 112:18	110:2, 7, 8, 14 111:13
administrative 179:1	171:3, 24 172:1, 3	anticipated 12:7 48:15	142:8 176:20
ADMITTED 184:7	airports 40:13 42:9, 23	152:23	approvals 57:2, <i>10</i> 58:3,
advance 56:16	150:18 165:25 166:12,	anybody 145:16, 20	14
adverse 175:10	12, 15 167:6	157: <i>15</i>	approve 97: <i>10</i> , <i>11</i>
Aerial 24:4	airspace 42:14	anyway 57:6 62: <i>13</i>	100:16, 20 102:8
aeronautic 171:10	airstrips 129:20 150:18	APLIC 98:15, 20 99:3	109:23, 25 118:5
Aeronautics 40:21, 24	165:25 166:16 167:6	apologies 82:11	approved 16:23 28:18
42:17, 25 43:2	AIS 10:11 12:13 16:1,	apologize 36:18 136:11	55:4 56:25 63:17
aesthetic 127:20 160:10	5 17:6, 6, 9 18:2, 6, 25	138:20 139:3, 8	65: <i>13</i> 69: <i>19</i> 85:6
176:4	19:7 20:15 21:11	apparently 82:4 84:1	158:4 164:9
	23:16 25:14 26:16		
aesthetics 176:11	25:10 25:14 20:10	appearance 180:15	approximate 138:11
		appendices 166:25	ArcReader 157:18

1/9/	20	15
------	----	----

Page 3

1/9/2015	Transcript of Proce	edings, Volume 11	Page 3
ADEA 1.7 7 10.15 00	1	82.10.120.6.24.160.7	
AREA 1:7,7 12:15,20	associated 49:9 55:1	83:19 138:6, 24 160:7	bird 6:18 37:18, 19
16: <i>19</i> 18:22, 23 20:20,	70:9 72:1 175:7	168:3 176:10	38:11 87:21 91:4,6
21 27:8 30:12 31:5	assume 15:21 17:18	Badger 38:6, 17 47:7	96:5 97:16 98:4 104:1,
35:17, 18, 22 36:7, 8, 10,	20:3 58:20 180:1	69:22 81:2 <i>3</i> 92: <i>10</i>	7 106:19 107:7, 20
21 37:20 38:11, 17, 20	assumed 11:21 176:10	107:3 118:6 177:19	112:12 127:5
39:1 40:14, 17 42:10,	assuming 8:10 80:19	based 7:1 42:13 75:1	bird-marking 106:5
11, 15 43:2 45:18	81:3 109:6	142:14 160:9 166:18	birds 38:16, 21, 22 39:1,
49:16 59:5, 22 60:15,	assure 28:9	basically 66:8 80:15	8 99: <i>10</i> 103: <i>13</i> , <i>17</i> , <i>21</i>
21, 25 61:1, 2, 15 64:2	ATC 2:3 9:24 12:6	167: <i>1</i> 174:2	104:9, 11, 12, 13, 21, 25
65: <i>3</i> , <i>6</i> , <i>11</i> 66: <i>12</i> , <i>25</i>	17:25 41:11 42:24	basis 116:9	108:10, 11, 17 127:7
67:2, <i>6</i> , <i>24</i> , <i>25</i> 75:8, <i>9</i> ,	95:1, 24	Bat 79:21	BIRNBAUM 4:19
12 87:21 91:6 96:6	attached 27:25 89:11	BAYER 1:16 181:5, 19	bit 71:12 74:8 91:11
97:16 104:20 105:5	attachment 88:20 90:11	beat 179:6	111:3
	1		
109:18 114:25 115:1	92:8, 16	bed 18:18	Black 53:23 54:2
123:19, 23 126:18, 24	attachments 89:15	beginning 22:1 131:18	blue 128:5
127:2 128: <i>10</i> 129:5	144:24	152:20 153:6	BMPs 65:5
136:19, 21, 24 142:3	attempt 145:11 146:17	begins 87:21 88:6	B-north 121:13, 18, 18
144:3, 14 145:5, 8, 23	attention 43:21, 23	91:10, 12, 25	bodied 38:16
146:2, 5 149:13, 17, 21,	58:16 136:6	BEHALF 2:3, 8, 13, 18,	book 164:14
23 156:22 168:11, 12	attorney 100:5	23 3:3, 8, 13, 17, 21 4:3,	bottom 6:16 157:3
169:2 <i>1</i> , 22 170: <i>3</i>	AUTHORITY 1:6 63:9	8, 13, 18 55:14	Boulevard 3:5
172:17 174:13, 25	65:3, 13 70:5 100:8	being's 39:25	bound 125:21 126:6
175:10 176:12 177:10,	101:5, 13 111:13 112:6	belabor 139:20	boundaries 24:1
15, 20	authorization 61:18	believe 9:19 14:21 18:3	Box 4:16
areas 16:16 18:19	81:14 82:14, 18 83:6	21:9 24:8 27:6 29:10	brand 175:15, 18
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
20:25 58:10 59:25	86:8	45:10 54:13 59:4, 24	breadth 19:17
60:14 61:7, 11, 12, 23	authorized 82:15	60:7, 18 61:4 68:22	break 16:14 46:7 113:3
62:4, 6 70:2, 9 71: <i>16</i> ,	automatically 180:11	71:22 78:6 83:5	breaks 103:20
21 73:6 76:24 96:1	available 9:20 30:19	107:25 109:11 118:9	Brian 2:5 54:11 74:12
98:1,4 101:24 103:19	34:24 35:4 47:19	120:22 124:9 138:5	99:22
105:1, 3 106:19 107:17,	104:24 115:25 120:18	146:21 147:15 153:12,	bridge 41:23 42:3, 4
20 125:12 135:19	132:8 152:14 163:2	15 156:4 158:22	brief 31:25 46:7
137:9, 11 146:23 147:20	164:18 174:6	164: <i>10, 11</i> 167: <i>15</i>	179:19, 24
ARIELLE 5:5	Avenue 2:5 4:10	168:7, <i>18</i> 169: <i>3</i> , <i>23</i>	briefly 60:12 65:24
arrangement 35:21	aversion 156:23	170:8, 16	briefs 102:25 180:23
arrived 144:9 175:11	avian 91:14, 17, 24 92:9	bell 55:22 64:3	BRIGGS 2:9 45:15
ascertain 29:6	93:19 94:23 97:5, 7, 19,	Ben 52:1 139:17	115:1
ascertained 142:11	20, 21, 22 98:16 99:7	BENDER 2:19	
			bring 71:20
aside 106:17 107:20	100:5, 14, 24 101:5, 17	beneath 175:14	broad 72:6 136:12
asked 9:15 31:17 34:14	105:13 106:4, 22, 24	beneficial 103:25	broadcast 93:2
47:5 71:5 74:15 76:12,	107:9, 12 109:24, 25	benefit 104:12 138:1	broken 25:3
22, 22, 25 86:1 100:5	111:21 112:4	143:1 146:1	Bronner 158:6, 10, 12
111:16 114:13 138:7,	avoid 17:7 33:1 133:6,	benefitted 180:22	174:15, 25
18 141:4, 6 144:8	11 142:4 143:4, 21	BENJAMIN 52:2	brought 136:5 144:7
158:12, 13, 16 168:8, 25	avoidance 85:3, 8 86:3	182:17	173:14
asking 21:17 39:13	avoided 140:13	best 14:8 50:2 59:10,	brown 128: <i>3</i>
62:11 100:20 101:9,11	aware 12:17 15:11	17 60:19 64:19 85:20	Bs 27:10
102:18, 19 110:12, 14	18:11 19:25 20:3	98:15 132:5 157:12	B-south 121:13, 19, 19
133:23, 25 135:11, 17	25:15 31:17 38:10	159:10 162:24	buffer 54:21
138:16 145:19 161:8	44:25 68:10 84:25	better 26:6 71:6	build 102:3
asks 112:25	121:24 135:8 156:18	137:18 150:18 168:25	
			Building 160:12
aspect 40:19	157:10 158:5 172:18	beyond 24:10 28:12	built 66:11 95:25
aspects 134:9 146:7	174: <i>12</i> 175: <i>1</i>	30:12 58:10, 14 60:15	bulk 115: <i>14</i>
177:3		61:19 63:9 65:3 71:25	Bullhead 79:22
Assembly 30:18	< B >	72:9 141: <i>14</i> 149: <i>16</i>	Bureau 40:18, 21, 23
assertion 163:10	B-1 59:19	big 13:16, 20 45:16	42:16, 25 43:1, 24
assess 20:16 107:17	B-2 59:19	149:25 160:12	BUSINESS 4:8 172:2, 5
134:19 140:9 142:18	B-3 59:19	bigger-picture 73:5	179:21
assessment 69:11, 12	B3a 123:14	biking 174:16, 24 175:3	buyer's 156:23
125:11 134:10, 12	BACH 4:9	Bill 27:24 28:6, 10	
assign 63:10	BACK 5:10 31:16	29: <i>13</i> 30:2	<c></c>
assigned 65:4 161:17	37:10 63:2 73:24	bind 45:20	calculate 122:9 155:13
-			
			l

	1/	9/	2	0	1	5
--	----	----	---	---	---	---

Page 4

1/9/2015	Iranscript
calculated 123:6	characterize 59:1
calculation 21:25 22:2	
$\begin{array}{c} \text{calculation} 21.23 22.2 \\ \text{call} 9.7 90.0 120.1 \\ \end{array}$	chart 56:10 128:
call 8:7 80:9 120:1	charts 10:12
131:1 148:18 151:15	Chase 3:10
162: <i>1</i>	check 44:2
Callan 52:1, 2, 6 54:11	choose 103:7 172
55:12 74:1, 12 76:4	chooses 158:3
139:18 141:15 182:17	chose 20:14, 15
called 69:20 121:18	chosen 17:4 69:1
calls 152:18	107:23 169:10
Camp 48:24	Christa 2:20 32:
CapX 41:19 68:16	37:15 48:7 55:12
69:7, 8 107: <i>12</i>	79:16 105:11 13
Car-deer 39:7	circuit 115:4 117
Carlos 3:4	circuited 117:20,
carry 114:21	circuiting 175:25
cascading 117:9	circuits 114:21, 2
case 33:1 44:6 49:4	115:12, 17 118:3
52:23 63:11 65:2,5	circumstance 125
68: <i>17</i> 69: <i>7</i> , <i>13</i> 72: <i>17</i>	circumstances 29
82:13 90:4 93:1 99:23	citation 90:8
101:1 134:20 157:24	
	citations 136:19
Cashton 146:5 category 116:24, 25	cite 89:13
category 116:24, 25	cited 137:21 150
cattle 16:7, 7	cites 159:22, 25
causal 135:20, 23	CITIZENS 2:14,
cause 157:9 165:6	CITY 4:18 141:2
caused 29:15 118:20	180: <i>13</i>
146: <i>5</i>	clarification 41:4
causes 15:24	62:15 75:24 87:
caution 134:18	90: <i>1</i> 91:22 147:
CECP 69:21	164:10
CECPs 68:14, 16	clarifications 87:
CENTER 3:8, 9	clarify 52:18 71:
centerline 14:22 157:1	81:18 85:19 87:2
178:8	88:12 89:19 90:1
	91:15 111:4 143
central 71:7 certain 61:7 69:17	149:20 154:21 1
81:20 107:1 111:9	168:13 174:7
certainly 15:1	clarifying 90:15
	clarifying 90:15
certainty 126:13	classes 23:16
certificate 30:9	classified 117:6
certification 32:12, 17	CLEAN 2:18 32
certifiers 32:10	37:16 48:8 55:12
certify 181:7	63:2 <i>3</i> 71:5 74: <i>1</i> :
cetera 19:11 24:18	79:17 105:8, 12
155:12	clear 21:14 43:1.
CETF 2:14 133:3 165:4	47:16 48:20 49:0
CH 36:7	55:23 88:2 111:1
chairs 30:18	129:22 178: <i>14</i>
chance 138:9	cleared 175:14
change 52:17 53:4	clearing 104:7
67:18, 21 73:17 113:4	clearly 146:11 14
157:10 163:20 171:23	clerks 30:21
179:4, 13	close 41:10, 21 1
	157:4 178:10
changed74:25171:21changes52:16170:24	CM 181:5, 19
Chapter 57:5, 23 153:13	coding 91:7
character 171:2	collapse 118:4
characteristics 101:16	collision 37:19 9
121:12	
	94:23 97:23 99:7
characterization 102:6	100:15 101:17, 21
	105:14 107:7,18

ze 59:12 10 128:9.9.12):12 10 :2 03:7 172:1 58:3 14, 15 7:4 69:14 69:10 2:20 32:5 :7 55:12 5:11 139:14 5:4 117:7 117:20, 21, 22 175:25 14:21, 25 7 118:3 nce 125:20 nces 29:20 Ю·8 136:19 137:12 :21 150:3 22, 25 S 2:14,23 8 141:20 on 41:4 52:12 :24 87:17 22 147:13, 25 ons 87:15 2:18 71:11 :19 87:25 :19 90:19 1:4 143:15 54:21 163:18 74:7 90:15 123:8 3:16 117:6 2:18 32:5 :8 55:12 :5 74:15 5:8. 12 139:15 14 43:15 20 49:6.19 2 111:18 78:14 75:14 104:7 6:11 147:10 :21 0.21 117:13 8:10 5.19 29:1 :7 18:4 37:19 91:5 23 99:7 01:17.21

collisions 38:16, 24, 25 39:3. 7. 8. 18 93:20 98:17 106:7 107:20 co-location 116:7 color 91:7 column 6:10.15 combination 67:8 Come 10:3 42:6 47:5 57:22 61:13 62:2 103:8 119:11 122:1 173:19, 20 179:9 comes 57:20 101:19 102:24 180:10 coming 45:14 62:2 124:17 138:22 commence 55:22 commencing 58:4 comment 11:4 42:8, 22 96:23 137:6 158:10 comments 10:13 11:3 15:7,9 18:10 75:1 132:11 136:18 137:2, 13, 21 138:18 139:1 146:3 152:10, 12, 19 156:10, 16 174:6, 12, 18, 23 175:20 176:19 COMMISSION 1:2, 22 5:3 6:10 7:9, 11 28:11 30:3, 4, 6, 6 55:18 56:20 63:17 78:20 94:2, 4, 9 99:3, 24 101:12, 22 102:2 111:10, 12, 23, 25 112:3, 19 118:5 120:9 131:9 135:4, 12, 19 136:5, 7, 9 137:8, 16, 25 140:20 142:8 143:10 145:16 146:8 155:18 158:3 162:9 **Commissioners** 17:5 27:1 125:18 136:10 Commission's 102:16 110:5 112:6 155:11 Committees 30:19 common 117:11, 11, 15. 16, 19, 20 118:3, 6, 7 commonly 118:20 commonplace 153:2 communicate 174:8 communication 129:18 communications 166:2.6 communities 103:16 127:6 **community** 103:23 104:4 compaction 25:18 28:25 companies 155:17 COMPANY 1:4 54:12 74:13 99:23 153:9 181:6 **COMPANY-WISCONSI**

N 1:5 comparable 121:23 compare 21:6 39:13 121:21 compared 128:4 comparing 21:7 comparison 121:11 comparisons 121:13 compensable 28:23 29:1 160:24 compensated 30:10 176:23 177:6 compensation 17:18, 20, 21, 22 28:21 30:9 compiled 69:16 complaints 30:3 complete 11:18 12:13 16:13 19:14, 18, 20 29:8 132:18 completed 168:18 Completely 48:1 complex 38:11 73:7 117:1 compliance 28:9 68:22, 24 69:5,6 complicated 166:25 comply 169:1 component 58:9 135:21 components 111:22, 24 compound 149:4 comprehensive 12:18 31:1 computated 147:10 computer 128:22 152:3 concentration 67:1 143:22 149:22 concentrations 141:18 concern 38:25 39:4 45:24 64:5, 10 66:8, 15 98:2 140:25 156:13 168:10.21 169:10 CONCERNED 2:23 11:14 16:10 64:1 106:18 107:21 concerns 11:18. 20. 21 16:4, 5, 20 17:1, 1, 3, 15 18:8, 9 19:16, 24, 25 20:2, 9, 11, 13 28:18 29:8 35:14 36:5,23 37:2 58:13 60:24 72:25, 25 75:11 86:5 97:18 98:3 107:24 136:18 137:3 141:3 169:7.8 175:2 conclusion 26:19 136:15 175:11 concur 78:19 condition 66:16 102:24 conditions 54:25 60:22 65:14 68:2 105:23 115:10 117:7.7 conduct 78:21 139:7

Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11

	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••		
conducted 102:10 139:6	Continued 3:1 4:1, 23	corridors 59:8, 13, 24	132:8, 25 139:12
168:12 169:3, 9	5:1 144:11 170:25	71:23 72:2 73:17 75:6,	150:10 163:3, 8 164:18
conductors 175:13	continuing 61:10, 22	14 76:16 117:16	165:2, 13 182:5, 6, 9, 10,
conducts 177:1	62:5	cortisol 16:6	11, 12, 15, 16, 19, 20
conference 179:2 180:2	contour 14:3, 16 15:5	cost 6:16, 18, 19, 20	183:1, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 16,
configuration 97:25	contours 14:6	19:22 138:1 152:6	19, 20, 21, 25 184:1
115:22	contributing 23:24	costs 6:11	cross-examine 171:16
confirm 154:15	control 25:18 57:16	Coulee 38:7, 17 47:7	crossing 107:8
confirmed 104:18	60:17 61:3 63:18	64:2 65:11 69:22	crossings 115:16
conflict 45:17 85:3, 8	64:23 65:16, 18 66:11	81:23 92:10 107:3	CRR 1:16 181:4, 15
86:2	conversation 167:12	118:6 177:19	CS 35:16 36:11, 14, 20
conflicts 86:4	171:11	COUNSEL 3:4 5:4, 5	cubed 35:11
confused 79:7 155:22	conversations 37:23	71:5 74:14, 16 89:25	cubic 140:5
confusing 148:14 163:7	96:1	count 126:7 147:3	cubic 140.5 cues 24:5
congratulate 119:8	conversely 176: <i>13</i>	COUNTY 1:7,8 3:3,4	
congregate 38:22	conversion 53:10, 18		CULLEN 4:9 5:7
connected 121:23 148:6		30:21 35:15, 16 36:1, 7,	cultivated 126:15
	54:1 70:18 104:11	19 88:2 92:1, 2 94:7	cumulative 107:21
Conservation 53:6, 15,	COOPERATIVE 3:21	181:2	115:13, 18
22 172:17 173:6	coordinate 150:15	couple 7:21 35:9 52:16	current 81:5 135:25
consider 70:18 146:9	coordinating 173:6	71:1 79:10 109:7 161:7	136:2 137:8
consideration 75:15	coordinator 82:16, 24	course 43:13 67:18	currently 52:22 78:24
considerations 20:16	83:4 162:11	cover 14:13 61:9 62:6	79:25 101:25 170:10
considered 7:14 24:11,	copies 12:25 13:3	115:4, 7	cut 178:12
23 31:6, 17 45:4 70:12,	copy 12:25 167:20	covered 26:12 66:9	cyber 137: <i>3</i>
16 98:15 141:23	corner 158:11	173:23	
153:23 156:16 171:4	corners 158:9	covering 129:22	< D >
172:5	corona-based 136:22	covers 115:9 123:19	dairy 24:17
considers 136:5	CORPORATION 3:4	CPCN 112:21	DAIRYLAND 3:21
constraints 123:10	115:6	crackles 176:17	damage 28:21, 22, 25
CONSTRUCT 1:6	corrals 18: <i>17</i>	Crane 6:20, 25 41:23	133:7, <i>12</i> 134: <i>3</i> , <i>4</i>
83:14 84:19	correct 9:13 34:11	42:2	damages 17:8
constructing 175:17	35:18, 19, 24 36:3, 6, 11,	cranes 38:16, 22	DANE 1:7 3:3, 4
construction 16:15, 17	25 38:4 42:18 48:1	Crawford 4:10	dash 90:2, 4
25:19 28:14, 22 29:15	49:19 50:14, 18, 19, 21,	create 15:16 39:2, 19	data 7:1 10:12, 15 24:3
55:22 56:2, 3, 12, 16	22 52:10 61:7 65:22,	created 107:22	78:24 88:21 89:13, 13,
57:1, 11, 16, 24 58:4, 5	23 71:18 74:24 75:1	creates 116:24	15, 21 122:14, 15 124:3
65:9 67:10, 17 68:22,	78:7, 8 79:23 80:3	criteria 54:25 55:3	131:19, 22 132:16
24 69:5, 12 70:1, 9, 15	84:5, 15 86:14 87:11	critically 82:5 84:2	140:24 144:11, 16, 24
80:5 83:16, 23 84:17,	98:19, 21 100:12	crop 12:12 14:14 24:18	145:13, 24 146:23 167:9
23 85:2, 8 86:4, 12	104:15 105:21 106:12	25:17 28:21	database 150:7
104:5 139:22 140:1, 10	109:16,21 114:9,10	cropland 12:10 20:23	DATCP 147:17
141:25 152:25	115:2, 3, 20 118:8, 9	cropping 14:5	DATCP's 147:21
consult 109:13	132:5 140:20 162:17,	crops 16:11, 14 28:22,	date 56:25 57:22 142:5
consulted 59:9 97:7, 9	24 163:10 166:19 181:9	25 126:24 127:2, 3	dated 81:15 96:6
100:16 137:15	corrections 34:17 74:1,	cross 9:21 31:24 33:5	181:11
consulting 123:16	5 78:13 114:11 179:4,	34:24 40:5 74:8 85:14	day 7:15, 19 8:6, 6
170:23	14	109:6 118:25 120:23	38:20 39:23 86:8
Consumer 9:9	correctly 20:13	139:11 148:3 161:3	92:25 93:1 170:7
contact 16:24 18:13	Correll 4:15 51:6,9	164:24, 25	179:22 180:14 181:11
28:16 157:22	52:1, 5 54:6 58:19	cross-contamination	days 7:21 56:22 57:6,
contacted 20:1, 3, 10, 12	62:14 71:1, 4 73:18, 20	16:11	20 179:3, 4, 14, 21 180:3
contacts 20:7	77:8 78:1, 4, 25 85:18	CROSSE 1:7, 7 4:20	DC 4:6
contain 48:17	86:15 87:6 88:20, 23	43:25 59:11	deadline 7:19 179:13
contained 137:12 166:3	89:9, 16, 18 90:13, 18,	crossed 32:11	deal 6:3 17:1 40:15
containment 16:16, 19	22 95:14, 16, 19, 22	crosses 88:2, 7 92:1, 2	57:18 64:14 127:8, 9,
contains 91:6 146:13	96:17 98:9, 11 99:1, 13	cross-exam 31:16	<i>15, 20</i> 129: <i>1</i> 155: <i>10</i>
content 138:13	111:3, 6, 15, 20 112:10,	1055 CAUNI 51.10	180:9, 9
context 121:15 122:2	<i>23</i> 182: <i>18</i> , <i>21</i> , <i>25</i> 183:2,	CROSS-EXAMINATION	dealing 156:7
151: <i>1</i>	<i>4</i> , 9	10:4 32:3 35:6 37:13	dealt 155:12
contingencies 118:2	corridor 12:7 20:19	40:6 44:23 48:5 50:8	decide 109:25
contingency 115:10	23:9	40.0 44.23 48.5 50.8 54:7, 9 55:10 79:1, 14	decided 100:25
116:25 117: <i>12</i>	<i>23.7</i>	99:14, 20 103:9 105:9	decides 101:22
continue 88:5		116: <i>3</i> , <i>15</i> 120: <i>1</i> 9, <i>24</i>	deciding 134:18
continue 00.2	l	110.5, 15 120.17, 24	ucciumg 134.10

Gramann Reporting, Ltd.

1/9/2013		edings, volume 11	Paye 6
decision 29:9 56:23	designated 56:3 132:13	25 183:4, 11, 15, 18, 24	75:11, 15 76:6 97:12,
57:3 63:16, 20 68:2	184:9	directing 150:17	<i>14</i> 101: <i>12</i> 109:22, 24
125:19 141:24 164:15	designs 118:15	direction 67:18	
decision-making 57:21	desire 171:24	directly 13:17 38:18	110:1, 7, 8, 12, 20 111:8,
decisions 20:17 73:3	despite 27:12	-	8 112:18 139:18
102:16 112:7 140:10	destroyed 126:25 127:3	53:7, 16, 24 58:14	141:14 143:2 146:25
		59:21 65:7 69:8, 24	147:17 173:5
142:11, 20 143:17 145:5	destruction 140:15	87:20 126:19 146:22	DNR-coordinated 172:16
declines 118:5	detail 26:1 59:16 73:2	175:3 177:2	DNR's 75:1 96:21
deemed 82:5 84:2	111:16	disapprove 100:10	111:/3 147:/9
Defense 43:19	detailed 69:11, 12 72:23	101:7 102:1	Docket 1:5 120:11
defined 18:2	73:4 170:3 172:16	discharge 67:8 68:1	164:8
defines 160:21	173:5	discovery 167:17	document 69:22 81:17
Definitely 112:22	details 72:7 140:17	discuss 83:8 167:16	82:3, 8 144:21 145:9
definition 134:23 135:2,	determinations 166:14	discussed 19:15 40:3	149:25 164: <i>13</i> 167: <i>3</i> ,
10	determine 23:25 30:15	41:18 42:19 50:10	20, 24 168:6, 7 172:20
degree 10:15 20:17	151:14	56:14 65:7 68:13	173:3
DEIS 136:14 152:11	determined 30:14 65:5	84:22 85:1 124:13	documents 57:21 69:17
Dekorra 36:15	111:23, 24 176:6	128: <i>1</i> 137: <i>13</i> 153: <i>17</i>	doing 39:22
delay 13:4	determines 99:25	158:2 161: <i>13</i> , <i>14</i> 164:5	DOMAIN 2:24
Delayed 132:12, 13	determining 72:3	discusses 66:21 139:16	Don 113:8
184:9	detour 14:19	152:21	DONALD 114:1, 5
deleterious 68:3	developed 63:19	discussing 71:16 83:25	183:10
denial 42:13	developing 97:4 107:18	139:17 163:19	DORSEY 4:5
densely 128:8 177:14,	development 64:22	Discussion 37:9 38:14	DOT 35:13, 23 40:11
14, 20 178:6	deviation 156:25 157:24	43:1 46:19 66:3, 23	41:9 47:15, 23 48:1, 17
density 61:4	158:1, 3, 6, 17, 24	73:23 74:13 86:22	50:11 147:18
denuded 66:8	deviations 86:12	89:2 91:1 93:8 96:11	dots 128:15
departed 49:5	devices 91:11 105:17,	98:24 99:17 112:12	DOT's 36:5, 23 37:2
departing 49:7	<i>19</i> 106:5 112: <i>15</i>	113:2 114:24 119:16	double 117:21 175:25
DEPARTMENT 4:13,	dewatering 143:2, 3, 18	144:16 159:5 160:6	double-check 68:23
<i>14</i> 9:8 10:24 34:8	diagram 92:8	164:23 168:2 173:17	
			132: <i>10</i>
38:3, 14 42:12, 14	dialogue 92:23	179:11, 16 180:7, 18	doubt 146:9
43:17, 18 45:13 47:21	differ 178:2	discussions 6:5 35:20,	Douglas 48:25
51:7 56:21, 25 58:1, 2	differed 147:20	25 36:9, 22 54:19	downgrade 125:13
59:9, 15 60:1 73:10	difference 21:16, 17, 22	63:21 73:5 74:16,21	Dr 63:23, 25 66:5 78:17
82:17 83:5 84:24	22:13, 19 122:4 176:17	75:5, 15 83:3 85:5	draft 73:15 110:10
86:13 97:4,6 100:6,9	differences 6:16 177:4	112:17 144:1,6 155:16	137:6 150:22 151:6, 10,
101:4,6 102:1,15	178:14, 16	169:2	14, 15, 16 152:11, 12
109:11, 12 125:6	different 6:11, 12 24:19	dispute 150:4	153:18 165:20 174:4,6
146:24 171:9	39:6 52:15 66:20 75:6	disrupt 67:12 143:1	drafting 165:18, 23
departments 137:17	91:7, 8 104:10 112:15	distance 27:12 47:18	173:12
146:24	117:17 121:22 133:16	50:12	drain 28:13, 20
Department's 69:9	135: <i>16</i> 138: <i>19</i> 141:9	distances 128:16, 20	drainage 25:20 28:20
departure 171:21	160:21 169:17 176:15	distinct 69:17	Drawings 92:9
depend 29:19 84:9, 11	178: <i>4</i> , <i>18</i> , <i>19</i>	distraction 39:2, 4, 14, 19	driftless 67:2 149:23
104:22 142:6	differentiation 22:12	distractions 39:6, 11, 17	drivers 39:2
dependent 80:7	differently 125:14	Distribute 12:24 172:19	driving 39:21, 22 70:7
depending 66:13 67:20	160:22 170:2	distributed 172:15	152:1,8
84: <i>19</i> 105:23 106:2	difficult 15:13	distribution 124:2, 4, 12	dropped 75:16, 18
118: <i>16, 17, 19</i>	dimensions 157:19	152:21 153:1, 8, 9, 14,	due 16:13, 16, 18 17:12
depends 59:3 105:24	diminution 159:9, 18	16,24 154:7	27:7 28:25 156:22
127:1 128:6 143:10	DIRECT 9:3, 11, 15	disturbance 64:3 65:21	168:10
depiction 92:17	10:10 34:3, 10 35:12	70:8	DULY 9:1 34:1 47:1
describe 13:8 20:22, 23	36:24 41:8 47:3 52:4,	disturbed 60:13 126:24	52:2 78:2 87:3 114:1
26:5 41:11 58:23	8, 11, 16, 20, 21 54:4	divert 67:17	120:3 131:3 162:3
60:12 144:5 156:18	58:16, 19 71:7 74:2, 5	diverters 112:12, 14	183:10, 14, 17, 23
described 73:10 94:6	76:24 78:3, 6 79:19	division 120:10 162:11	duration 48:13
101:18 133:19 145:9	87:5,9 111:12 114:2,7	divisions 23:25	
describing 19:13 71:21	120:4, 11, 14 123:11	DNR 53:7, 16, 24 54:18,	< E >
DESCRIPTION 184:7	124:7, 8 131:4, 11, 18	<i>23</i> 57:10 58:10 61:10,	earlier 15:23 27:3 59:7,
design 29:15 42:4	132:1 150:13 162:4, 13	<i>16, 22</i> 62:5 63:6, <i>10</i>	<i>earner</i> 15:25 27:5 59:7, 23 109:12 111:16
57:15 94:18 106:9	165:22 182:4, 8, 14, 18,	64:13 65:8 67:22 68:9	
115:7 118:16, 17, 19	103.22 102.7, 0, 14, 10,	69:21 70:1 72:25	127:25 161:8 172:14
113.7 110.10, 17, 19		07.21 10:1 12:23	l

Gramann Reporting, Ltd.

1/9	/20	15
-----	-----	----

1/9/2015	Transcript of Proce	eaings, volume 11	Page /
170.04			
179:24	emphasize 106:5 125:13	estate 43:25	179:6, 10, 12, 17 180:4,
early 138:5 173:16	emphasized 105:12	estimated 6:19	8, 16, 19
easement 10:22 14:22	employ 88:9 91:13	et 19:11 24:18 155:12	example 41:8 70:2
17:20, 21 21:4, 13	employed 91:24 94:5		
		evaluate 133:16 158:16	75:7,7 112:11 121:16
22:15, 17, 18, 19, 25	employment 155:12	evaluated 20:21 21:5	exceed 47:19 64:24
23:8, 12, 14, 18, 21	encompasses 123:5	evaluation 136:2	65:1
30:10 43:17 47:20	encourages 103:25	event 117:12	excessive 15:12
48:18 50:13, 17 53:2	encroaching 126:16	events 117:4, 8, 8	excuse 29:1 46:5 52:12
61:15 122:6, 19 176:25	encroachment 18:20	eventually 96:12	excused 33:13, 14 46:3,
easements 10:21 21:23	19:6	everybody 20:12 157:12,	4 51:3, 4 77:10, 11
easier 6:9 7:8 15:22	endangered 80:20 81:1	14 160:21 174:1 180:20	
	_		86:18, 19 112:24 119:5,
163:11	85: <i>3</i>	everybody's 20:9	6 130:7, 8 161:22, 23
East 2:5, 16 91:12 92:3,	ENERGY 2:14 120:10	evidence 9:20 171:15	178:23, 24
4 176:10	162:10	exact 118:10	executive 22:4
Eastern 79:21, 24 80:25	engineer 94:14, 15	Exactly 112:22 118:13	exhibit 6:12, 12 7:14, 17
81:4, 14 83:2 86:6	152:25 171:10	167:19	9: <i>13</i> 12:23 13:7 28:1
economic 134:7	engineering 100:21	EXAMINATION 9:3	30:9 31:22 56:5, 10, 11
economies 134: <i>3</i> , <i>4</i>	102:9 115:21 137:15	34:3 47:3 52:4 71:3	59:22 65:24 84:16
edge 47:14 48:21	142:6, 9, 13 143:17	78: <i>3</i> 85: <i>17</i> 87:5 111:5	88:19 89:21 92:7, 10
126:18	engineers 137:13 164:15	114:2 120:4 131:4	132:12, 13 167:15
edges 126:16	ensure 32:12 53:8, 17,	161:5 162:4 177:25	172:15, 23
effect 17:3 156:14			
	25 69:6 70:10	182:2, 4, 8, 14, 18, 21, 25	EXHIBITS 1:22 6:5
effective 105:20, 23	enter 31:13	183:2, 4, 9, 11, 15, 18, 22,	34:12, 18 114:9 118:22,
effectiveness 106:2	entered 54:15 180:15	24 184:2	<i>23</i> 131: <i>13</i> 132: <i>4</i>
effects 68:3 161:12	entire 28:1 56:16 81:3	EXAMINER 1:10 6:2,	162:14, 23
effort 26:20, 23 57:15	90:8 121:15, 20 122:2	8, 22, 25 7:4, 7, 10, 13, 18,	exist 23:4
139:25	137:24	23 8:1, 5 9:2, 22, 25	existing 19:3 21:2, 4, 21
efforts 61:11, 23	entirety 93:5	10:3 12:24 13:2, 5, 8,	22:9, 14, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18,
EGAN 4:19	entity 97:15 160:1		
		12, 15, 23 22:23 23:3	25 23:2, 5, 9, 11, 12, 14,
EIS 66:21 121:4, 11	entry 115:15	26:8, <i>12</i> 29:23 30:1, 5,	<i>19</i> 47: <i>12</i> 49: <i>5</i> 56: <i>4</i>
122:10, 15 123:8	enumerate 133:13	25 31:7, 11, 19, 23 32:2	66:6, 6 118: <i>14</i> 122: <i>17</i>
125:20 128:10, 23	environment 128:6	33:5, 7, 12, 15 34:2	123:4, 14 136:8 158:25
133:4, 5, 6, 11 135:4, 19	169: <i>17</i> , <i>18</i> 170:2	35:5 37:7, 10 40:5	164:7 175:9, <i>12</i> 176: <i>1</i>
136:11, 16 137:6, 7, 25	ENVIRONMENTAL	43:10, 12, 22 44:3, 7, 10,	178:5
139:15, 20 140:12	3:8, 9 42:20 68:24	15, 18, 22 45:8 46:2, 10,	exit 115:15
141:17 146:13 147:7			
	69:5 72:1,9 73:6	17 47:2 50:5, 24 51:2,	expand 21:4 45:17, 22
149:20 151:6, <i>10</i> , <i>15</i> , <i>16</i>	114:22 120:10 124:22	5, 8, 12 52:3 54:8 56:8	122:19
153:5, 17, 25 155:19, 20	125:11 131:10 133:7,	62:12, 20, 23 66:1	expanded 23:8 59:5
156:5, 25 158:20	12 134:21 150:15, 22	68:19 70:22, 25 73:21,	122:7, 22
-			
159:22 160:11 161:13	152:11 159:20 162:10	24 74:4,9 75:22,25	expanding 179:19
164:5 165:7, <i>18</i> , <i>24</i>	172:10 173:8	77:6, 9 79:2, 5, 7, 13	expansion 22:24 48:16
166:15 169:8 171:3	environmentally 73:6	81:9 85: <i>13</i> , <i>16</i> 86: <i>17</i> ,	expansions 25:22
172:6 173:12 174:4, 6,	environments 81:22	20 87:1,4 88:18,25	expect 18:21 74:4
8 175:6 178:15	EPRI 159:22, 22 160:2,	89:3, 8, 17 90:7 95:15,	experience 71:13
either 39:25 47:20	3	17 96:8, 12 98:22, 25	104: <i>13</i> 160: <i>15</i> 175:7
67:23 72:3, 24 153:18	E-P-R-I 159:25	99 :15, 18 102:11, 21	176:5, 7, 8
elaborate 46:13 90:23	equipment 15:13, 20, 21	103:4, 8 105:8 108:13,	experienced 67:14
			•
93:15	equivalent 118:16	<i>22, 25</i> 109: <i>5</i> 110: <i>9, 16,</i>	expert 15:20 62:18
ELECTRIC 1:5 115:6,	ERF 31:20 162:17	20, 23 111:1, 11 112:9,	83:4 98:13 159:23
<i>14</i> 153:9 154:7 160: <i>1</i>	ERF'd 150:21, 25 151:5	24 113:5, <i>10</i> 116: <i>1</i> , <i>13</i> ,	160: <i>1</i> 167:6
electrocution 99:10	152:15, 15, 17, 18, 18		
		<i>19</i> 118:25 119:4, 7, <i>10</i> ,	expertise 28:12 30:12
element 115:14	Erik 2:24	13 120:20 130:1, 4, 6	40:15 60:15 134:6
eliminated 97:1, 2	erosion 14:18 25:18	132:9, 15, 21 135:13	147:2 <i>3</i> 169:4
104: <i>6</i> , <i>17</i>	57:16 60:17, 23 61:2	139:10 144:20 148:3, 5,	experts 136:1 137:14
ELPC 3:8	63:18 64:22 65:16, 18	11, 13, 17, 23 149:3, 15,	explain 40:17 56:19
Elroy 67:3 141:21	66:11 68:22	<i>18</i> 150:8 151:2 158:20	68: <i>19</i> 71: <i>14</i> 82: <i>20</i>
Eiroy-Sparta 75:8	errata 131:15, 24	159:1, 4, 6 160:4, 7	108:14 148:8 151:9, 18
e-mailed 43:24	162:16 163:6, 12	161: <i>3</i> , <i>21</i> 163: <i>4</i> 164: <i>21</i> ,	
			169:5, 8
e-mails 44:19 152:17	Especially 48:18 78:23	<i>24</i> 165: <i>11</i> 167: <i>18</i> , <i>25</i>	explained 125:12
EMF 16:6 136:19	essentially 49:18 59:10,	168: <i>3</i> 171: <i>17</i> 172:22	explanation 76:15
EMINENT 2:24	21 63:16 65:20 76:8,	173:1, 23 174:20	144:8 145:4, 7, 21, 22
emissions 136:22, 25	<i>13</i> 84: <i>18</i> 109: <i>15</i>	177:24 178:22, 25	
CHH3310113 130.22, 23	15 07.10 107.15	111.27 110.22,23	exposed 66:12
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11

Page 8

1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11		
exposure 140:14	FASICK 34:1,6 35:8	first 17:6 53:2 65:20	75:21 84:13 93:15
express 20:11 173:18	37:5, 15 40:8 44:25	76:7, 9, 11 123:1	103:3 105:6 109:3
expressed 36:24 88:9	182:7	133:13 142:4 173:13	110:25 115:24 116:11
156:13 157:15 168:21	Fasick's 35:3	180:14	119:3 120:18 139:9
175:2	favorite 8:6	Fish 80:7, 14, 16	141:13 161:1, 20
expression 168:10	feasibility 91:11 94:16	fit 45:1	163:24 164:2 165:10
expression 108.10 expressway 36:19	feasible 91:4 95:25	five 131:13 162:14	177:22 178:21
extend 48:22 50:16	features 146:15	179:4	future 16:15, 18 25:22
116:6	federal 42:24 53:4, 13,	flight 168:22 171:20	28:5 48:16 172:20
extending 146:4	21 80:4, 19 164:12	Floor 4:20	20.3 +0.10 172.20
extends 23:15 24:9	federal-listed 80:13	flow 110:11 139:23	< G >
extent 26:13 47:18	federally 80:1, 16	140:2, 16	gain 16:8
57:4, 9 62:20 75:4	fee 52:21	focus 37:24	galvanized 128:5
94:2 107:6 108:3	feedback 59:14 60:5	focusing 117:15	gas 162:10
165:17, 20 175:11	63:20 73:12 77:1	FOLEY 2:4	gather 10:25 11:17
extents 48:16	feeds 67:18	folks 42:3, 4	12:4
extreme 117:4	feel 19:17 142:25	follow 47:15 60:9	gathered 11:7 28:13
extremely 48:15	feet 14:25, 25 15:1	123:14	general 60:20 70:16
-	93:18, 22 94:22 101:23	followed 32:11 138:4	71:11 92:9 103:13
< F >	102:8 140:5 157:1, 2, 5,	following 73:9 112:18,	104:8, 12, 14 161:14
FAA 40:12, 22 42:8, 11	6, 14 170:16 178:8	19	generally 11:17 59:15
166:3, 6, 14 168:21, 23	FEIS 7:3	follows 178:5	66:17 71:21 72:16
169:2, 7, 9, 11, 22	fence 16:16 20:19	follow-up 44:20 48:3	127:7
FAA's 167:4 168:10	24:10 103:20	50:6 138:14 140:24	generated 128:22
facilities 129:18	fenced 20:21	141:13	geographically 67:4
facility 123:4	fencing 20:22	food 104:21	geological 149:12 150:6
fact 47:10 48:24 74:25	fewer 148:21 178:7	forbs 108:4, 9, 13, 18	getting 41:23 56:15
83:25 84:6 85:8	field 14:5 15:6 49:1, 8,	F-O-R-B-S 108:24	139:4 148:7
107:11 154:13	10, 12, 19, 25 50:2	FORCE 2:14	GIS 12:8, 9, 9 24:2, 6, 7
factor 24:22 141:23	98:14, 16 126:15, 18, 19	foregoing 181:8	128:18 146:22 147:9
factored 24:10	142:15, 19 152:5 167:9	foregone 26:19	give 24:21, 22 68:11
factors 61:12 62:1	168: <i>10</i> 170: <i>10</i> , <i>14</i> , <i>25</i>	foresee 65:1	75:7 90:7 94:20 95:3
66: <i>13</i> 71:25 161:9, <i>12</i>	172:2	Forest 53:23 54:2	155:6 172:8
failure 118:20	fields 12:11 14:13, 14	125:10 147:6	given 17:22 65:2
Fair 29:25 62:7 86:11	15:3 126:15 127:9	forested 70:17	giving 25:10
169:5 Esimfield 25:18 22	figure 31:10 158:23 172:8	forests 146:14	go 13:24 25:24 32:2
Fairfield 35:18, 22 fairly 71:23 72:6	figures 7:2 124:25	forgot 165:12 form 69:11	37:7 42:3 44:19 45:24 46:17 50:16 52:3 66:1
fall 38:22 83:12 88:10	125:1, 1	formats 152:19	71:25 73:21 74:9
familiar 55:23 58:9	file 7:16, 25 9:10 31:20	forms 28:21	79:13 80:13 86:20
68: <i>14</i> , <i>16</i> 93:8 117:5	34:12 179:3	Fort 43:14, 16 45:2	88:25 89:17 96:8, 16
127:13 134:14, 25	filed 6:6 30:11 32:13	46:14 47:8, 22 48:9, 11	98:22, 25 99:15 103:5,
135:24 167:8 172:15	131:15 132:15 162:16	49:17, 23, 23 50:20	6 109:6 111: <i>13</i> 113: <i>1</i>
far 43:3 60:3 63:14	171:12, 19	144:2 145:5, 8, 12	128:12 133:14, 19
67:5 146:4	filing 7:19 132:10	forward 16:21 45:5	142:3 148:20 150:9
farm 12:14 15:12 16:3,	163:6	98:2 173: <i>14</i> 180:23	159:1 160:4, 16 161:3
4, 12, 13, 25 17:8, 13	fill 67:24 68:7 70:7	found 6:14 31:8 80:6,	164:21 167:25 179:15
18:2, 20 19:4 24:21	final 57:15 63:18 65:18	<i>12</i> 122: <i>13</i> 164:6	180: <i>6</i> , <i>16</i>
25:12, 22, 22 32:12, 16,	66:2 <i>1</i> 102:9 136: <i>15</i>	Foundation 6:20, 25	goal 134: <i>1</i>
17, 23	137:7 139:15 140:12	17:12 20:25 145:18	goals 133:5, 6, 10, 19, 24
farmer 15:2, 11 17:17,	141:17 142:6, 9, 13, 19	foundational 111:19	goes 20:17 43:16 60:3
23 18:11 32:21	146: <i>13</i> 153:5, <i>18</i> , <i>18</i>	four 10:20, 23 11:14	94:18 118:10 141:25
farmers 15:7 18:6	166:15 174:8	12:5 106:19	169:8 176:9
19:10 29:5	financial 156:3	Frank 3:14 116:21	going 8:6 13:16 16:21
farming 14:3, 11, 17	find 6:7 68:24 95:3	frequently 38:21	23:22 26:3 29:24
farmland 10:13, 19	122:21, 25 142:14	front 89:23 112:6 157:2	39:22 41:5 44:2 49:23
12:12, 14 14:4 16:3	143:22 151:25 152:5	full 19:12 27:24	57:15 65:24 66:20
17:8 19:4 23:16 25:4,	155:6 167:23	fully 18:11	81:4 84:16 85:25
5, 6, 6 27:4, 22 28:16	fine 7:24 8:1 96:15	function 118:13	90:19 96:19 98:2
123:5 farms 32:7 33:2	124:1 132:22 163:16	Fund 53:6, 15, 23	102:5 135:18 146:5
farther 176:3	finish 128: <i>1</i> finished 46:8	further 26:20, 23 30:24 33:4 35:25 36:9 43:8	156:7 157:17 159:14 167:19 169:6 171:13
iaithei 170.3	firm 117:25, 25 181:5	48:21 71:12 73:20	107:79 109:0 171:73 177:8
	101.0	······································	

Good 10:6, 7 35:8	144:24	highest 27:13, 16, 21	identified 32:8 35:12
37:15 40:8,9 44:4	handle 40:18 45:20	67:1 141:18 149:22	59: <i>1</i> , <i>13</i> , 24 61:22 98:3
52:6, 7 55:12 60:2	handled 152:12, 13	high-level 71:23 72:6	139:23 154:17 172:12
79:16 87:7,8 96:13	153:8, 21	highly 23:16 177:19	identifies 24:3
103:11, 12 120:6 121:1	handles 40:22	high-quality 123:10	identify 165:7
131:6 133:2 139: <i>14</i>	happen 39:7, 24 48:12	HIGHWAY 2:23 35:14,	identifying 146:13
150:12 162:6 165:15, 16	61:6 121:4	15, 16 36:1, 1, 7, 20	image 90:6
	1		
government 80:20	happens 17:17 141:10	40:18 41:20 45:2	imagine 62:1
Governor 30:17	hard 180:21	48:14, 19, 20 50:18	immediate 175:10
Gramann 1:17 181:5	hardship 15:17	88:2, 7 92:1, 2 94:7	impact 6:19 10:15
	-		-
grant 53:1	hay 16:14	117:22 164:13	17:23 18:7, 14 19:9, 12
granted 81:2, 3 84:7	hazard 166:2, 19 169:23	highways 40:15 42:22	26:5 27:25 42:20
180: <i>3</i> , <i>4</i> , <i>11</i>	head 55:24 68:11	43:4 152:1	66:21 70:3, 7, 7, 12, 14,
granting 180:10	138:10, 12		
		hiking 174:24	16, 19 92:9 121:14
grass 83:10	header 155:24	hills 64:8 123:10	124:22 129:6, 12
grassland 81:19, 20 84:4	heading 45:15	hillside 66:9	134:11, 19 142:4
grasslands 83:15	health 18:22 134:8, 11,	hilly 178:13	143:12 150:16, 22
gray 128:5	21 135:22 175:2	hired 26:22, 23	152: <i>11</i> 155:8 156: <i>3</i>
Great 50:24 113:6, 10	hear 14:10 92:20 93:5	hiring 26:17	157:7, 11 159:20
132:21	170:9	hold 63:16 174:10	160:10, 18 165:19
GREATER 1:7 24:25	heard 37:23 38:19	HOLLAND 3:13 116:21	
			169:21 172:11 173:8
25:7 178:17	92:23 105:17 106:10	Holtz 6:23, 24 7:17	175:7, 10, 17, 19 176:14
greatest 175:7	114:19 127:12 128:2	Holtz's 6:6	impacted 24:17 69:25
greatly 180:22	141:9, 15	home 129:8 157:2	impacts 6:18 11:14, 15
0	· · ·		
ground 64:3 84:11	HEARING 1:20 9:10	homeowners 176:5	12:8 17:10, 12, 15
groundwater 67:8 68:1	26: <i>13</i> 34:9 43: <i>13</i>	homes 128:9, 12, 15, 18	18:2 <i>3</i> 19: <i>13</i> , <i>18</i> 20:8,
GROUP 3:14 4:8 76:17	92: <i>19</i> 93: <i>3</i> 114:6	129:5 156:22 158:24	17,20 21:1 25:16,17,
grouping 56:3	119:14 179:5 180:24	176:4 178:7, 10	19, 20, 21 33:1 107:25
growing 28:22		1	
	hearings 151:12 163:25	Honor 10:1 13:13 26:3	114:22 125:12 127:20
guess 13:15 14:8 17:14	174:10	29:18 30:24 31:8 41:3	133:13, 16 134:10, 22
20:5 21:14 23:8 31:15	heartburn 45:14	43:9 46:5, 12 74:7	139:16 140:19 146:6,
50:25 62:8 72:21	height 92:24 93:9, 14,	103:7 124:15 132:24	14 147:6 152:23 153:3,
82:23 85:19 93:17			
	18, 22 94:10, 21, 22	139:9 148:4 161:2	16,22 156:1,18 157:9
98: <i>12</i> 102:22, 25	97:24, 24 101:2 102:17	164:20 177:23 180:12	160:10, 13, 15, 20, 21, 22,
129:23 156:1 166:13	168:9, <i>16</i> 169:23 170: <i>1</i> 9	hope 155:4	23 164:4 165:6 166:17
167: <i>11, 18</i> 171:5, 8, <i>13</i>	heightened 128:4	horses 18:16, 18	171:1, 1, 4 172:5 178:2,
guidance 82:22	HEIM 4:19	housed 18:18	
-			18, 18, 19
guide 72:11	HELD 1:20 11:7 37:9	housekeeping 6:3 8:3	implement 68:2 140:14
guidelines 98:15, 20	46: <i>19</i> 66: <i>3</i> 73:23	houses 49:11 128:11	implemented 140:18
99:4 , 8	86:22 89:2 96: <i>11</i>	Howe 63:23, 25 65:24	importance 25:3, 7 27:4
guy 62:10	98:24 99:17 113:2	66:5 78:1, 17 79:3	Important 37:19 38:11
B- J 02.10		-	
	help 15:2 18:13 58:11	167:14	82:5 84:3 87:21 91:6
< H >	72:11 106:14 108:9	human 18: <i>18</i> , 22 39:20,	96:5 97:16 98:4
H5 87:20 88:6 90:17	133:11 156:5, 17, 19	25	106:19 146:6
91:9 92:5 94:6	helps 133:15	hums 176: <i>16</i>	improve 176:4, 6, 8, 11
H7 92:6,6 94:8	hemmed 45:16	hundreds 15:1	incentive 143:8
habitat 57:18 84:10	HENN 47:1, 5 48:7	hungry 148:7	incidental 61:18 80:4,
103:14, 17, 24, 25 104:7,	55:14, 25 56:6, 11	hydrogeology 67:21	11, 21 81:2, 14 82:6, 12,
11, 13, 16, 20 105:2	84:16 89:4, 10, 11, 12,	hydrology 67:13 142:3	13, 16, 24 83:1, 4, 6
107:21 108:1, 6, 10	14, 21 90:10 92:7		
		hypothetical 29:19	85:20, 22 86:3 117:7
127:5, 7	132: <i>17, 18</i> 182: <i>13</i>	hypothetically 102:12	Incl 1:21
habitats 81:24 103:20	herbicide 32:15	171:19 177:5	include 11:13 30:17
104:10, 10, 23, 24	herbicides 32:22		60:22 92:4, 5 94:5
Halderson 4:20	Herring 2:10	<1>	
	-		100:24 101:18, 20
Hall 4:5	H-frame 87:19, 24 91:2,	I-90 35:16 48:13	105:13 128:12, 20
Halpin 1:23 8:12 9:1,6	18 92:15, 18, 24 93:11,	I-94 37:25	included 16:3 19:17
10:6, 10 13:6, 7, 11, 12	<i>18</i> 94:2 101: <i>1</i> , <i>2</i> , <i>3</i> , <i>23</i>	IBA 88:11 91:10, 12, 25	22:23 23:9 27:5,6
21:25 30:23 31:20, 22	112:2	93:12 94:3, 7 96:25	30:14, 20 71:15 92:24
32:5 182:3 184:8	H-frames 94:5	97:8, <i>12</i> 100:7 101: <i>13</i>	96:25 97:1 100:17,20
Hamilton 3:11	Hi 79: <i>18</i>	106:18, 23 109:14, 20, 23	112:5 122:10, 11, 15
hand 167.8	high 20.16 64.1 107.7	IBA's 110.2	173.73 134.11 140.8

high 29:16 64:1 107:7

157:4 175:22 176:20

higher 59:15 122:12

IBA's 110:2

idea 24:21 96:13

identification 13:7

Gramann Reporting, Ltd.

handed 58:12 81:13

hand 167:8

1/9/2015

(800) 899-7222

123:23 134:11 149:8

includes 132:19

157:16, 23 164:2 173:7

1/9/2015	Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11		Page 10
including 25:17 55:1	instances 147:3	issues 15:2, 16, 19, 24	kinds 73:7 101:10
57:16 97:24 128:16	instrumentation 168:21	17:15, 23 29:6 39:14	King 3:5
133:14	insufficient 48:17	42:5, 19, 21 57:18	knew 159:14
inclusion 101:15			
	intend 84:19	58:14 72:1,9 73:1	know 8:8 14:25 18:12
inclusions 26:18	intense 18:18	94:16 112:11 133:16	20:12 21:16 23:20
inclusive 136:12	intention 14:23 101:7	137:15 143:13, 19	28:8 29:3 32:20, 24
income 18:4	intents 173:5	147:1 166:9, 18 167:16	35:11 39:8, 15, 19
incompletenesses 174:7	interact 29:5 174:3	180:14	43:15 44:18 45:19,21
inconsistent 98:7	interactions 49:10	issues, 143:14	58:7, 13 59:18 61:1, 25
incorporated 28:2, 3	interchange 35:15, 16	issuing 56:21 63:20	62:9, 12, 20, 22 65:17
incorporates 89:12	36:2, 6, 16 45:18 121:21	item 179:1	66:10 67:7 69:17 71:6
increase 19:22 129:14	interchangeable 121:25	items 6:17 73:5 101:8	75:8, 17 76:11 77:3
increased 114:20	interest 25:25 154:14	its 13:14 24:14 27:7	83:18, 20 103:1 110:11
incremental 175:17	157:15	64: <i>11</i> 80: <i>11</i> , <i>21</i> 110:8	123:16 125:15 140:1, 8,
independent 26:17	interfere 14:4, 5		
		125:11 133:13 136:5	11 141:13 142:21, 22,
independently 10:17	interject 26:4	-	25 145:20, 25 149:9
124:2 145:11 146:17	interrupt 88:18	< J >	151:5 157:21 167:19
147:7	interruption 147:13, 25	Jablonski 3:14 116:14,	170:12, 23 171:6
INDEX 5:10	intersect 121:25	<i>16</i> , <i>20</i> , <i>21</i> 118:24 183: <i>13</i>	172:14, 21 173:11, 20
Indian 44:6	intersection 122:1	Jackson 4:20 180:12, 13	179:25
indicate 52:21 79:20	interstate 36:19 38:8,	JAMES 5:6	knowing 141:11, 12
indicated 54:20 91:4, 10,	12 39:2 46:14 47:8,17	January 1:21 96:6	knowledge 50:3 59:17
13 175:21 176:19	48:19 49:8, 17 50:11,	181:11	71:12 132:5 137:16
indicates 128:18 139:21	13 54:22 88:1,7 92:1,2	JENNIFER 1:16 181:4,	142:3 143:7 162:24
140:12, 16 156:25	interstates 36:9	15	168:13
indicating 49:12 56:11	INTERVENOR 4:8	jogging 174:16 175:3	known 67:3 153:20
indication 10:14			
	intervenors 8:9	jogs 176:9	154:13, 16 172:11
individual 24:12, 14	Introduce 116:19 171:15	JOHN 5:4 44:19	knows 145:19
29:5 50:21 82:5 84:2	introducing 31:3	JOINT 1:4	Koch 3:18 174:15
individually 16:25 17:2	invariably 165:6	Joseph 4:5	KUNZE 3:17, 18 10:1,
28:17	invasion 16:15	Jr 3:5	5, 8 12:22 13:1, 4, 10,
industry 160:1	inventory 28:13	Judge 48:4 56:7 62:22	18, 22, 25 14:1 23:7
influence 94:19 101:17	investigate 169:21	70:21 81:8 85:12	26:9, 11, 14, 15 29:25
inform 44:7 173:10	investigating 149:1	144:19 167:16 168:6	30:4, 8, 23 31:4, 15, 21
information 10:25 11:7,	investigation 163:25	172:20	40:7, 10 41:7 43:5, 8
8 12:3, 6 17:9 46:15	164:3	judgment 125:15, 18	103:6, 7, 10 105:6
56:24 71:20 72:7, 10,	invited 76:6	147:1, 15, 17	120:22, 25 121:2
21, 23 73:14 82:23	involve 49:23	June 81:15	124:19 126:1,4 148:4
95:24 122:13 123:17	involved 30:7 41:19	jurisdiction 42:14	150:8, 11, 12 151:3
124:5 125:3, 8, 9 132:4	43:2 58:15 69:8, 13	jurisdictions 40:12	154:2, 5, 10, 23 155:1, 3
140:22 145:1 146:21	97:4 136:13 139:5		
		Justin 3:10	156:6 159:8, 16 160:8
147:21 149:11 156:17,	144:1 155:15 173:6	Justus 152:20	161:1 165:14, 17
<i>19</i> 157:22 158: <i>18</i>	177:2		166:23 167:21 168:5
162:23 164:1 167:20	involvement 71:15	< K >	169:5 171:15, 18
173:12, 13, 15, 18, 21	involves 164:3	KARSH 5:5 44:16	172:19, 25 173:4
informed 156:21 177:3	irrigations 25:20	120:1, 5, 17, 22 124:15	174:11, 19, 22 177:11,
inherent 18:7 170:25	Island 37:19 38:10	130:5 131:1, 5 132:7	22 182:5, 11 183:6, 16,
injury 15: <i>12</i> 29: <i>14</i>	87:21 91:6 93:12 96:5,	135:6 147:12, 24 154:1,	21 184:1
in-lieu 52:21	25 97:8, 12, 16 98:6, 7	3, 8, 21, 24 155:2 156:4	KV 1:6 118:7, 8
input 10: <i>12</i> 136: <i>14</i>	100:7, 9 101:13 106:18	161:6, 19 162:1, 5	124:13 176:15, 16
151:14 177:13	109:14, 20, 23 110:1, 14	163:1, 14, 17 164:17	
inquire 135:18	Island's 110:6	168:24 177:8 178:1, 20	<l></l>
inquired 137:11	issuance 57:18	183:15, 18, 22, 24 184:2	LA 1:7, 7 4:20 43:25
inquiries 59:12			
-	issue 14:19 18:14 39:5,	KATHLEEN 162:3, 8	59:11
inquiry 59:17 136:7	14 41:9, 18, 19 45:18	183:23 Kothar 150:20 154:19	LABOR 4:8
137:8, 20	47:6 48:24 57:20	Kathy 150:20 154:18	lack 71:6 145:17
insemination 16:8	64:14, 17, 18 68:10	155:9 162:1	laid 58:12
inserted 147:7	80:11, 21 98:12 102:22	keep 50:12 73:13	Lake 53:7, 10 54:14, 20
insight 137: <i>18</i>	111:12, 12 138:19	kilovolt 122:6, 7 152:22	land 10:11 12:18 15:16
insofar 138: <i>14</i>	139:17 140:23 141:14	175:23 176:1 177:16	17:11, 11, 22 18:6 19:4,
install 82:18 84:6	143:24 144:7 171:20	kind 76:18 83:24	10 20:18, 23 21:3, 12
instance 118: <i>14</i>	issued 57:21 58:3 70:4	104:18, 22 149:4	23:17, 25 25:2 27:14,
	85:23, 24	,	17 28:14 53:5, 14, 22
	·····, •·	1	

Gramann Reporting, Ltd.

Page 11

122:19 123:2 126:16, 20 154:19 landholders 155:17 landowner 17:20 19:16, 21 28:6, 9, 10 29:11, 13, 14, 17 30:2 50:21 157:25 158:8, 11 177:1 landowners 11:13, 15, 23 14:24 25:15 27:24 29:5 142:2 164:4 173:10, 15 174:3 landowner's 19:16 LANDS 2:13 12:11 129:15 154:8, 25 landscape 104:25 176:2 178:14 lanes 123:14 language 83:8 LARDNER 2:4 large 26:13 38:11, 16, 21 67:11, 17 73:5, 7 123:10 142:15 152:2 larger 11:20 20:20 21:19 166:12 176:16 late 7:14 155:5 latest 111:15 LAURA 3:17, 18 10:8 40:10 121:1 150:12 165:17 LAW 3:8, 9, 14 56:21 layer 24:2 128:18 147:9 layers 12:9 lead-up 139:20 learn 26:24 leave 8:6 31:19 44:11 103:1 leeway 14:21 Legal 5:4, 5 29:19 length 27:7 115:19 116:7 122:5 124:1 lengthy 166:11, 25 Leon 67:3 141:20 Leopold 88:11 Leopold-Pine 37:19 38:10 87:21 91:5 93:12 96:5, 24 97:8, 12, 16 98:6 100:7,9 101:13 106:18 109:13, 20, 23 110:1, 6, 14 LEPINSKI 5:6 letter 96:4, 23 98:7 174:5 letters 90:6 138:6, 22, 3:14 23 157:13 174:1 level 16:6 24:2 59:16 73:2 levels 117:3 18 libraries 30:20 light 82:21 84:6 lighting 169:12, 17, 24 170:1,17 limitation 168:9, 16, 19 169:14

limitations 123:11 145:8. 12 169:24 limited 104:17 106:23 145:4 limiting 19:10 limits 66:11 179:19 LINE 1:6 16:17 18:21 22:15 24:10 38:7,17 39:1 41:10, 20 42:6 45:1 47:7, 25 54:12, 21, 22 55:20 56:1, 17 58:4, 17 65:13 67:11 80:5 83:17,21 84:4,8 91:11. 13 95:5, 6 97:24, 24, 25 104:5 105:17, 19 106:14 111:7 122:6.7. 12 124:4, 12, 13 126:11. 20 128:13 129:9, 10 131:18 148:6 149:20, 20 152:20, 21, 22 153:1 154:7 156:23 157:5, 9, 14 158:25 168:15 170:24 175:4, 8, 12, 15, 18 176:9, 11, 15, 16 177:16, 19 178:5, 8, 11 lines 10:10 11:11 19:10 24:4,8 29:16 38:24 41:8 45:19 49:14 52:20 53:3, 13, 21 72:2 87:18 117:12 124:2 125:22 126:14 128:16, 19 129:13 137:4 153:8, 14, 17, 19, 24 163:23 164:12 165:22 170:11 175:9. 22. 23 Lisa 2:9 list 18:9 25:24 30:13, 15, 17 32:8 157:16 listed 12:20 21:7 80:1, 16.19 137:9 170:20 listened 34:20 124:8 144:13 170:8 listening 171:8 literature 136:2 138:19 little 60:15 71:12 72:22 74:8 76:15 91:11 111:3 117:1 live 18:6 38:24 93:2 lived 158:11 livestock 19:1 living 18:9, 23 LLC 1:4 2:15, 19, 24 LLP 2:4 4:5,9 load 117:9 loads 117:24 127:15, 17, local 103:25 134:3, 4 153:8 173:9, 14 174:3 locate 47:24 54:21 located 47:18 128:25 locating 142:2

location 15:24 17:13 49:24 67:20 70:8 91:2 100:1, 11 101:3 102:17 106:10 142:10, 11, 18, 20 143:17, 19 153:20 158:24 161:16 169:12 locations 35:13 47:13 70:11 72:8 139:25 142:7 151:10, 11, 20 logical 110:11 long 61:1 115:18 142:4 150:1 Long-Eared 79:21 longer 52:23 102:2, 3 131:22 long-term 12:19 68:3 look 23:24 24:14 59:23 83:10 135:25 156:17 180:23 looked 11:2 137:12, 21 147:3 152:2 looking 19:24 22:4 27:2, 3, 3 56:10 58:19 71:22 155:22 looks 135:19 loosely 71:10 LORENCE 5:4 9:4, 19 13:11 26:3, 10, 11 33:8, 11 34:4 35:3 41:3 44:14, 15, 17 45:10 46:1 50:6, 9, 23 113:7 114:3 115:24 119:2, 8, 9, 12 125:25 126:3, 4 182:4, 8, 16 183:11 Lorenz 95:1, 13 127:11, 13 Lorenz's 170:6 lose 18:21 117:25, 25 loss 16:14, 16, 18 17:11 20:23 104:13 107:21, 25 117:9 176:23, 24 losses 16:15 160:18 lost 104:7 lot 39:10 59:16 62:12, 22 64:7 67:7 72:7 105:17 146:3 156:5 163:11 167:1 lots 155:4 low 168:22 lower 21:18 27:8 176:14, 14, 14 Luther 3:5 LYNN 1:16 181:4, 19 < M > M2 92:16 ma'am 161:21 178:23 machine 181:9 MADISON 1:7, 22 2:16, 21, 25 3:6, 11, 15, 24 4:10.16

magnetic 127:9

magnitude 165:5 mail 152:17 mailing 30:13, 15, 17 157:16 mailings 173:22 Main 2:16 3:15,23 4:20 64:20 maintain 32:12 54:21 Maintenance 40:18 42:3 major 25:16 majority 141:17 making 140:10 141:24 142:19 164:16 managed 173:11 MANAGEMENT 2:3 60:19 64:19 65:4 81:21 83:15 84:4 97:19 106:11 manner 117:3 map 13:14 21:14 24:4 76:16 89:20 90:1, 18, 24, 25 91:3, 6, 16 128:15 158:22 mapping 152:4 maps 59:23 72:6, 14, 17, 19 73:11 76:7 89:10 128:21 157:13 Marcel 2:15 133:2 165:4 Marilyn 131:2, 3, 8 183:17 Marinara 148:10 mark 13:5 marked 13:7 56:5 88:13, 16 89:20 92:7 184:7 marking 91:11, 13 105:17, 19 markings 169:12, 17 Marsh 35:18, 22 Martin 3:5 Massasauga 79:21, 24 81:1, 4, 14 82:4 83:2 84:1 86:6 materials 146:20 math 21:25 22:1 matter 30:7 61:6 73:16 matters 6:3 40:12, 22 maximize 94:23 McCoy 43:14, 16 45:2 47:9 48:9, 11 49:17, 23, 23 50:20 144:3 145:5, 8,12 McGILLIVRAY 2:19 mean 10:15, 24 22:21, 22 26:23 35:11 58:8 62:1,9 72:22 81:24 83:25 84:3 102:21 110:11 147:16, 16 148:8 155:17 160:18, 20 167:18 174:23 Meaning 49:20 135:24

Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11

Page 12

1/9/2015	Transcript of Proce	eaings, volume 11	Page 12
			1
160: <i>14</i> , <i>23</i>	misspoke 62:15	118:3	26:8, <i>12</i> 29:23 30:1, 5,
means 10:18 64:16	mister 56:11	MUNICIPAL 4:3 172:3	25 31:7, 11, 19, 23 32:2
meant 56:1 107:4 140:1	mitigate 17:8 18:14		33:5, 7, 12, 15 34:2
measure 105:16 108:7	25:16 53:9 86:9 97:23	< N >	35:5 37:7, 10 40:5
measured 128:21	101:21 133:7, 11	name 9:5 34:5 54:11	43:10, 12, 22 44:3, 7, 10,
measures 65:9 100:25	171:19 175:10	99:22 114:4 120:6	15, 18, 22 45:8 46:2, 10,
101:11 106:6, 10 141:1	mitigated 14:20 15:19	131:6 133:2 162:6	17 47:2 50:5, 24 51:2,
169:25 170:2, 18	17:10, 16, 19 19:19	narrative 76:18 123:18,	5, 8, 12 52:3 54:8 56:8
mechanism 64:20, 21	25:23, 25 108:1 160:11,	22	62:12, 20, 23 66:1
138:25	12 177:6	narrow 47:24	68: <i>1</i> 9 70:22, 25 73:2 <i>1</i> ,
mechanisms 86:3, 7, 10	mitigates 53:18 54:1	National 53:5, 8, 14, 16,	24 74:4,9 75:22,25
media 157:21	mitigation 26:5 52:22,	22, 24	77:6, 9 79:2, 5, 7, 13
meet 37:2 64:23	24 57:2, 24 91:5, 14, 17,	native 63:6 108:9	81:9 85:13, 16 86:17,
meeting 41:11 61:19	24 93:19 94:23 96:2	NATURAL 4:13, 14	20 87:1,4 88:18,25
71:20 72:18 73:10	97:5, 7, 9, 10, 20, 21, 22	51:7 84:24 123:9, 11	89: <i>3</i> , 8, <i>17</i> 90:7 95: <i>15</i> ,
76:7 151:11, 23	98:2, <i>16</i> 99:7, <i>10</i> 100:6,	133:20	17 96:8, 12 98:22, 25
meetings 11:6 58:18, 24	8, 14, 24, 25 101:5, 11	nature 41:24 127:16	99:15, 18 102:11, 21
59:7 72:5, 15, 20 74:14,	105:13, 16 106:4, 6, 22,	172:17	103:4, 8 105:8 108:13,
<i>18, 19, 22</i> 76: <i>12</i> 150: <i>21</i>	24 107:9, 12 108:6	near 35:17 40:13 66:6,	22, 25 109:5 110:9, 16,
151:6, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20,	109:24, 25 111:22	7 93:11 127:1 170:10	<i>20, 23</i> 111: <i>1, 11</i> 112: <i>9</i> ,
21 152:7 174:2, 2	112:5 133:16 140:15,	nearby 129:6	<i>24</i> 113: <i>5</i> , <i>10</i> 116: <i>1</i> , <i>13</i> ,
meets 36:5	17, 25 141:11 166:17	necessarily 65:17	<i>19</i> 118:25 119:4, 7, 10,
Megan 4:15	169:24 170:1 171:1, 2	106:25 178:17	13 120:20 130:1, 4, 6
Mele 3:23	mitigations 169:3	necessary 45:22 86:12	132:9, 15, 21 135:13
member 23:24	mixing 25:18	166:18	139:10 144:20 148:3, 5,
memo 179:2 180:2	MN 2:11		
		need 7:24 8:9 12:25	11, 13, 17, 23 149:3, 15,
mention 20:18 169:23	models 128:22	26:22 31:20 34:25	18 150:8 151:2 158:20
mentioned 29:4 32:6	modification 163:20	47:13, 17, 22 48:12, 22	159:1, 4, 6 160:4, 7
37:16 60:7 65:20 80:1	modifications 93:23	49: <i>18</i> 55: <i>19</i> 65: <i>1</i>	161: <i>3</i> , <i>21</i> 163: <i>4</i> 164: <i>21</i> ,
106:17 143:18 170:9	modified 71:9	66:17 73:2 84:13 86:9	24 165:11 167:18, 25
mentions 66:25 141:17	moment 23:23 98:9	95:17 105:3, 13 110:19	168:3 171:17 172:22
merely 94:21	119:7 172:8	111:13, 22 112:5 113:6,	173:1, 23 174:20
•			
met 55:3	monetary 161:17	7 126:21 129:22	177:24 178:22, 25
method 96:2 153:16	money 53:5, 13, 21	132: <i>17</i> 143: <i>3</i> 154: <i>14</i>	179:6, 10, 12, 17 180:4,
MH 35:15 36:2 45:15	152:6	163:5, <i>10</i> 167:20 169:3	8, 16, 19
MICHAEL 1:10	monitor 26:17	179:21, 23	nonorganic 16:12
microphones 51:9	monitored 61:2	needed 14:24 79:20	normal 166:8
Middleton 3:18 59:11	monitoring 114:16	needs 163:24 164:2	
			Normally 67:23 127:19
167:10 172:3	monitors 28:11	negative 156:14	north 38:12 115:1,6
migratory 38:21, 22	month 84: <i>18</i>	negotiations 155:16	121:16 181:6
mile 115:13, 19 116:7	months 61:6	neighborhood 174:14	northbound 41:11, 22
122:8	Morey 167:9 168:10	neighboring 16:12	NORTHERN 1:4 58:25
miles 122:3 169:13	170:10, 14, 25 172:2	neither 70:13	59:6 71:8 79:21
Milwaukee 2:5 181:2, 7	MORGAN 2:9	NERC 115:7, 12, 17	note 8:2 10:12 31:13
mind 62:2 103:14	morning 10:6, 7 35:8	116:22	40:3 54:25 68:23
minimal 153:3	37:15 40:8,9 52:6,7	network 118:18, 19	124:16
minimize 14:18 53:9	55:12 79:16 87:7,8	Neumeyer 113:8 114:1,	notes 181:10
68: <i>3</i> 114:2 <i>1</i> 133: <i>15</i>	139:17 141:15 162:17	5, 16 115:25 116:5	notice 39:23, 24, 25
140:18	Mosca 63:22 68:13	183: <i>10</i>	40:1 150:21 151:4, 5
minimized 143:24	71: <i>10</i>	N-E-U-M-E-Y-E-R 114:5	157:13 166:2, 18
minimizes 53:18 54:1	Mosca's 59:22	NEW 1:6 6:5 21:2, 3,	notices 166:8, 9
minimum 16: <i>18</i> 64:24,	motion 179:20, 22	12, 21 22:9, 16, 19, 24	notification 32:21
24 65:2	180: <i>10</i>	23:1, 4, 4, 5, 9, 14, 17, 21	notified 157:25
Minneapolis 2:11	move 14:25 23:22	66:6 74:5 107:22	NR 60:8, 9, 12 61:1
MINNESOTA 4:3	129: <i>15</i>	108:2 115: <i>14</i> 117: <i>3</i>	NSP 22:4
minor 142:14 163:20	moved 15:23	118:15 123:3 156:18	NSPW 2:8
minute 37:8 95:3	movement 153:7	164:3, 4 175:8, 15, 18,	number 6:7 16:18
98:23 99:16 100:4	moving 14:2, 22 15:1, 3	<i>19</i> 178: <i>12</i>	18:17 23:10 24:16
164:22	MRA 163:9, 21	NEWMARK 1:10 6:2,	27:13, 21 61:12 69:17
minutes 152:1,8	multiple 74:18 97:23	8, 22, 25 7:4, 7, 10, 13, 18,	88:14, 19 89:5, 15
Mirror 53:6, 10 54:14,	101: <i>18</i> , 21 105: <i>14</i> , 23	23 8:1, 5 9:2, 22, 25	96: <i>14</i> 112: <i>15</i> 121: <i>5</i>
19	114:21, 25 115:4, 11	10:3 12:24 13:2, 5, 8,	124: <i>1</i> 126:2 131: <i>15</i>
		12, 15, 23 22:23 23:3	138:11 154:4 160:20
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11

Page 13

1, 5, 2015		culligs, volume II	
166:9, 11, 14 167:14	22 85:1, 7, 11, 13 86:1,	order 8:8 26:18, 25	165:22 166:22 172:10
173:22	15 89:8, 16, 19 90:7, 21	55:18 56:22 57:6, 20	175:6 179:19 182:2
numbers 7:5 21:6	91:21 92:13, 13 93:4	70:4 78:20 94:5 97:1	PAGES 1:20 166:5
122: <i>16</i> 146: <i>19</i> 147: <i>4</i> , <i>4</i> ,	95:7, 19, 23 96:8 99:15	102:24 110:5, 10, 18	179:19
8 155:5 157: <i>16</i>	100:18, 23 101:10	111:23, 25 112:3, 19, 19	painted 128:5
NW 4:6	102:20, 21 103:2, 4	114:21 133:13 139:24	papers 92:11
	104:16 106:9, 13	142:17, 23	paragraph 123:1
< 0 >	107:16, 25 108:4, 12, 19,	ordered 26:21 28:12	parcel 24:2
oat 12:11	22, 25 109:18, 22	57:13	parcels 12:5
object 6:21 7:20 26:4	110:23, 24 112:9, 24	ordering 55:21	park 42:1 53:5, 7, 8, 11,
62:8 102:5 138: <i>17</i>	113:6, 10 116:13	orders 56:20 143:10	14, 17, 22, 24 54:14, 20
163:5 168:24 171:13	117:18 118:5, 25	ordinance 168:9, 16	55:3
177:8	120:20 122:17 124:1	organic 24:17 32:7, 10,	parks 73:7
objection 31:12 115:22	125:17 129:17 132:9,	16, 17, 21 33:1	Parrett 60:7 92:21
116:6, 9 135:5, 6	21 134:3, 14 136:13	organic-run 16:13	98:13
143: <i>14</i> 145: <i>17</i> 174: <i>17</i>	138:8 140:4, 22 141:5,	organize 150:14	Parrett's 124:6
objections 74:2	13 142:17 143:5,11	original 11:6 144:9	part 17:19 23:3, 4, 11
objective 170:17	144:5 145:11 148:15	148: <i>19</i> , 25 181:9	28:6, 15 35:1 43:21
obscure 106:14	149:3, 15, 18, 25 153:25	originally 137:21	63:6, 7 64:21 65:23
obstacle 14:8, 11, 19	154:20 156:2 158:19	ornithology 98:14	76:10 80:6 96:13
obtain 55:19 109:14	161:3 163:4 164:21	outbuildings 18:17 19:2	97:13 100:17 107:18
110:1, 6, 13, 18 159:18	167:7 169:6 177:24	outreach 11:1 157:23	144:10 146:6 150:23
obtained 55:21 61:9	178:22 179:21, 23 180:5	outreaches 151:22	151:6 167:2
62:7 125:4	older 117:2	outside 74:22 106:14	partially 50:16
obtrusive 176:16	Oliveira 2:15, 15	126:14, 19	participate 139:1
Obviously 6:21 124:20	132:24 133:1, 3 135:9,	outstanding 131:20	participated 58:18, 24
occur 32:16 39:3 83:19	<i>15</i> 161:8 164: <i>19</i> 165: <i>1</i> ,	overall 20:8 133:24	participation 173:24, 25
126:8	<i>3, 4, 10</i> 183: <i>19, 25</i>	176:4, 6, 8 177:12	180:20
occurred 39:15, 17, 18	Olsen 2:24	overhead 49:14	particular 29:22 35:13
126:7	ONALASKA 4:18	overlapping 123:4	41:18, 19 42:1 63:25
occurs 65:21	59:21 180:13	overrule 102:16	72:17 94:3 105:16
offered 74: <i>1</i> offers 17:6	once 16:22 61:9 62:6	oversight 61:10, 23 62:5	112:14 143:24 157:24
office 44:1	63:18 69:13 70:4 80:15,16 90:8 134:10	68:9	161:15
offset 126:15	149:4	overview 71:23 owned 47:20 48:11	parties 6:21 179:15
O'FLAHERTY 4:19	ones 99:9, 11 169:1	owner 10:19 28:16	partner 97:15
Oh 7:4 52:12 68:21	ongoing 96:1 106:10	owner-owned 24:2	partnership 96:25 97:8, 12, 13, 16
82:10 89:16 119:10	112:17	owners 10:13 19:1, 4	parts 133:23, 25
132:21, 21 148:17	online 37:21	24:3 155:8 175:6	party 8:9 30:10
165:12	open 49:11 102:22	176:23	party 8.9 50.10 pasture 12:11 16:16, 19
Okay 6:8 7:4, 7, 13 8:1	OPERATE 1:6	owner's 14:4	18:21 20:19, 24
9:2, 22, 25 10:3, 9, 24	operation 16:25 18:3	owns 47:23	pastures 18:17 19:2
11:8 14:12 22:3 23:3,	24:19 104:5 170:25		Paterson 2:20
15 26:8, 14 27:2 29:23	operations 12:14 16:4	< P >	path 174:14, 16
30:13, 25 31:7, 11, 19,	17:8 19:5, 11 24:17, 21,	p.m 180:24	paths 123:15 154:16
23 32:15 33:5, 12	24 49:11	P.O 4:15	172:12
34:20 35:3, 5 37:7, 22,	opinion 54:23 58:7	PA 2:9	patience 180:21
24 38:1, 14, 19 39:13	60:1 76:13, 22, 23, 25	Pabellon 3:5	pattern 14:4, 14, 15
40:2, 16, 20 41:16	77:3 93:14 96:21, 24	paddock 20:19	Paul 120:1, 3, 8 183:14
42:12, 12, 16 43:5, 10,	97:6 98:7 106:4 135:1,	page 10:10 11:11 16:1	pavement 47:14 48:21
<i>22</i> 44: <i>3</i> 46: <i>1</i> 49: <i>4</i>	12 140:4	17:6 21:10, 12 22:8, 8	paying 43:20, 23
50:4, 24 51:2, 5 54:8	opportunities 174:9	23:17 25:14 27:3	P-East 35:14 36:2
55:8, 16, 25 56:14 57:4	opportunity 20:10	31: <i>10</i> 41:8, <i>14</i> , <i>15</i>	41:2 <i>1</i> 45: <i>14</i>
59:9, 20 60:7, 12, 25	72:10 73:16 77:1	52:20 53:3, 13, 20	people 11:18, 20, 22
61:25 62:4, 23 63: <i>10</i> ,	92:20 93:5 94:25 96:4,	55:16 58:17 66:25	19:24 39:9 137:16
25 64:5, 10, 13, 16	18 177:15	74:1 79:19 82:2,9	138:24 146:4 152: <i>3</i> , <i>15</i>
66:16, 25 67:6, 10 68:9,	opposed 60:3 117:13,	87:18 95:5,6 121:5	173:19 174:5, 23 178:9
13 69:4, 10, 20, 24	19 147:4	123:1 125:25 126:2	PEPPEY 181:19
70:20 73:18, 21 74:4, 6,	option 52:22, 24 59:20	131:18 139:15 149:21	perceived 145:8
9 75:20, 22 76:12, 21	60:2	150:13 152:20 153:25	percent 27:18, 18 61:5,
77:5 79:2, 5, 8 80:15,	options 144:2 158:2	154:1, 2, 4, 9, 12, 16, 22	9,20 62:6 105:22
<i>19, 24</i> 81:7, <i>13, 22</i> 82:2,	oral 78:11	156:25 157:3 158:20,	122:4 123:2
25 83:8, 18, 24 84:13,		<i>23</i> 163:23 164:11	

Gramann Reporting, Ltd.

percentage 27:17 Perfect 155:7 performance 115:9, 11 periods 85:2, 3, 7, 9 peripherally 134:6 permanent 67:24 70:12, 18 permit 28:7 41:10 43:18 44:5 47:20, 24 56:21, 22, 24 57:3, 5, 5, 19, 19, 23 60:23 61:3 63:7.10.11 64:14.17 65:12, 15, 16, 20 66:18 67:22 68:2, 6 70:4 80:4, 11, 22 81:2 82:14 84:7 86:4.7 permitability 72:25 permitable 49:14 72:12 permits 42:13 55:19, 21 56:15, 18 85:20, 22, 23 143:2 permitted 104:3 permitter 85:22 permitting 40:19 41:2 60:16, 17 62:10, 18 63:9 perpetual 30:10 person 14:11 24:7 26:22 43:25 155:7 personal 71:12 personnel 38:15 persons 29:15 perspective 69:9 71:17 pertaining 35:1 pertains 159:18 168:9 169:6 pesticides 16:11 phase 16:17 phone 152:18 157:16 167:13 photo 66:5 physical 15:12 137:3 pick 148:23 picking 148:25 **picture** 66:14 pilots 171:23 **Pine** 98:6 PINES 4:9 place 32:20 67:23 75:5 90:8 104:12 112:18 142:4 156:25 175:22 placed 84:10 126:14 placement 15:15 69:25 101:16 168:14 places 107:6 151:25 152:2, 5 placing 114:24 plan 12:18 17:21 31:2 57:2 64:23, 23 65:1, 19 68:22 69:11, 12 97:5, 7, 9, 10, 19, 20, 21, 22 98:2 100:6, 8, 15, 17, 24 101:5, 8, 11, 17 105:13 106:5, 23, 24 107:9, 12,

14.18 109:24 110:1 111:22 Plankinton 181:6 planned 85:2 planning 57:16, 17 76:19 115:5.8 116:10. 17.23 plans 48:16 57:25 63:19 68:25 69:5, 16 71:14.15 plant 108:4, 20 109:2 planting 106:13 108:8 play 61:13 62:2 94:11 please 9:5 12:22, 23 23:23 62:24 63:2 88:14 114:4 120:6 124:20 131:6 133:9 141:6 143:15 151:9,18 162:6 163:18 172:8 plus 23:5 point 13:19 26:18 31:3 59:4, 8, 10, 11, 18, 18 71:23 73:14 75:17 78:20 92:3 96:15 105:20 110:10 122:1 123:16 142:7, 18, 23 170:17 174:17 pointing 25:9 points 94:6 112:3 pole 14:2 15:2, 4, 23 17:12 67:11 69:25 114:25 115:18 127:2 128:4, 5, 5 169:17 170:21 171:20 poles 14:22, 25 15:15 27:13 47:17 48:20 84:10 117:14 126:22 128:1 170:10, 13, 16, 20 175:13 pole's 17:13 POLICY 3:8, 9 populated 128:8 177:14, 15,20 178:6 population 81:4 populations 82:4 84:1 104:1 156:8 portion 23:8 43:18 48:8.10 55:16.19 56:1 58:4 87:19, 25 90:16 91:9 109:14 124:18 133:21 portions 56:3 69:24 position 58:2 120:9 131:9 162:9 positions 14:2 possibility 47:7 56:15 67:16 110:3 possible 14:24 67:20 68:11 75:4 76:23 86:11 93:25 94:12, 20, 24 108:1,3 114:20 123:12 133:17 136:12 148:19 163:24 165:8

169:15, 19, 24 170:1, 21 171:22, 25 173:16 Possibly 42:15, 16 93:21 126:23 164:6 postal 152:16, 16 post-released 151:10 potential 16:15, 17 17:1 18:14 20:8, 23 25:16 26:16 37:18 38:15 39:14 42:12 49:9, 13, 15, 20, 22 55:1 60:21 66:21 76:8 85:10 107:7, 17 117:11 168:23 171:3 176:24 potentially 10:21 16:20 32:18 57:17 61:8 66:10 67:12 127:2 133:17 144:10 156:8 164:4 171:23 Potts 2:5 6:4, 9, 24 7:3, 6.8,11,16,21,25 13:13, 20 31:8, 12 46:8 54:10, 11 55:8 62:8, 17 74:7, 11, 12 75:20 79:12 89:6, 12 90:3, 15, 21 99:21, 22 102:13, 14, 20 103:2 109:7, 10 110:12, 17, 24 132:19 135:5, 7, 11 163:5, 16 164:25 171:13 174:17 179:1,8 180:1 182:19, 22 183:5, 8 POWER 1:5 3:21 4:3 39:1 84:4,7 Poynette 35:17 36:8, 16, 18 practice 98:16 practices 17:7 60:19 64:19 141:25 **prairie** 173:6 pre-application 58:18, 24 59:4, 7 71:17 72:5, 15 73:3,9 74:14,18 75:2 76:6, 10 133:15 144:8 precautionary 134:14, 17,23 135:3 preference 54:20 93:20 prefiled 32:6 38:24 52:9 58:16 63:22 87:9 prehearing 179:2 180:2 preliminary 63:15 71:13 73:15 preparation 9:10 34:9 69:21 114:6 150:15 prepare 34:9 114:7 prepared 25:16 114:13 125:7 128:23 preparing 133:6, 10 135:4, 19 136:11 137:25 159:19 presence 18:19 49:12 64:6 170:24 175:9

present 60:1 78:11, 16 81:22 92:19 93:3 105:1 124:6 127:11, 25 178:15 presented 59:14, 20 76:7, 14 148:22 174:4 presenting 72:12 preservation 12:19 31:5 preserving 133:19 PRESIDING 1:10 Presumably 25:13 Presuming 26:23 pretty 43:3 prevent 41:22 133:6, 11 140:15 preventing 134:3 prevents 45:16 previous 70:11 147:13 Primarily 48:13 66:22 primary 64:5, 13, 16, 17 70:6 prime 23:15 25:2, 4, 6 27:22 principally 16:12 principle 49:7 134:15, 17, 24 135:3 prior 28:13 29:8 32:21 102:6, 9 138:22 139:21 173:12 private 48:23 50:17 155:17 probably 30:6 42:24 85:24 96:13 problem 51:13 148:1 problems 50:10 procedure 32:20 procedures 32:11 proceed 41:1 51:7 88:8 172:21 proceeding 52:10 71:8 78:5 87:10 99:6 100:23 PROCEEDINGS 1:11 6:1 42:7 58:11 181:8 process 30:2 53:1 60:17 64:21 66:15 73:4 75:18 76:6, 10, 19, 20 133:14, 15, 18 136:15 137:6, 20, 24 138:23, 25 151:9, 18 163:20 173:16, 24, 25 176:25 177:2, 3 179:24 processing 19:23 136:14 produce 18:3, 4 production 25:17 productive 23:16 25:4, 9.11 productivity 25:12 professional 148:15 program 52:22 **PROGRESSIVE** 3:14 project 12:15 16:22 17:9 18:11 24:23

1/9/2015	1/	9/	20	15
----------	----	----	----	----

Page 15

1/9/2013		eulitys, volume 11	Fage 15
26.24 20.11 17 22.7	DEC 11.6 99.12 22	70.22 71.2 5 70.0	24 129.9 11 12 144.25
26:24 28:11, 17 32:7	PSC 11:6 88:13, 23	70:23 71:2, 5 79:9	24 138:8, 11, 13 144:25
42:9 53:9, 18 54:1	96:6, 14, 19 102:8	99: <i>19</i> 103: <i>13</i> 105:7	145:3, 7
57:13 59:5 60:18	104:3 131:15 141:14	109:8 114: <i>13</i> , <i>19</i>	receipt 132:14 184:9
67: <i>17</i> 68:4 69:8, <i>16</i> , <i>18</i>	145:21, 21 146:17	115:24 116:1, 12 119:3	receive 152:13, 19
70:6 81:5 83:23, 24	150:21 151:5, 18	120:13, 18, 21 121:3	received 12:8 18:12
85:5 106:25 107:2, 3, 3	152:12 156:16 159:18	124:16 130:2 131:25	31:22 63:15 138:1
109:18 127:22, 24	166:19 167:7, 9, 14	132:23 133:4 137:2	
			140:22, 23 146:3
128:17 133:17 134:5,	168:22	139:9 148:7 150:17, 17	receives 17:20
<i>19, 19</i> 135:2 <i>1</i> 143: <i>19</i>	PSC's 151:9 155:12	161:2, 7, 8, 20 162:19	receiving 136:13, 18, 21,
149: <i>13</i> , <i>17</i> 153:7 160:9,	PUBLIC 1:2, 5, 22 5:10	163:2, 4 165:10 168:25	24 137:2 144:25 179:3
<i>13</i> 165:5 166: <i>11,13</i>	11:3, 4, 6 15:7, 9 30:20,	177:23 178:21	recognize 11:11, 12
168:12 170:22	22 99:24 101:12, 22	quick 147:12 161:7	81:17
projects 67:15 142:16	102:2, 16 110:5 111:10	-	
		quite 20:5 73:4 178:4	recollection 73:13
157:18	129:15 132:11 134:8,	_	recommend 87:24
project's 55:4 85:25	11 135:22 136:14, 18	< R >	134:18
proper 150:25 155:7	137:2 151:12, 14, 22	radiation 136:25	recommendation 16:24
properties 32:16 159:19	152:14 154:8, 18, 25	Rahn 120:2, 3, 8, 23	88:4 91:23 94:4, 9, 13
173:10	155:10 156:10, 16	121:1 124:18 129:24	recommendations 94:1
property 23:25 24:4, 8,		183:14	97:3 99:2 100: <i>1</i> 9
	157:18 163:25 173:24,		
9, 12, 14 25:11, 21	25 174:1, 9, 10, 12	raise 18:8, 9, 16 72:24,	112:3 168:23 169: <i>16</i>
29:15 32:10, 22 48:10,	175:20 177:13	25	recommending 134:20
23 49:24 50:1, 2, 17	publication 99:3	raised 6:17 16:18	reconstituted 117:3
53:2 55:3 61: <i>14</i>	published 99:8 151:17	160:11 163:25 166:9,	record 6:2 9:5 13:14,
125:21 126:6, 9, 19	174:4	18 167:16	<i>19, 21 31:14 34:5 37:8,</i>
155:8, 11, 13, 20 156:14	pull 7:22 146:7 154:14	ran 48:24	9, 11 43:15 44:12 46:6,
157: <i>19</i> 158: <i>9</i> , <i>13</i> 159: <i>9</i> ,	Purdue 164:15	range 106:1	16, 18, 19 51:10 52:19
<i>19</i> , <i>23</i> 160: <i>1</i> , <i>10</i> 161: <i>13</i>	purpose 14:16 18:2	rare 78:21, 24 86:6	54:15 62:15 63:3 66:2,
175:6 176:23, 24 177:4	31:2 165:7	rates 16:8	3 68:20 73:22, 23, 25
proposal 41:21 67:23	purposes 60:10 93:19	Rattlesnake 79:22 81:15	86:21, 22 88:12 89:1, 2,
116:6 118:6 125:21	115:11 173:5	reach 104:25	4, 19, 20 90:9, 20 96:9,
proposals 75:19	pursue 28:19	reaction 39:25	
			11 98:22, 24 99:16, 17
propose 6:15 8:7 36:4	purview 146:24	read 11:4, 5 15:7, 9, 10,	111:4, 18 113:1, 2
proposed 6:13 11:14	pushing 174:24	10 53:4 63:1,3 90:14	114:4 118:21 119:9, 10,
22:19 37:1 58:25 66:7	put 13:23 30:21 39:11	105:19 124:7, 8 141:8	<i>16</i> 120:7 131:7 148: <i>14</i>
81:6 83:12 84:17 98:5	41:21 45:5 46:16	156:10, 17 171:6	150:23 151:7 154:22
101:23, 24 106:20	47:13 137:7 147:4	175:20 176:19	159:4, 5, 7 160:5, 6, 7,
141:19 156:23 157:14	179:12	reading 68:15 177:13	<i>16</i> 162:7 164:22, 23
	4		,
159:2 175:4 176: <i>1</i>	putting 72:2	real 41:21 43:25 110:4	165:4 168:1, 2, 4
177:18		159:22	173: <i>17</i> 179: <i>11, 13, 15</i> ,
protected 42:9	< Q >	realign 41:25	16, 18 180:6, 7, 9, 17, 18,
protecting 134:8	qualify 104:9, 14	realignment 36:4 41:12	20, 22
Protection 9:9	question 17:25 19:8	really 29:18, 21 39:10	recorded 21:15
protocol 80:25 81:13, 18	28:18 29:21, 24 32:1	45:20 62:9 84:9, 11	recover 29:1
• ·			
protocols 81:19 83:9, 11,	44:4 46:13 50:7 58:8	101:9 102:23 104:18	recovered 160:19
12, 18, 20, 22	62:25 66:20 77:2	105:24 110:10 140:8	recreation 129:15 154:9,
provide 10:14 63:19	80:24 86:2 87:23	165:20	25
72:10 73:12 77:1	90:16 102:25 111:7, 16,	reason 49:7 83:5 110:4	recreational 53:10, 19
78:20 87:12 103:17, 20	19 116:5, 14 126:5	134:22 150:4	54:2 154:16 172:12
108:5, 10 127:7 129:9	133:8 134:23 135:15,	reasonable 103:18	RECROSS-EXAMINATI
131:20 168:8 169:20	<i>16</i> 136:4 139:3, 8	104:8 105:4 107:19	ON 74:10 76:2 109:9
173:15	141:7, 8, 9 146:10	156:19 164:6	182:22, 23 183:8
provided 10:16 12:6	147:14 149:4, 8 150:24	reasoning 76:17	re-deck 41:24
23:20 52:8, 11, 13	158: <i>13</i> 159:9, <i>13</i> , <i>17</i>	reasons 18:20 145:4	Redirect 33:7, 11 45:9
53:12 71:10 72:14, 17	164: <i>19</i> 165: <i>1</i> 166: <i>10</i>	158: <i>16</i>	50:25 70:25 71:2, 3
78:5,6 87:9 90:19	167:22 171:5 174:2 <i>1</i>	rebuild 41:23	85:16, 17 86:16 111:2,
92:16 95:12, 24 98:15	175:25 178:2	rebuttal 9:12, 13, 16	4, 5 119:1 130:4 161:5
135:9 140:19, 20	questioning 54:13	34:10 35:20 55:17	
			165: <i>11</i> 177:24, 25
provides 90:24, 25	questionnaires 16:2	152:20 162:13 163:9	182:21 183:2, 9, 22
providing 60:5 157:16	questions 9:15, 23 10:2	recall 32:13 55:16 60:5,	184:2
provisions 55:7	13:24 26:6 28:19	10 63:25 64:8 66:22	reduce 105:14 140:14
proximity 156:7 157:4	30:24 31:23, 24 34:14	68:15 69:4 72:19 75:4,	reducing 106:6
178:11	35:4, 9 37:11, 24 40:11	17 136:18, 21, 24 137:2,	reductions 16:19
prudent 29:7 41:1	43:8, 10 52:25 54:8	,,,,,	re-enforce 84:13
Farmene w/1/ TLil			10-0010100 07.1J
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

	1/	9/	2	0	1	5
--	----	----	---	---	---	---

refer 88:13 89:4 91:17 remember 74:16 167:12, research 135:25 136:6, right 6:7, 22 7:18, 19 95:5 121:3 163:23 13 170:13 174:23 8, 19 137:9 8:2 9:22 12:2 13:12 164:12 167:7 removal 16:13 reseeding 60:13 61:23 29:25 33:15 34:2 reference 88:13, 23 remove 75:14 62:6, 11 36:13, 21 37:10 41:18 96:6, 14, 19 117:15 removed 104:20 105:2 residence 157:8 45:8 46:2, 10 47:2 131:15 166:16.24 129:11 residences 25:21 49:16 50:5 51:8 62:3 167:7.14 172:20 173:2 reopening 164:8 resident 157:10 63:21 65:8, 21 70:22 175:25 repeat 62:24 133:7 residential 103:16, 23 74:19 77:6 80:6 86:17 referenced 54:14 96:19 141:6 150:24 104:4 127:6 155:8 87:1 89:22 90:14 91:1 116:22 rephrase 39:16 135:13 156:1 175:6 93:4 94:14 99:18 referred 47:16 71:22 105:8 109:5 111:1 replaced 127:2 residents 156:10, 13 89:19 99:9, 12 128:10 replacement 176:13, 21 173:20 174:13, 14 112:13 113:5 116:1 158:6, 23 replanting 108:2 175:1 177:14 119:4 121:6 130:1,4 referring 12:5 23:21 replied 12:1 resolved 41:2, 6 45:18 132:11, 12 135:1 75:9 88:16 89:10 92:7 replies 16:3 **RESOURCES** 4:13, 14 139:10 141:21 149:2 reply 20:6, 14, 15 138:7 51:7 84:24 85:4 98:20 123:21 149:24 150:8 154:4, 10 165:11, 123:11 133:21 151:21 154:22 179:19, 21, 23 12 172:24 178:19, 25 refers 10:11 report 159:22, 25 170:3 respect 36:7 87:12 179:10 refined 59:8 73:17 Reported 1:15 181:7 168:14 right-of-way 14:3 21:2, reflected 122:16 123:19 reporter 141:8 respond 44:1 3, 7, 11, 18, 19, 23 22:7, reflects 31:16 10, 11, 14, 16, 16, 24 23:9, reporters 113:4 181:5 responded 131:23 138:4, regard 72:8 85:19 Reporting 1:17 181:6 8,21 12, 14, 15, 19 27:8, 17, 22 112:2 124:24 167:9 reports 16:1 respondents 125:5 32:22 38:3 45:2 46:15 regarded 18:24 represent 24:9 54:11 responds 163:9 180:2 47:8, 12, 19, 19, 24 48:1, regarding 16:4 37:18 66:5 74:12 84:16 91:8 response 7:2 8:4 33:6 9, 14, 17, 22 49:5 50:11 43:14 53:1 55:7 58:11 99:22 133:3 171:10 43:11 53:12, 20 66:13 66:6 104:6 106:15 71:6 72:7 86:2 87:19 70:24 74:3, 8 85:15 representation 102:7 107:22 108:5 114:22 91:2 92:23 93:9, 14 88:21, 21 89:5, 10, 14, representatives 49:11 121:12 122:11, 18 94:2, 10 96:22 97:3 15, 21 90:11 138:15 represented 100:22 123:3, 3, 4 129:12 98:2, 4 99:3, 7, 10 134:17 145:13 139:4 144:16,25 157:1, 20 175:14, 15, 18 109:19 111:7 124:1 representing 37:16 145:14 158:8 179:20 178:6, 12 127:5 137:3 140:17 represents 91:3, 16 Rights 27:25 28:6, 10 **responses** 10:13, 16 144:2 150:18 152:12 123:2 11:1, 13 89:13 132:16 29:13 30:2 47:22 165:24 174:*I* request 7:1 28:15 138:11, 13 ring 55:22 64:3 risk 64:1 97:24 101:17, regardless 47:21, 23 89:13, 14, 15, 21 93:24 responsibilities 153:12 83:24 responsibility 150:14 131:19 132:16 138:1, 21 105:14 117:19 regards 42:23 71:13 17 140:24 144:16,25 responsible 29:14 56:21 risks 117:23 100:14 145:13, 21, 22, 24 167:9, River 53:23 54:2 107:8 165:23 **Region** 43:25 17 179:18 115:16 rest 35:17 36:8 92:5 regularly 174:15 Requested 141:8 109:18 113:9 121:19 RMR 1:16 181:5 regulations 169:2 requesting 96:25 174:6 restoration 25:19 70:2 Road 3:18 22:16 115:1 regulatory 64:13 69:6 requests 96:22 131:22 restored 70:11 123:18 158:6, 10, 12 96:22 97:14 139:5 144:11 restricting 126:17 174:15.25 related 8:3 18:23 175:2 require 18:16 26:20 restrictions 86:9 roads 123:14,15 relates 30:1 57:25 63:6 64:21 65:9 result 134:4 158:10 **ROBERT** 34:1,6 182:7 relation 42:9 128:19 67:21 68:6 69:21 70:1 role 96:21, 22 retract 141:9 relationship 40:11 43:3 104:23 110:5 111:8 re-vegetated 61:4 **Room** 3:5 92:19 93:3 122:18 142:8 164:8 135:21 re-vegetation 60:20 route 11:15 16:23 17:4 relative 47:14 117:19 169:11 20:16 28:17 29:9 61:11 63:8 140:10 required 23:20 48:18 **review** 30:3, 4 42:8 43:16 45:4 49:6, 16, 19, release 150:22 151:6 57:10 61:2 64:23 80:5 73:11 94:25 95:8.20 22 55:5 56:20 60:2 Reliability 115:6, 7, 11 86:13 111:9 122:8, 12 96:4, 18 133:14, 18 63:16, 17 65:14 69:13 reliance 147:8 123:3 141:14 170:18, 18 134:2 138:18, 23, 24 71:7, 7, 10 76:24 81:23 relied 10:25 11:2 **requirement** 26:18 57:8 139:1 146:6 149:16 84:20 85:4,6 88:10 relocated 153:17 61:17 70:10 142:24 152:14 159:21 100:3 102:3 104:3 relocation 55:2,7 143:7, 9 170:19 reviewed 12:10, 21 42:8 107:23 109:15 121:15, 153:20 176:3 requirements 30:16 55:13 63:22 107:14 16, 16, 18, 20, 23 122:3, 5 rely 124:24 165:18 56:23 60:13 61:19 118:2 133:21 134:5,9 128:7 139:24 143:11, 172:20 173:9, 14 65:16 69:7 115:9 136:6 153:10 166:2 23 149:6 156:20 158:3 relying 24:5 147:9 159:2 163:20 169:10 requires 143:2 179:2 reviewing 136:13 145:3 173:19 **re-route** 54:15.18 reviews 57:10 routes 19:1, 5 56:4 remainder 121:20 re-routes 6:11, 13 revised 7:16 58:25 59:1, 8 71:8, 16 remains 80:20 72:4, 8, 24 75:6 76:8, REYNOLDS 2:15

Gramann Reporting, Ltd.

Transcript of Proceedings, Volume 11

Page 17

13, 23 84:19 98:5 157:18 SESSION 1:13 slated 153:19 106:20 141:18, 19 seeding 63:6 set 117:14 slight 86:12 144:10 148:19, 21, 25 seeing 72:19 175:13, 22 share 156:5 small 90:14 98:12 routing 8:10 35:2 180:23 shared 122:18 166:11 36:10, 23 47:7 50:1 seek 104:21 105:3 sheet 131:15 162:16 smaller 11:21, 22 21:17 59:20 71:13 74:22, 25 seeking 109:12 167:4 173:10 75:11 141:24 144:2, 14 seen 56:12 65:18 sheets 131:24 169:23 SMMPA 4:4 145:5, 12, 22 146:1 167:14 shelter 104:21 snapshot 66:10 row 22:9, 9 24:18 Segment 15:8 20:16,18 socioeconomic 138:1, 17, short 93:21, 24 94:12, 24 Rowe 78:1, 2 79:4, 5, 16 27:8, 13, 16, 21 35:14 shortest 27:7, 12 21 139:5, 6, 7 161:9, 12 36:2 37:25 38:2, 7 182:24 shorthand 181:9 soil 25:18 R-O-W-E 79:6, 8 42:1 56:2, 15, 15 57:11 shout 51:11 soils 28:25 rows 103:20 58:5 60:4 66:7, 22 show 47:11 56:5 65:24 solicited 174:5 **RPR** 1:16, 16 181:4, 15, 67:4 92:6 100:5 84:16 118:3 153:4 solution 15:25 101:25 109:15 121:14, 19 172.22 somebody 124:21 129:2 **rules** 47:15 18, 19 123:13, 18 128:7, showed 6:11 47:12 160:15 runoff 64:2 65:10 8 141:20 143:22 149:6 showing 76:8 128:15 Someone's 43:22 rutting 70:3 152:23 154:17 156:11 shown 147:10 Somewhat 66:24 105:20 159:3 164:8 168:8 shows 128:9, 11 158:23 143:24 < S > 169:12, 18 170:4, 22 shrubs 103:17 104:6 Sorry 13:4 14:10 20:5 S.C 3:22 108:5, 9 127:6 172:12, 17, 17 173:7 22:11 34:19 36:12 safely 119:2 175:8 177:19 178:4, 7, sic 13:6 128:22 41:14 52:8 65:25 76:1 safer 171:21 9, 10, 11, 11 **SICKLE** 3:22 89:9, 25 97:21 107:4 safety 47:16 segmented 43:3 57:2 side 45:21, 22 117:22 108:15 109:1,7 112:19 sake 23:22 116:21 121:6 122:23 segments 45:14 56:2, 4, 134:19 sat 72:19 12 59:6 75:16 76:16 127:23 147:25 149:25 sides 45:16, 20 47:10 84:17,23 88:5 91:7 150:24 155:22 159:24 sauce 148:10 125:22 126:6, 11 92:4 107:2 121:13 savanna 81:19, 20 sight 128:13 163:5 165:12 83:10, 15 84:4 122:22 178:3, 4, 15 significant 166:9 sort 15:3 29:18 67:22 significantly 103:24 SAVE 2:13 124:21 select 151:19, 19 166:25 saying 15:23 21:15 selected 16:23 38:7 157:7 sorts 29:20 76:5 100:13, 14 104:9 55:5 63:18 65:14 signs 36:18 SOUL 2:13 133:3 126:9 142:10 84:20 85:6 SILVER 5:5 44:16 165:4 says 36:18 80:8 82:22 selecting 151:10, 19 120:1, 5, 17, 22 124:15 sounds 55:23 98:12 123:2 125:20 self-interest 143:4 130:5 131:1,5 132:7 135:23 scenario 61:13 self-reporting 125:4 135:6 147:12, 24 154:1, source 67:7 103:25 schedule 58:12 86:5, 13 self-representing 10:8 3, 8, 21, 24 155:2 156:4 117:11, 11 146:19 scientific 134:21 135:20 161:6, 19 162:1, 5 40:10 121:2 150:13 sources 137:20 137:15 165:17 163:1, 14, 17 164:17 South 2:10, 20 3:10 scope 19:12, 14 149:17 self-weathering 128:1, 3 168:24 177:8 178:1, 20 4:15 60:3 121:16 scoping 136:15 151:13, sell 156:22 183:15, 18, 22, 24 184:2 146:4 176:10 15, 23 152:7 174:1 semblance 175:14 similar 52:25 53:12, 20 southbound 41:20 **SCOT** 5:7 semis 39:8 69:22 83:18, 20 SOUTHERN 4:3 59:1 screening 129:9, 11 Senate 30:18 simple 21:25 22:1 71:8 seasonal 86:5 send 44:13, 17 173:22, simply 97:15 154:15 Southwest 43:25 149:23 seat 87:4 22 167:22 spaghetti 144:9 146:7 second 25:14 35:15 sense 126:18 single 10:18 11:4 19:21 148:9, 18, 24 29:11 114:25 115:12, 46:6 52:8 69:20 88:19 sensitive 57:17 73:6 Sparta 76:24 17 117:21 140:6 156:8 speak 13:16 97:18 secondary 70:7 sent 16:2 152:16 sir 34:7 42:17 43:6 123:24 125:6 section 88:12 123:8, 24 50:15 157:13 173:25 speaking 102:11 127:7 124:14, 23 125:20, 23 sentence 140:2 148:8 167:13 171:8,9 site 84:12 127:8 128:7, 11, 14 separate 60:17 97:14 siting 40:12 72:1 specialist 63:11 65:4 129:1 153:13, 13 154:6, 138:16 sitting 58:6 82:25 specially 173:11 19 155:6, 19, 23, 24 serious 15:11 situation 40:25 41:2,6 specialty 12:12 24:18 165:21 167:5 served 179:15 68:6, 7 83:2 106:2 species 57:18 78:21, 24 sections 165:24 **SERVICE** 1:2, 22 53:8, 117:8 118:11 126:7 80:6, 13, 21, 22 81:1 security 137:3 14, 17, 22, 25 80:8, 14, 17 situations 61:21 71:19 82:6, 19 83:4 84:14 99:24 101:12, 22 102:2, sediment 64:2, 11 117:9, 25 146:11 85:9 86:5, 6, 10 104:22 SEE 5:10 12:24 21:11 16 110:5 111:10 six 34:12 105:24 106:3 108:9 27:2 32:6 58:25 59:22 119:15 155:10 size 140:9 specific 20:16 47:6 73:16 82:7 149:13 **SERVICES** 2:24 53:5 skip 29:24 48:8 60:22 65:9 72:8,

Gramann Reporting, Ltd.

(800) 899-7222

22 77:2 81:20 83:14,

Page 18

., , , 2020
23 84:10, 12 86:5
94:21 97:18 98:1
106:25 107:1, 2, 20
135:24 161:15 174:18
175:2
specifically16:654:2458:860:571:983:8
93:11 101:10 102:8
110:13 114:24 115:8
153:4 167:11 168:16
specifications 100:21
speed 170.23
speed 179:23 speeds 48:19
spell 108:23
spend 19:23 57:14
spoke 137:17
spot 42:2
sprayed 32:22
spring 67:19,21 68:1
139:22, 23 140:10, 13,
<i>16</i> 143: <i>1</i>
Springfield 13:10 31:1,
5
Springfield's 12:17
springs 66:20, 21 67:2, 3, 6, 12 139:16 140:19
3, 6, 12 139:16 140:19
141:1, 18 142:10, 19
143:4, 12, 20, 22, 23
149:5, 6, 8, 12, 22
stable 82:4 84:1
Stacy 78:1, 1, 2 79:3
182:24
STAFF 5:3 6:5, 13
7:11 8:7 38:18 44:8,
11 58:10 61:16 76:6
113:8 114: <i>1</i> 120: <i>3</i>
124:2 125:10 131:3
136:9, 11 137:8, 14, 25
139:6 145:22 146:17
157: <i>17</i> 162: <i>3</i> 183: <i>10</i> ,
14, 17, 23
staff's 146:2
stages 138:5
stand 46:16 47:5 120:2
131:2 162:2, 20 163: <i>13</i>
174:21
standard 66:11 83:22
98:14 115:9 116:10, 17,
22, 23, 23 153:11
standards 60:19 64:24,
25 65:2, 17 115:4, 7, 13
25 65:2, <i>17</i> 115:4, 7, <i>13</i> , <i>17</i> 117: <i>1</i> , 2, <i>23</i> , <i>24</i>
standpoint 115:21
stands 134:18
stapled 81:11
start 85:25 94:7
111.70 121.7 149.5 20
111:19 121:7 148:5, 20 started 8:8 138:23, 25
Starting 133:4
Starting 133:4 STATE 4:14 9:5 32:9
34:5 41:9 53:2, 7, 10,
23 54:2, 14, 20 55:2, 3
58: <i>17</i> 61: <i>14</i> , <i>14</i> 71:20

73:7, 7 80:11, 20, 21 82:15 114:4 120:6 131:6 136:2 137:17 139:24 146:24 162:6 165:23 181:1 stated 55:17 104:15 131:19 139:21 154:13 169:7 state-endangered 79:24 Statement 19:12, 20 26:5 28:1 42:20 78:19 124:22 150:5, 6, 16, 23 152:11 159:20 165:19 171:6 172:11 173:8 **STATES** 1:5 11:10 17:6, 21 20:15 25:14 29:13 82:3 123:18, 22 128:7 149:21 154:15 172:11 175:6 state's 80:25 statewide 25:3, 7 27:4 stating 174:12, 13 statutory 30:16 stay 49:25, 25 steel 128:3 Steele 87:2, 3, 7 99:22 105:11 183:3 steep 64:6 123:10 steer 15:4, 22 126:21 steering 15:12, 16, 24 STEIDTMANN 1:16 181:4, 15 step 66:15 76:9,11 Stephanie 3:10 steps 140:15 stipulate 169:22 stop 17:9 storm 60:9 62:18 63:6, 7, 10 64:14, 17 65:4, 10 66:17 straight 39:22 straighter 176:3, 11 strand 148:24 strategies 91:5, 8 97:23 101:15, 18, 21 105:14 112:5 140:18 141:11 strategy 97:23 stream 65:22 streams 64:2, 7 65:10 67:7.12 Street 2:10, 16, 20, 25 3:11, 15, 23 4:6, 15, 20 stretch 38:8 strike 63:13 88:3 92:14 145:6 146:18 strollers 174:24 structure 41:11, 22 92:16, 18, 23 93:19 94:10, 19 95:24, 25 97:24 99:25 100:11 102:17, 17 106:9 115:12 117:7, 15, 16, 20, 20, 21 118:6, 7 139:25

142:7, 11, 19 143:17 169:18, 23 170:20, 21 structures 42:13 47:14 48:18 87:19,24 88:1,3, 5 91:2, 14, 17, 18, 24 92:24 93:9, 11, 15, 21 94:3, 24 100:1, 11 101:2, 2, 3, 16, 23 111:9 112:2 114:20 115:5 118:3 142:2 168:15 studied 45:1 studies 138:21 139:5, 6, 7 169:9 study 6:18 47:6 59:4 138:15, 17 161:14, 15 168:8, 11, 19 Subdivision 28:2 173:7 subject 171:1 subjects 136:3 143:20 165:24 submission 64:22 submit 12:22 113:9 120:11 131:11 162:13 submittal 57:24 submitted 52:14 56:24 93:16 95:1 96:5 118:21 146:23 147:5 submitting 69:11 subSegment 87:20 88:6 91:9 94:6 159:3 subsequent 117:8 substantial 18:16 139:22, 23 140:2 Substation 45:15 115:2, 15 substitute 147:1, 15, 16 substituted 147:22 suffer 18:22 suffice 62:4 sufficient 72:23 sufficiently 111:17 suggested 100:23 suggesting 100:9 Suite 2:10, 21, 25 3:11, 23 4:6, 10 181:6 summaries 12:10 summarize 95:11, 16, 18 summary 11:19 22:5,8 superintendent 54:19 superior 164:7 supplement 44:11 57:22 supplemental 57:23 supply 158:18 support 54:18 76:18 152:3 167:3 suppose 110:3, 21 supposed 30:19 173:20 Sure 7:10 13:2 26:22 31:1 37:6 40:4 42:23 43:7, 14 44:9 52:20 67:9 73:19, 25 75:25 76:4 79:3 80:9 91:3 101:6,9 103:15 111:18

117:10 133:24 135:2 143:21, 25 150:16, 25 159:11 172:9 174:21 surface 140:14 surprised 166:13 surrebuttal 6:6 52:11, 17 87:9, 17, 18, 23 91:22 131:11 132:1 162:13 163:19, 22 164:11 surrounding 128:6 sur-surrebuttal 52:9 60:8 95:1 survey 10:13, 16, 18, 23 11:1, 17 12:1, 4 16:25 18:12 19:15, 21 84:14 125:4 149:12 150:7 surveyed 10:20 11:15, 24 surveys 10:11 11:2 19:23 23:25 78:22 79:20 80:6 survival 82:6 Susan 4:9 sustained 15:11 171:17 swan-type 112:14 switch 172:10 SWORN 9:1 34:1 47:1 52:2 78:2 87:3 114:1 120:3 131:3 162:3 183:10, 14, 17, 23 system 25:20 115:8, 10, 14 118:4 systems 152:4 < T > table 6:17 21:8 22:1, 22 27:2, 4, 6 121:3, 11 122:17 127:13 tables 22:7 117:4 122:14, 15 146:13, 20 147:2 tack 8:10 take 7:21 8:10 18:7 21:24 28:25 61:18 72:9 80:4, 11, 22 81:2, 14 82:6, 12, 13, 16, 18, 24 83:1, 4, 6 84:7 85:20, 22 86:4 87:1 112:18 117:12, 23 119:7 137:22 159:3 179:25 taken 11:16, 24 17:3 21:4, 12 23:17 46:7 113:3 118:11 158:15, 17 takes 28:21 80:17 104:12 135:4 talk 26:16 59:3 155:7 156:2 157:17 talked 137:19 149:5 171:16 talking 7:5 21:16, 21 23:19 48:7, 10 57:4 70:17 90:16 102:23

Page 19

1/9/2015	I ranscript of Proce	edings, Volume 11	Page 19
104.02 126.0 140.0	59.21 (2.19 70.20	1 4	
104:23 136:9 142:2	58:21 62:18 70:20	time 7:23 18:13 19:22,	126:11, 14 129:7, 9
147:17 154:24 158:9	73:18 86:16 90:5, 12	23 21:24 23:22 25:25	137:4 156:23 157:5, 9
168: <i>14</i> 172:23 174:18	105:6, 11 109:3 112:23	28:22 29:1 43:6 54:4	158:25 168:15 170:10,
tall 170:13	116:11 118:24 119:12,	57:11, 15 58:23 60:1	24 175:8, 9, 12, 18 178:5
taller 176:2	14 120:17 121:1,11	66:12 67:14 73:11	Transportation 34:8
tally 12:3 24:18	123:8 124:19 126:1,4	76:8 84:11 85:2,7	38:3, 15 42:13 43:17
TASK 2:14			
	129:5, 24 147:24 148:2	86:8 89:13 124:22	47:21 164:15 171:9
taxpayers 152:6	150:21 152:10 154:20	129:25 131:21 154:14	180:14
TECHNICAL 1:13	155: <i>1</i> 160: <i>3</i> 161: <i>1</i> , <i>19</i> ,	173:13	transposed 155:4
60: <i>1</i> 8 167: <i>3</i> 171: <i>15</i>	21 164:17 166:23	timeline 84:25	traveled 59:21 174:15
techniques 17:7 140:14,	172:25 175:1 177:22	times 105:12 177:4	tree 24:10
17	178:22	tiny 90:5	tree-lined 16:14
tell 66:14 82:25 116:17	Thanks 33:12 37:5	titled 81:13 92:9	trees 103:17, 20 104:6
124:21 159:17 161:11	46:2 48:4 51:2 55:8	today 9:16 34:15 52:14,	106:14 127:6 129:6, 8,
174:7	77:9 85:12 89:17	19 58:6 78:10 82:25	11
telling 174:5	112:25 130:6 132:22	87:13 114:14 120:13	Trevor 2:4 35:8
temporary 67:24 70:12,	180:20	131:25 162:19	tried 151:25, 25 152:5
16	theirs 147:1, 15	today's 9:10 34:9	triple 117:20
Ten 157:5, 6			
	thing 15:3 41:6 45:12,	58:11 114:6	trout 67:7
tender 54:6 78:25	23 153:7	Tomah 59:22 76:24	true 48:25 49:4 77:4
99: <i>13</i>	things 17:18 29:20	tool 64:13	80:25 84:3 131:21, 22
tendered 144:21 167:24	34:25 39:11 41:24	top 68:11 82:2, 8 90:1,	132:4 162:23 181:8
173:3	73:8, 17 94:19 112:17	6 138:10, 12	trust 90:13
tens 14:25	134:2 137:13, 14, 19	topic 155:6 175:20	try 11:5 18:9 41:25
TERENCE 47: <i>1</i> 182: <i>13</i>	138:16 142:14 143:18		
		topographical 168:8, 11,	51:11 72:11 111:4
term 68:14 71:7	147:2, 2 153:11	19	125:13 136:12 146:7
134:14 148:16 150:25	think 6:9, 24 7:6, 12	topography 64:6 65:2	174:8
terms 25:12 71:15 74:1	8:5 19:3 26:2 29:21	178: <i>13</i>	trying 6:6 13:20
91:1 117:5 135:14	30:1,5 36:15 39:24	topology 118:14, 15	102:15 174:2 178:15
146:15	46:8 51:6, 12 62:14	topsoil 25:18	Tuesday 55:25
territories 44:6			
	63:25 65:3 68:5 73:15	total 20:18 23:6 27:8	turn 14:5 166:20
testified 38:20, 23 55:25	74:15 76:25 84:6 93:4	122:20 123:3	twice 31:13
62:9 85:2 <i>1</i> 165:5	97:18 98:9 100:13, 21	totaled 12:10	two 16:3 27:10 46:13
testify 150:14	101:19 102:7, 11, 22	totals 10:14 11:25	118:12 121:22 138:16
testifying 113:9	108:16 122:21 125:12	touch 29:11 124:20	140:5 164:14 178:2,4
testimony 9:11, 13, 16,	141:5, 16, 23, 25 142:2,	touched 137:14	179:20 180:3
19 10:10 11:10 26:4	5, 6, 13, 17 143:3 144:7	tough 45:20	type 18:25 24:16 30:7
32:6, 13 34:10, 15, 17,	146:8 149:7 151:8, 22	tourism 161:12	73:9 99:25 100: <i>11</i>
20 35:12, 20 36:24	152:7, 15, 17 153:6	tower 94:18, 19	102:17 108:20 109:1
37:17, 18 45:13 52:9,	154:3 156:2 158:5	towers 29:16	173:21
10, 11, 13, 14, 20 54:14	160:16 163:7, 11, 22	TOWN 3:13 12:17	types 11:17 24:19, 21,
55:13, 17 57:7 58:17,	168:25 171:14 177:9	13:10 30:21 31:1,5	24 25:5 42:5,6 104:10
20 60:8, 10 63:22	180:22	35:17 36:8, 15 67:3	112:4, 17
68:13, 15 74:2 76:5	third 22:8 35:18 82:2	116:21 141:20	typical 92:18 93:18, 22
78:5, 10, 11, 13, 16	thorough 29:10, 12	townships 138:7, 8	94:22 95:25 142:15
79: <i>19</i> 80: <i>15</i> 87: <i>10</i> , <i>12</i> ,	169:20 177:13	TPL 116:23	Typically 48:13 72:15
13, 16 92:20 93:6, 16	thought 36:12 42:25	TPL-001-4 115:9	115:15
95:8, 11, 20 98:3	105:22 146:4	tractor 126:21	
101:25 102:6 105:19	threatened 81:5	Trade 9:8	< U >
106:22 109:12 114:7,	three 7:15, 19 11:12	traffic 47:16	U.S 35:14 36:1 80:16
11, 14, 17 120:11, 14	16:2 18:5, 5 28:2 <i>1</i>	trail 55:2, 2 75:8	Uh-huh 14: <i>19</i> 16:9
124:6, <i>9</i> , <i>18</i> 127: <i>11</i> , <i>12</i> ,	35:10, 11, 13 52:25	trails 53:16 73:7	21:22 22:6 24:13
25 131:11, 18 132:1, 22	61:21 115:17 121:14	train 18:16	26:10 41:17 44:7 45:8
144:13 162:14, 21	122:3 125:22 126:6, 11	trained 18:18	67:10 81:16 103:4
163:7, 11, 19, 22 164:2	179:3, 14	TRANSCRIPT 1:11, 20	ultimately 45:5
165:22 170:6			
	three-day 7:19	5:10 6:1 179:3, 13, 14	Ultraviolet 136:25
text 122:21, 24, 25 167:2	three-mile 169:13	TRANSMISSION 1:4, 6	Um-hmm 126:10
texting 39:9	threshold 61:20	15: <i>15</i> 18:21 19:6	151:24 172:25
Thank 10:6 13:18, 22,	thrust 136:4	22:15 40:13 42:6 45:1,	unable 156:21
25 14:16 22:11 26:11	tile 28:13	19 47:25 50:17 54:12,	unacceptable 118:4
30:23 31:15, 21 35:8	tiles 28:20	22 67:11 72:2 74:13	unavoidable 140:19
40:3 43:5 45:7 46:1,		99:23 104:5 114:20	
	tillage 126:20		uncertainty 134:21
10 48:2 50:4, 23 52:12		115:8 117: <i>1</i> 2 125:22	

135:20.23 uncommon 171:11 under-built 124:13 152:22 undergrounding 124:12 152:21, 24 153:1, 22 understand 19:8 20:5. 13 22:21 69:10 76:4, 21 94:16.17.17.18.21 99:24 129:23 143:21 153:1 168:22 171:5 understanding 14:23 16:22 38:2, 6 57:1, 12, 14 69:2 71:24 82:15, 17.20 83:16 90:23 91:3, 20 92:15, 17 93:17, 22 95:10, 11, 23 96:3 102:19 106:24 107:1, 13, 16 111:8, 21 112:1.4 understood 80:9 150:2 undue 15:17 unfortunately 81:10 **UNIOUE** 2:13 18:24 118:14 unusual 153:2 update 76:18 131:20, 24 132:17 upkeep 29:16 upland 61:1, 11, 12, 23 uploaded 162:16 usage 115:4 use 6:20 12:18 19:2 23:18 53:10, 19 54:2 64:18 68:13, 16 87:19, 24 94:2 101:1, 22 104:9 114:20 115:13 117:3 126:17 155:11 163:20 171:2, 24 172:1 uses 38:2 USGS 137:18 usually 148:20 UTILITIES 1:5 utility 53:2 67:15 83:17 155:16 177:1 utility's 28:7 utilized 99:4, 9 utilizing 96:2 UV 136:24 < V > Valerie 2:10 valleys 64:7 valuable 11:10, 12 value 17:22 25:11.21 146:8 155:11 156:14 160:10, 16 176:24 177:5 values 147:19.21 155:13, 20 161:13, 17 VAN 3:22 variance 169:11 171:11, 19

variations 75:6 variety 86:10 108:10, 17 various 49:11 122:22 125:15 varying 128:16 vegetation 106:11 108:2 venues 152:2 verbiage 167:4 verified 10:17 125:8 verify 124:2 125:9 145:11 version 74:5 versus 21:2, 21 22:4 27:9.10.18 58:5 125:10 178:9 viability 25:22 viable 72:4 102:25 vicinity 49:8 71:11 Vickers 3:10 view 20:8 72:6 146:2 viewed 175:16 viewing 30:20, 22 Vincent 3:23 violate 115:12 116:10 violated 116:18 visibility 97:25 128:4 129:6, 12 176:14 visible 24:5, 8 38:8 176:2 178:9 vistas 133:20 visual 24:5 127:20 128:23 155:8 175:7 voice 51:13 Volk 49:1, 8, 10, 12, 18, 25 50:2 voltage 21:18 29:16 122:12 157:5 175:22 176:14,20 **VOLUME** 1:12 volumes 38:21 voluntary 11:8 vulnerable 18:20 < W > waiting 73:16 walking 174:16, 24 175:3 want 25:24 31:13, 13 37:24 44:11, 13 45:11 46:15 54:3 58:16 76:4 79:2 85:24 87:25 101:5 107:8 129:22 148:12 150:16 179:23 wanted 30:25 40:2 43:14 49:16 71:11 111:17 132:9 154:11 wants 109:22, 23 Warrens 164:1 Washington 4:6, 10 watching 37:21 93:2 Water 53:6, 14, 22 60:9 62:18 63:7, 7, 10 64:14,

17 65:4, 10, 10 66:18 67:18 140:16 waterway 57:19 58:9 60:16, 21, 23 62:10, 17 65:12 146:25 waterways 64:11 147:20 way 14:8 36:11 39:10. 12 59:12 61:25 64:11, 17 66:9 110:22 117:6 137:7 141:12 142:4, 22 143:8 160:21 161:14 ways 59:10 WDATCP 9:1 182:3 WDNR 52:2 78:2 87:3 182:17, 24 183:3 we, 155:17 website 13:10 Webster 4:15 Wednesday 168:7 Week 7:24, 25 34:21 114:17 144:14 weigh 29:7 125:10 weight 16:8 24:25 25:7. 10 125:14 weights 125:16 Weiss 1:23 96:13 124:17 129:4 131:2.3. 8 132:10, 13, 17, 18 133:2 139:14 150:12 155:4 165:5 166:22 183:17 184:9 welcome 55:9 155:2 welcomed 177:15 Well 7:23 13:15, 24 17:15 23:1 38:19 44:6, 10 46:17 47:22 49:10 51:10 63:13 65:12 74:23 75:7 83:19 100:23 104:22 107:9 110:9 119:4 121:24 124:11 129:23 132:22 135:17 141:19 144:5 146:17 171:8 172:22 179:22 180:5 went 8:9 WEPA 162:11 We're 13:16, 20 23:19 29:23 44:5 46:8 57:4 60:25 70:17 71:22 73:25 83:24 90:16 102:11, 23 104:22 117:5 129:22 156:18 West 2:25 3:15, 23 4:10 87:20 91:9,24 94:7 176:9 WESTERBERG 2:19, 20 31:25 32:4, 5 33:4 37:12, 14, 15 40:2 48:3, 6,8 50:4 55:11,12 56:9 58:21, 22 63:1, 5 66:4 68:21 69:1 70:20 75:23 76:1,3 77:5 79:10, 15, 16 81:7, 10,

12 85:11 89:25 90:5, 12 102:5 103:6 105:10. 11 108:12, 16, 19 109:3 139:13, 14 143:16 144:19.23 145:19 148:1 149:19 182:6, 10, 15, 20, 23 183:1, 7, 20 Westerberg's 147:14 WESTON 4:9 wetland 38:11 57:5, 19, 23 58:9 60:16, 22, 23, 25 62:10, 16, 17 65:12 67:24 68:7 69:13, 15 123:19 wetlands 69:7, 24 70:5, 17 123:22, 23 146:14, 25 147:20 we've 6:4 28:15 71:16 96:1 105:17 106:10 157:12, 20, 20 171:14 **WHEELER** 3:22 whichever 107:23 WHITNEY 4:5 WI 2:5, 16, 21, 25 3:6, 11, 15, 18, 24 4:11, 16, 21 wide 48:15 106:1 wider 48:20 width 114:22 122:6 WiFi 152:3 Wildlife 80:7, 14, 17 willing 55:6 willingness 88:9 91:10, 13 **Wilson** 2:25 wind 16:14 103:20 winnowing 148:21 WISCONSIN 1:2, 8, 22 2:5, 13, 18 4:14 9:8 32:5 34:8 37:16 48:8 55:13 63:23 67:1 71:6 79:17 82:4 84:2 99:25 105:12 137:18 139:15 141:19 149:9, 12, 14, 21, 24 181:1,7 Wisconsin's 74:15 WisDOT 34:1 182:7 wish 8:8 withdraw 135:15 witness 8:6 9:1 23:1,5 29:22 33:10, 14 34:1 37:6 40:4 41:5 43:7, 20, 24 44:4, 9, 13 45:12 46:4.12 47:1 51:4 52:2 54:6 55:9 62:21. 24 63:4 73:19 77:11 78:2, 25 79:4, 6 86:19 87:3 88:22 89:7 90:4, 10 95:1, 20 96:10 99:13 108:15, 18, 20, 24 109:1 110:21 113:8 114:1 116:2 119:5, 6, 14 120:3 130:8 131:3 132:7, 12, 18 144:21

/9/2015		edings, Volume 11	
147:19 148:10, 12, 15,	169:14		
18 149:2, 11, 16 154:6	zones 49:6, 19		
158:22 159:2 161:23	Zuelsdorff 150:19, 20		
162:3 164:18 167:24	154:18 155:9, 21 156:7		
173:3 178:24 182:2, 3,	159:10, 14 162:2, 3, 8		
7, 13, 17, 24 183:3, 10, 14,	163:2, 6, 18 165:15		
17, 23	177:12 183:23		
witnesses 8:7 38:20, 23	Zuelsdorff's 169:4		
46:13 113:7 114:16	177:10		
wonder 21:15			
wondering 79:19			
wooded 129:5 178:13			
word 102:23			
wording 167:1, 5			
words 52:23 105:2			
110:4			
work 9:7 14:24 18:13			
19:11 32:9 34:7 41:24			
45:25 123:24 124:4, 18			
43.23 123.24 124.4, 18			
141:1, 4, 5, 12 160:9			
141:1, 4, 5, 12 160:9			
worked 126:18			
working 18:22, 23			
41:12 55:20 56:1			
67:14 124:21			
works 7:13 42:24 53:7,			
16, 24			
worry 104:18			
worth 18:4	5		
Wow 43:22			
write 121:6 155:25			
writing 52:14 93:16			
131:27			
written 52:9 78:5			
87:10 138:6, 24 164:14			
wrong 135:1			
wrote 152:16 154:18			
<x></x>			
XCEL 2:8			
. \$7 -			
<y> Nach 7.25 0.22 27.10</y>			
Yeah 7:25 9:23 27:10			
29:23 36:14 39:13			
44:15, 22 55:24, 25			
57:9 61:9 66:19 71:1			
95: <i>14</i> 102: <i>13</i> , 25 103:2,			
4 105:25 107:5 110:20			
133:23 138:20 148:13			
150:3 180:5, 5			
year 18:4 80:2 84:11,			
18 85:24 150:1			
years 18:5, 5			
Yep 80:10 81:9			
yesterday 78:16 92:19,			
25 172:16, 18			
YOYI 87:3 183:3			
_			
< Z >			
zone 47:16 48:20 49:9,			
13, 15, 20, 22 168:17, 20			