

**CAPX 2020 UTILITIES
HAMPTON - ROCHESTER - LA CROSSE 345 KV TRANSMISSION PROJECT
DOCKET 5-CE-136**

**INCOMPLETENESS RESPONSE INDEX
April 1, 2011**

Item No.	Application Page	AFR	Information Requirement	Comments/Response	Location of Response	ERF Ref. No.
01-1	1-15; Table 1	2.4.2	Describe how the "wetland impact by route" was calculated. Does this right-of-way (ROW) include all wetlands that would be impacted, either temporary or permanent?	<p>Permanent wetland impacts based on pole placement were identified by route in Table 1 on page 1-15 of the CPCN Application and in Appendix T, WDNR Utility Permit Application. Pole impact areas used in the calculation are explained in Footnote 4 of Table 1 in Appendix T.</p> <p>The Applicants received further clarification from the WDNR and added a row to Table 1 of the CPCN Application termed "Conversion/Change in Wetland Type from Forested to Nonforested within Right-of-Way (ROW)". The Applicants have also verified that the 0.1 acre of permanent wetland impact due to pole placement is correct.</p>	Table 1 on page 1-15 of the CPCN was revised.	
01-2	1-19, 2-95; Appendix M	2.1.7 and 2.2.3	Provide the cost estimate with component costs and a complete description, including pole types and construction issues that would need to be addressed, for construction and operation of the "Wisconsin Highway 88 Connector" segment identified on page 1-19 of the application. Provide an overall cost for use of this segment to completion of a line to its terminus.	The PSCW has determined that this information could be treated as a data request rather than an incompleteness item. As a result this information will be submitted separately.	Not included in this submittal.	Not Applicable
01-3	1-19, 2-95; Appendices C, D, and M,	2.2.3 and 2.3.3	Provide maps and appropriate GIS layers showing the Wisconsin Highway 88 Connector segment as part of an Alma-Briggs Road route with appropriate connections made to the remainder of the proposed route.	The PSCW has determined that this information could be treated as a data request rather than an incompleteness item. As a result this information will be submitted separately.	Not included in this submittal.	Not Applicable
01-4	1-19, 2-95; Appendix A	2.2.3 and 2.4.1.3	Provide environmental and social information for the Wisconsin Highway 88 Connector segment analogous to that provided for proposed route segments including, for example but not limited to, wetlands crossed, farmland crossed, soils and erodability information, and distances to homes. Provide all AFR tables for this new segment.	The PSCW has determined that this information could be treated as a data request rather than an incompleteness item. As a result this information will be submitted separately.	Not included in this submittal.	Not Applicable
01-5	1-19, 2-95, Appendices M and T	2.2.3 and 2.4	Provide environmental data and social information for the Arcadia-Etrick Connector segment analogous to that provided for proposed route segments including, for example but not limited to, wetlands crossed, farmland crossed, soils and erodability information, and distances to homes. Use the table formats required in AFR 2.4 and also those used for Appendix T, Tables 1-5.	The PSCW has determined that this information could be treated as a data request rather than an incompleteness item. As a result this information will be submitted separately.	Not included in this submittal.	Not Applicable
01-6	1-19, 2-95 , Appendices M and T	2.1.7 and 2.2.3	Provide the cost estimate with component costs and a complete description, including pole types and construction issues that would need to be addressed, for construction and operation of the Arcadia-Etrick segment identified on p. 1-19 of the application. Provide an overall cost for use of this segment to completion of a line to its terminus.	The PSCW has determined that this information could be treated as a data request rather than an incompleteness item. As a result this information will be submitted separately.	Not included in this submittal.	Not Applicable

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

Item No.	Application Page	AFR	Information Requirement	Comments/Response	Location of Response	ERF Ref. No.
01-7	2-29 , Tables 2.1-1 thru 2.1-9, and Appendix L	2.1.2.2	Provide segment ID identification for pole configurations. The pole configuration descriptions in Segment 2.1.2.2, Tables 2.1-1 thru 2.1-9, and the figures in Appendix L do not identify a specific segment.	Appendix L has been revised to include a Segment to Structure Drawing Reference table and notes were added to appendix figures as identified on the appendix cover sheet to address this comment.	Response Item 01-7, page 1, Revised Appendix L.	
01-8	2-40, 2-41	2.1.3.1	Provide 2010 actual load by substation.	Table 2.1-10 has been revised as requested.	Submitted on March 24, 2011. Table 2.1-10, pages 2-39 thru 2-41.	146251(Excel spreadsheet)
01-9	2-46 - 2-48	2.1.3.3	Provide power flow simulation data (raw format) for the TSSR Supplement-2010 161 kV Alternative and alternatives listed in questions 4 to 6 in the August 2010 Data Request.		Confidentially filed Feb. 15, 2011.	144772
01-10	2-47, 2-49; 2-56 - 2-64	2.1.3.3 and 2.1.7	Provide, in 2010 dollars, costs for the proposed project and project alternatives (including those listed in questions 4 to 6 in the August 2010 Data Request). These costs should include any fee payments. Provide costs (2010 dollars) in the proposed project cost for any upgrades required during the service period (2015-2050) of the proposed project (345 kV line between Hampton and La Crosse). Provide these costs as an MS Excel worksheet.		Submitted on March 24, 2011. Response Item 01-10, page 45.	146251 (Excel spreadsheet)
01-11	2-52	2.1.3.4	Provide an MS Excel worksheet that details the calculation of present value for electrical losses shown in Table 2.1-14. These calculations should be based on 2010 dollars. Provide above described MS worksheets for alternatives listed in questions 4 to 6 in the August 2010 Data Request.	Tables 2.1-14 and 2.1-15 were revised.	Submitted on March 24, 2011. Tables 2.1-14 and 2.1-15, pages 2-60 and 2-61.	146251 (Tables)
01-12	2-54	2.1.4 and 2.6.1	Provide a labeled plan with side and front elevations with dimensions for Figure 1 (Appendix K). Provide vertical dimensions for equipment and provide a diagram(s) showing substation equipment from the side with heights of equipment above ground level. Show proposed equipment in relation to surrounding landscape features.	Response Item 01-12 adds Figure 1A, to be inserted after Figure 1 in Appendix K. The CPCN text has been revised to include a reference to this new figure.	Section 2.1.4, page 2-63; Section 2.6.2, page 2-192. Response Item 01-12, page 49.	
01-13	2-58; Appendix D	2.31, 2.3.3, and 2.7.4	Provide maps and GIS layers to illustrate locations and configurations of existing distribution lines in the project area (particularly those located along any proposed transmission routes or connector segments, or serving the confined animal operations identified in Figure 12, Appendix U).	Information was included in the GIS submittal made to the PSCW on February 22, 2011. Distribution lines have been added to the Environmental Features Maps in Appendix D.	Response Item 01-13, Revised Appendix D	
0-14	2-58	2.1.7.2. 2, 2.4.1	Provide construction details, including environmental impacts associated with the relocation of any distribution lines, organized by route.	The WDNR requested that the Applicants address the location and relative magnitude of distribution relocation for each route, by segment if possible. The distribution relocations by route and segment can be found in the CPCN Application, Table 2.1-18. This table has been revised in the CPCN Application to provide more detail on how the lines would be relocated and is also enclosed in this response. In addition, figures identifying where these relocations would occur are enclosed in this response.	Section 2.1.7.2, Table 2.1.18, Pages 2-67 thru 2-70. Response Item 01-14, page 53.	

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

Item No.	Application Page	AFR	Information Requirement	Comments/Response	Location of Response	ERF Ref. No.
01-15	2-61, Table 2.1-19 and 2-63, 2.1.7.3.3.1.3	2.1.7.3.1.3	Discuss the potential costs for replacement trees within DOT ROW and whether that has been included in Total Project Cost Estimates, Table 2.1-19.		Response Item 01-15, page 67.	
01-16	2-61, Table 2.1-19 and 2-63, 2.1.7.3.3.1.3	2.1.7.3.3.1.3	Describe what activities would be covered by the estimated \$5,000 per mile for agricultural protection and how the figure was estimated.	<p>The Applicants assume that agricultural protection measures would only be necessary in areas that have livestock or practice organic farming. Based on a rough estimate of livestock areas and an assumption of minimal organic farmland, \$5,000 per mile of agricultural protection costs were included in cost estimates. The need and exact locations for these protection measures would be determined based on landowner discussions.</p> <p>Possible practices covered by this estimate may include, but are not limited to: equipment cleaning, applications of composted manure or rock phosphate, preventing the introduction of disease vectors, restoration and replacement of beneficial bird and insect habitat, maintenance of organic buffer zones, use of organic seeds for any cover crop or similar measures. The Applicants recognize that Organic System Plans are proprietary in nature and would respect the need for confidentiality.</p>	No further response in this submittal.	Not Applicable
01-17	2-63	2.1.7.3.3.1.1	Detail how the costs for Internal EMs were determined. Include anticipated hours of work, rate of pay, lodging, meals, travel expenses, etc. How do these cost estimates account for differences in the natural/sensitive resources present along each route?	<p>As stated in section 2.1.7.3.3.1.1:</p> <p>“The estimated cost for internal environmental monitors is \$500,000. This estimate assumes that one monitor would work full time for approximately 100 weeks of construction.”</p> <p>It’s anticipated that an external resource may be retained for internal environmental monitoring. Based on the Applicants previous experience, environmental monitors cost approximately \$5,000 per week. Specific hourly rates and per-diem rates would be determined based on a competitive bidding process at the time a contractor is hired.</p> <p>It is assumed that 1) one full time environmental monitor would be present throughout construction for any route that is approved; 2) construction time for any permitted route would be 100 weeks and 3) monitoring costs would be the same for any route that is approved.</p>	No further response in this submittal.	Not Applicable
01-18	2-63	2.1.7.3.3.1.2	Detail how the costs for Independent EMs were determined. Include anticipated hours of work, rate of pay, lodging, meals, travel expenses, etc. How do these cost estimates account for differences in the natural/sensitive resources present along each route?	<p>As stated in section 2.1.7.3.3.1.2:</p> <p>“The estimated cost for independent environmental monitors is \$500,000. This estimate assumes that one monitor would work full time for approximately 100 weeks of construction.”</p> <p>Based on the Applicants previous experience, environmental monitors cost approximately \$5,000 per week. Specific hourly rates and per-diem rates would be determined based on a competitive bidding process at the time a contractor is</p>	No further response in this submittal.	Not Applicable

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

Item No.	Application Page	AFR	Information Requirement	Comments/Response	Location of Response	ERF Ref. No.
				hired. It is assumed that 1) one full time environmental monitor would be present throughout construction for any route that is approved; 2) construction time for any permitted route would be 100 weeks and 3) monitoring costs would be the same for any route that is approved.		
01-19	2-63	2.1.7.3.3.3	Detail how the costs for DNR permits and approvals were determined. Do the costs include field studies and reports?	The CPCN Application text has been added to Section 2.1.7.3.3.3:	Section 2.1.7.3.3.3, page 2-74.	
01-20	2-64, 2.1.7.3.4 and Appendix H	2.1.7.3.4	Within the high-voltage transmission fee section, discuss how integral the non-345 kV transmission construction is to the proposed 345 kV construction. (This issue relates to the recent Commission discussion of "but for" inclusion of lower voltage portions of a project into the base cost from which the fees are calculated.)		Response Item 01-20, page 69.	
01-21	2-92	2.1.7.2.1.2 and 2.4.1.3	Provide an analysis and breakdown of the expected costs and processes necessary to obtain DOT's release of scenic easements affected by any route.	The Applicants' reading of WisDOT's scenic easements indicate that electric transmission lines are a permitted use within scenic easements. Therefore, release of scenic easements would not be required. The Applicants will continue to work with WisDOT on determining any appropriate mitigation for the routes being studied.	No further response in this submittal.	Not Applicable
01-22	2-92	2.4.1.3	Provide written documentation from DOT and/or WI Mississippi River Parkway Commission (WMRPC) that identifies the values that will be affected by this project along the Great River Road National Scenic By-Way. Provide an analysis that would evaluate the impact to these values between routes. Refer to the December 28 and January 27, 2010, letters from Ruben L. Anthony and Mike Berg of DOT to William Fannucchi of Commission staff. Explain the reasoning for the values identified. If such documentation cannot be obtained, provide documentation from DOT and/or WMRPC on why it cannot.	The Applicants have requested this information from WisDOT in a February 16, 2011 letter that is included in the response. A reply has not been yet been received.	Response Item 01-22, page 71.	
01-23	2-94; Appendix N	2.2.3	Describe the future of the existing Q1 transmission line and ROW should a Q1 route not be approved by the Commission. When would DPC's Q1 line need to be rebuilt or upgraded by DPC? What options would DPC pursue if their Q1 line is not rebuilt as part of the CapX project? What state or federal agency approvals would be necessary for each option?		Response Item 01-23, page 75.	
01-24	2-94; Table 2.2-3	2.3	This table should include the Galesville option as an option to minimize Black River impacts. Expand this table to include the Galesville option.	The purpose of Table 2.2-3 was to provide a comparison of the three existing corridors that cross the wetlands associated with the Black River floodplain to identify a route to compare to the Q1-Galesville Route that would not require crossing of the wetlands associated with the Black River floodplain. However, the Applicants have provided an updated Table 2.2-3 with the Q1-Galesville Route information included.	Table 2.2-3; page 2-104.	
01-25	2-94	2.2.3.1.6.1.2	Include information about DNR-owned/managed lands. Provide documentation regarding new easements or changes to existing easements that would be needed along any proposed routes.		Response Item 01-25, page 83.	

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

Item No.	Application Page	AFR	Information Requirement	Comments/Response	Location of Response	ERF Ref. No.
01-26	2-96	2.4	Describe the potential rerouting of the Marshland-Holland 69 kV line from its location near 7 Bridges Trail to the Q1-State Highway (STH) 35 Route, including what would happen to any distribution underbuild and all the route adjustments and connections that would be made. What decisions must be made to determine if this rerouting would be done?		Response Item 01-26, page 87.	
01-27	2-96	2.1.7 and 2.4	Provide environmental data for removing the Seven Bridges 69 kV line (NSP Marshland-Holland) from the Van Loon, including construction issues that would need to be addressed, and including wetlands crossed, soils and erodability, access plans, etc. Provide overall costs for removal of this segment.		Response Item 01-27, page 91.	
01-28	2-96	2.1.7 and 2.4	Provide environmental data for removing the Q1 161 kV line that currently goes through the southern portion of Van Loon, including construction issues that would need to be addressed, and including wetlands crossed, soils and erodability, access plans, etc. Provide overall costs for removal of this segment.		Response Item 01-28, page 93.	
01-29	2-97	2.2.4	Provide copies of public outreach mailings and any handouts used at public information meetings for this project. Identify any internet site links that show the information that was shared with the public before, during, and at public information meetings.	<p>The requested mailings and handouts were submitted to the PSCW under separate cover.</p> <p>As stated in the CPCN on page 2-100, the public participation process has been continuously promoted and periodically updated through the virtual open house on the CapX2020 website at:</p> <p>http://www.capx2020.com/Gallery/openhouse/index.html</p> <p>The following has been added to the CPCN Application text:</p> <p>"The CapX2020 website located at http://www.capx2020.com/index.html has copies of mailings and fact sheets."</p>	Section 2.4.1.2, page 2-110.	
01-30	2-106 - 107, - 2.3.5 and Appendix R	2.3.5	Text incorrectly identifies the towns, villages, and cities that the routes cross and is a different list than that included as part of Appendix R. Text and Appendix R have incorrect list of available land use, agricultural, and other plans. Text discusses at length Buffalo County and the village of Holmen only; application should discuss all available land use plans and whether they contain anything significant to the project.	The CPCN Application text and Appendix R have been revised	Section 2.3.5, pages 2-116 thru 2-121. Response Item 01-30.	
01-31	2-106	2.3.5	How does the proposed project affect the management plans for DNR properties that are directly impacted by the proposed routes?	The only WDNR property that would be crossed by any of the routes proposed in the Application is the Van Loon Wildlife area, During further discussions held with the WDNR on 2/17/2011, it was determined that the WDNR would address potential impacts to its management plans for the property. The Applicants have been directed to route all communications through the WDNR Office of Energy and have therefore not been in communication with the manager of the property.	No further response in this submittal.	Not Applicable
01-32	2-114	2.4.1.2	Provide copies of all project-related correspondence to and from the owners of the BNSF, CN, and C&NW railroads and copies of all ROW sharing agreements.		Response Item 01-32, page 95.	
01-33	2-114	2.4.1.2	Provide the status and preliminary results of the alternating current study requested by BNSF.		Response Item 01-33, page 97.	

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

Item No.	Application Page	AFR	Information Requirement	Comments/Response	Location of Response	ERF Ref. No.
01-34	2-115	2.4.1.3	Provide documentation from DOT that shows the proposed sharing of ROW and crossing of interstate or state highway ROWs that is acceptable to DOT and can be permitted.		Response Item 01-34, page 103.	
01-35	2-121 – 2-125; Appendix A Table 2	2.4.2.2.7	Resubmit Table 2 with all columns populated. Table 2 has been modified in the application (columns are missing). This table must conform to the table as it appears in the AFR.	The Applicants had obtained the required permission from the PSCW to modify the table in the manner presented in the CPCN Application and as it has been accepted in previous applications. However, the Applicants have prepared a supplemental table presenting the landcover intercepted by the centerline of the proposed routes so that the length information is available for other analyses.	This was submitted to the PSCW under separate cover.	Not Applicable
01-36	2-123	2.4.6	Provide information on how the proposed project will affect land enrolled in the Managed Forest and Forest Crop Law programs. There are a number of plots within the ROW that may be enrolled in managed forest law and forest crop law.	The CPCN Application text has been added to Section 2.4.6 to address this item. Managed Forest and Forest Crop Land GIS files were submitted to PSCW as part of the GIS submittal made on February 22, 2011.	Section 2.4.6.4, page 2-148. Shapefiles were submitted with the February 22, 2011 GIS submittal to the PSCW.	
01-37	2-126	2.4.3	Identify properties affected by the proposed project ROW that were purchased with LAWCON funds.	The proposed routes do not cross properties purchased with Land and Water Conservation grant program (LAWCON) funds. Text has been added to Section 2.4.3 to address this item.	Section 2.4.3.1.5.2, page 2-140.	
01-38	2-126	2.4.3.1.5.2	Provide a separate table that identifies all state properties directly affected by the proposed routes. Include the type of property, route and segment numbers, linear distance of impact, wetland impacts, and waterway impacts.	Property information is included Appendix A, Table 3 by property, route, segment number and linear distance of impact. Wetland and waterway impacts are presented in Appendix T.	No further response in this submittal.	Not Applicable
01-39	2-134	2.4.6	Provide correspondence from the federal agencies (e.g. USFWS, USCOE) that documents a willingness to accept or approve impacts to their properties.		Response Item 01-39, page 105.	
01-40	2-135	2.4.8	Provide the endangered and threatened species report(s) that satisfies the filing requirements for this section. The report should be filed confidentially and as part of the Application, not as a separate document.	This item was removed from the list by the WDNR at a meeting held on February 12, 2011.	No response required.	
01-41	2-135	2.4.8	Discuss the potential location, impacts, and feasibility of a route segment to connect segment 8C to segment 18B to avoid rare bird nesting areas at the Amsterdam Grasslands Area owned by the Mississippi Valley Conservancy.		Response Item 01-41, page 111.	
01-42	2-135	2.4.8	Provide historical occurrences (from National Historic Institute (NHI) Database) for the assessment included in sections 2.4.8.1 to 2.4.8.3.	The CPCN Application text has been modified to include both historic and non-historic occurrences.	Section 2.4.8, pages 2-149 and 2-150.	
01-43	2-135	2.4.8	Paragraph 1 of this Section mentions NHI occurrences within two miles of the route options whereas paragraph 2 begins a summary based on intersection of the occurrences with the route. Provide the summary of rare species occurrences consistent with the two-mile search area by route and route segment and by taxa (i.e. plant or animal group). This response can be combined with the preceding requirement about historical occurrences. Include a separate, but similar table by route and route segment for rare species occurrences noted during the surveys completed specifically for this project, which should be primarily birds and plants.	The information in the first portion of the request was provided in Tables 1A and 1B of the confidential Rare Species and Natural Communities Analysis and Survey Summary Report submitted as part of the CPCN Application. The Applicants fashioned these tables based on the AFRs, as well as another Applicant's response to a data request on another 345kV transmission line project that was recently ordered by the PSCW. The Applicants have supplied summary tables in the response.	Response Item 01-43, page 115.	
01-44	2-135	2.4.8	Provide a table that summarizes where rare species or potentially suitable habitat for rare species occurs along each project route by route segment. Consider in this response the survey results presented in the Confidential Rare Species and Natural Communities Report (Confidential Report) and the Habitat Summary	The Applicants agreed to distil the information provided in Tables 4a through 4e of the confidential Rare Species and Natural Communities Analysis and Survey Summary Report, and summarize the data by taxa (i.e. plant or animal group), route segment and route in a non-confidential form. However, upon subsequent	Referenced table was submitted confidentially to the PSCW.	Confidential submittal

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

Item No.	Application Page	AFR	Information Requirement	Comments/Response	Location of Response	ERF Ref. No.
			Tables in addition to the NHI historical and non-historical occurrences. Include staging areas in this analysis. Summarize the information by taxa.	review it became apparent that such a non-confidential summary was not possible without being in potential conflict with the Natural Heritage Inventory (NHI) license and data sharing agreement regarding the presentation of sensitive rare species information. As such, multiple summary tables are referenced in response to this request. In addition, Response Item 44, Table 1 (Confidential) was prepared to summarize where threatened and endangered species or potential suitable habitat for these species occurs along each route by route segment.		
01-45	2-136	2.4.8.4	Define "designation" as used here. Provide a citation or reference source for the designated areas identified in Table 2-4-6.	These areas are identified as areas set aside for natural resource purposes or values, such as Wildlife or Scientific and Natural Areas by the WDNR, USFWS or the Mississippi Valley Conservancy.	No further response in this submittal.	Not Applicable
01-46	2-137	2.4.8	Summarize by route and by route segment any potential impacts the project could have on NHI species and habitats. Include segments where the applicants have proposed to remove existing lines and co-locate them with the proposed 345 kV line such as the line along Seven Bridges. Discuss impacts based on the proposed construction actions, including access routes, the proposed schedule and construction sequence, and in relation to the habitat of the species.	The potential impacts the Project could have on rare species and habitats were detailed in Tables 3a and 3b of the confidential Rare Species and Natural Communities Analysis and Survey Summary Report, as well as Sections 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 of the confidential and redacted versions of the report. Further summary and additional information regarding potential impacts is provided in the response to this item.	Response Item 01-46, page 125.	
01-47	2-137	2.4.8	Do the habitat maps and tables provided in the Confidential Report include construction and staging areas and any off-ROW access areas? If not, provide this information. Note that Table 6, which is referenced on page 2-137 for additional information on this topic, does not distinguish off-ROW access.		Response Item 01-47, page 127.	
01-48	2-137	2.4.8	Describe by taxa how the proposed project could be modified to avoid, minimize, or mitigate any potential adverse effect on the species. It is acceptable to combine species with similar habitat requirements where avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures may be similar. Provide a detailed description of how "standard construction techniques and construction timing should result in minimal ground disturbance....."		Response Item 01-48, page 129.	
01-49	2-138	2.4.9, 2.6.8.5, and 2.9.2.3	Provide the archeologist's reports for this project and a list of all historic and archeological sites potentially affected by the proposed project along the routes, connecting segments, alternative segments, staging areas, substation sites, and off-road access routes. For each resource identified, describe how the proposed project might affect it and how the project might be adjusted to reduce or avoid adverse impacts. This information does not have to be confidential. See the attached letter from Chip Harry L. Brown to Kenneth C. Rineer dated March 22, 2002 (Attachment B).	Electronic copies of the reports have been provided to the PSCW under separate cover. Based on conversations with the PSCW on February 17 and 18, 2011, the text in Section 2.4.9 was revised to address this item.	Section 2.4.9, page 2-152.	
01-50	2-138: Table 2.4-7	2.4.9, 2.6.8.5, 2.9.2.3	Table 2.4-7 must clearly show historic properties by town, Range, Section, and 1/4 1/4 section. The third column is not clear.	The table has been revised accordingly for the routes and substation sites. Also, the following text has also been added to Section 2.5.7 to address staging areas. "None of the staging areas directly impacts archaeological sites. However, Staging Area 1 is located approximately 316 feet from a documented archaeological site (47BF64). "	Table 2.4-7, pages 2-153 and 2-154; Table 2.6-1, page 2-199. Section 2.5.7, page 2-189.	

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

Item No.	Application Page	AFR	Information Requirement	Comments/Response	Location of Response	ERF Ref. No.
01-51	2-145	2.6.8.6	There is no identification of state-designated trout streams and/or exceptional/outstanding waters. Provide the following information for all areas adjacent to state designated waters: describe the additional construction practices that would be employed to adequately protect the function of these streams.	Marilyn Weiss at PSCW advised on March 9, 2011 that no further information was required.	No further response in this submittal.	Not Applicable
01-52	2-145	2.4.13.3.3	Provide information on identified invasive species occurring in wetlands within all proposed ROWs. Organize by segment.	The CPCN Application text has been revised to address this item.	Section 2.4.13.3, page 2-160.	
01-53	2-156	2.5.1	If matting and ice roads are not viable options in wetlands due to site conditions and weather, what construction options will be used? Has helicopter construction been evaluated? If so, provide details including cost.		Response Item 01-53, page 131.	
01-54	2-156; Appendix J	2.1.7.1	Show estimated costs assuming that helicopter installation is required for all wetland impacts within the Black River Floodplain.		Response Item 01-54, page 133.	
01-55	2-157	2.5.1.7.	Provide a habitat description and description of rare species impacts at each of the staging areas.		Response Item 01-55, page 135.	
01-56	2-159	2.5.6.1	Identify locations where there is greater than 10 percent slope; include whether or not these areas are located near/in sensitive areas.	<p>The Applicants received further clarification of this question from the WDNR. Specifically, the WDNR requested that the Applicants address where poles would be located in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly erodible soils regardless of slope • Slopes greater than 10 percent • Slopes greater than 10 percent in highly erodible soils <p>In addition, the WDNR requested that the Applicants determine whether or not these pole locations would be near wetlands, waterways or threatened or endangered resources. The requested information has been presented in the response to this item.</p>	Response Item 01-56, page 137.	Responses
01-57	2-160 - 2-161, Section 2.5.1.8.1	2.5.1.8.1	Provide details on mitigation of construction impacts to agricultural lands. Include a discussion of construction practices and recovery options.	The text has been added to Section 2.5.1.8.1 to address this item.	Section 2.5.1.8.1, pages 2-174 thru 2-176.	
01-58	2-165 - 2-166	2.5.4.1 and 2.5.4.1.1	It is unclear whether "fill" will be used to build access roads in wetlands. It is stated both ways throughout the application. Confirm the methods that will be used to access wetland locations, and what materials may be used.	<p>Based on the Applicants review of access routes, no wetland fill is anticipated for any of the access routes. It is the Applicants' intent to avoid fill. However final access planning with the construction contractor may identify very few isolated areas where minimal temporary fill may be required. If such fill would be required, such locations would be handled through the appropriate use of temporary fill and coordinated with permitting agencies (USACE, USFWS and WDNR).</p> <p>The CPCN Application text has been revised.</p>	Section 2.5.4.1, pages 2-181 and 2-182.	

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

Item No.	Application Page	AFR	Information Requirement	Comments/Response	Location of Response	ERF Ref. No.
01-59	2-166	2.5.4.2	Provide site specific invasive species plan. Include in that plan how the plan would comply with NR40. DNR staff has not had a discussion with the applicants regarding any pre-construction survey detailing invasive species locations, dominance, and BMPS.	The CPCN Application text has been added to Section 2.5.4.2 to address this item.	Section 2.5.4.2, pages 2-182 and 2-183.	
01-60	2-167	2.5.5.1, 2.5.5.2	Provide a site specific revegetation and post-construction monitoring plan that includes seed mix, how long and when the site will be monitored, goals for site compliance, what actions will occur if the site does not revegetate, or if the site has an increase of invasive species. Organize the information by natural community or land cover type.	The CPCN Application text has been added to Section 2.5.5.1 to address this item.	Section 2.5.5.2, page 2-184.	Redline
01-61	2-168	2.5.6	Provide an erosion control plan that meets all information required in the AFR and the DNR NOI.	The CPCN Application text has been revised to address this item.	Section 2.5.6.2, page 2-186.	Redline
01-62	2-181 - 2-182	2.6.8.4	Identify endangered, threatened, and special concern species or important or valuable natural communities potentially affected by the proposed substation sites.	The redacted and confidential versions of the Rare Species and Natural Communities Analysis and Survey Summary Report addresses habitat and other natural features. To supplement the above information, a non-confidential summary of NHI historic and current EO records within the 2-mile search area for each route, substation, and staging area is summarized by taxa in Response Item 43. Table 1: Historic and Current NHI Element Occurrence Records within 2 Miles of Routes, Substations, and Staging Areas by Species Group.	Response Item 01-62, page 141.	
01-63	2-181 - 2-182	2.6.8.4	Provide a map and description of habitat present on the alternative substation sites. Describe potential impacts the project could have on such species.	CPCN Application text has been added to Section 2.6.8.4 to address this item.	Section 2.6.8.4, page 2-198.	Redline
01-64	2-195	2.8.4	Identify state threatened or endangered animal species that may require consultation for Incidental Take or that may require an application for an Incidental Take permit under 29.604. Provide your answer by route and route segment. Describe the impacts or project actions that may result in incidental take to these species based on the route or route segment. This response should be filed confidentially.		Response 01-64.	Confidential submittal
01-65	2-197; Appendix P	2.9.1	The letter dated December 23, 2010, to DNR was not sent and should be replaced in this Appendix with the correct letter dated January 10, 2011.	A copy of the letter dated January 10, 2011 that was submitted with the Rare Species report is included in the response and replaces the letter in Appendix P.	Response Item 01-65, page 143, provides a replacement letter for Appendix P.	
01-66	2-202 ; Table 2.9-3	2.9.2.2	Provide a determination by DATCP as to whether or not the project would require an Agricultural Impact Statement (AIS). If an AIS is required, document that the necessary information (Notification Packet) has been provided to DATCP so that the AIS can be prepared in time for staff to fit its analyses into the PSC review timeframe.		Response Item 01-66, page 147.	
01-67	2-203	2.9.2.3	Provide copies of any feedback obtained from the three local historical societies that attended the informational meeting and site visit hosted by RUS.	No correspondence or Project-related feedback was received from the local historical society staff that attended the informational meetings.	No further response in this submittal.	Not Applicable
01-68	2-203	2.9.3.3	Provide ongoing status updates about milestones reached and the progress achieved in the Minnesota and RUS EIS preparations and project reviews.	The Applicants will provide periodic updates to PSCW regarding upcoming milestones and process steps in the Minnesota and Federal EIS processes.	No further response in this submittal.	Not Applicable

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

Item No.	Application Page	AFR	Information Requirement	Comments/Response	Location of Response	ERF Ref. No.
01-69	Appendix D	2.4.14.3 .9	For TCSBs, where are the areas of grading located? All bridge locations should be separately numbered and correlated to the Utility Permit application tables.	<p>Based on field reviews of waterways that would be spanned by Temporary Clear Span Bridges (TCSBs), it was determined that the topography of both sides of each bridge is relatively flat. Therefore, only minimal blading may be required to set the TCSB down on the banks of the waterway. The Applicants expect that grading for TCSBs would not exceed 10,000 square feet. The Applicants also expect that no grading would take place below the ordinary high water mark of waterways crossed by TCSBs.</p> <p>The TCSBs are currently identified within the Utility Permit Application (Appendix T – Table 1) by the Feature ID in which they are located. This provides the reviewer the ability to cross reference the TCSBs identified within the Utility Permit Application to their location as shown on the Environmental Features Map provided in Appendix D of the original Application.</p> <p>Matting would be used for pole locations located below ordinary high water levels. The Applicants anticipate no grading other than slightly outside (1 foot) of the limits of the pole foundation in these locations.</p>	No further response in this submittal.	
01-70	Appendix J	2.5.1.4	How deep to the caissons go into the ground?	Text has been added to Section 2.5.1.4 to address this.	Section 2.5.1.4, page 2-170.	Redline
01-71	Appendix J	2.5.1	Will the soils at the STH 35 crossing of the Black River be able to support the vibratory caisson foundations discussed on page 1-18? If not, what other options exist?	A preliminary geotechnical investigation was conducted at the Black River floodplain, which included one soil boring and an analysis of existing well logs in the area. The soil profile was found to be consistent across the area. This analysis shows the area to contain redeposited fine sands to gravelly sands consistent with a floodplain. The soil profile and strength properties are adequate to support the vibratory foundations proposed for the Black River floodplain. Bedrock was also determined to be sufficiently deep so as to not interfere with caisson installation.	No further response in this submittal.	Not Applicable
01-72	Appendix J	2.5.1.8	Document construction techniques for tree clearing along STH 35 Black River crossing.	<p>Tree clearing along the STH 35 Black River Floodplain area would be accomplished using the following general methods. Exact methods would be determined after a contractor is hired and specific equipment availability is known.</p> <p>Tree clearing would occur in winter. Access to the ROW would be accomplished using matting. Trees would be felled and cut into manageable pieces using chain saws. Logs and brush would be gathered and loaded using low pressure vehicles (tracked or rubber tire). Tree stumps would be left in place. All cut logs, branches and brush would be removed from the ROW.</p>	No further response in this submittal.	
01-73	Appendix J - pg. 4	2.5.1.8	Will stumps be removed from the ROW? Will the holes from the stumps be filled with soil?	Stumps would not be removed from the ROW as part of tree removal. Stumps would be cut off close to the ground and left in place.	No further response in this submittal.	

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

Item No.	Application Page	AFR	Information Requirement	Comments/Response	Location of Response	ERF Ref. No.
01-74	Appendix L, Drawing S6-13	2.1.2.1	Provide insulators and conductor information on Drawing.	Drawings have been revised. The following note was added to Appendix L Figures S6-7A, S-7B, S-8, S-9, S-10A, S-10B, S-13, S-15 and S-16: "This is a dead end structure. Insulators are in-line with conductors and therefore not shown on the drawing."	Response Item 01-7, page 1, provides a revised Appendix L.	
01-75	Appendix M; pg. M-7 - Figure 1	2.3.1	Figure 1, pg. M-7 is not legible. Provide map at a larger size (11"x17").	A larger map was provided to the PSCW under separate cover.	No further response in this submittal.	
01-76	Appendix U	2.7.1.4.1	Amperage reported on EMF tables for proposed structures report only one current value for each double-circuit configuration. Include amperage for both circuits on each table (e.g. Tables 11 and 11c, the amperage reported for these two tables is identical but the magnetic fields suggest that at least one circuit has a much different amperage value).		Response Item 01-76 provides a revised Appendix U	Responses
01-77	Appendix U	2.7.1.5	Phase angles are not provided in the EMF tables.	The EMF tables included in Appendix U have been revised to include phase angles. This revised Appendix U is attached to the response to Item 01-76 and replaces the original Appendix U.	Response Item 01-76 provides a revised Appendix U	Not Applicable
01-78	GIS Data/Digital Data	Pg. 4	Provide published map files in .pmf format for all GIS maps in the Application. The publisher map files do not function properly. Data links are missing on 23 out of the 39 .pmf maps provided.	Published map files in *.pmf format for all GIS maps in the CPCN Application have been provided in the GIS data submittal. Data links have been corrected. Submitted to PSCW on February 22, 2011.	No further response in this submittal.	Not Applicable
01-79	GIS Data/Digital Data	Pg. 4, 2.6.1	Provide digital copies of substation layouts as prescribed in AFR (AutoCad *.dwg format).	The proposed substation layout has been provided in AutoCad *.dwg format in the GIS data submittal. Submitted to PSCW on February 22, 2011.	No further response in this submittal.	Not Applicable
01-80	GIS Data/Digital Data	Pg. 4; 2.3.1	Provide shapefiles for distribution lines.	Distribution line shapefiles have been provided in the GIS data submittal and have been added to Appendix D, Environmental Feature Maps.	No further response in this submittal.	Not Applicable
01-81	GIS Data/Digital Data	Pg. 4; 2.3.1	Provide a list (Excel spreadsheet) of shapefile, raster, aerial photos, and any other GIS file names. In the list include a detailed description of content of each file, source of the data, and date.	An Excel spreadsheet containing a list of shapefiles, raster data, aerial photos, and other digital data has been provided in the GIS data submittal. All GIS digital data has been re-named according to examples provided by PSCW.	No further response in this submittal.	Not Applicable
01-82	GIS Data/Digital Data	Pg. 4; 2.3.1	Provide shapefiles showing federal and state properties or managed lands (refuges, wildlife/fisheries, parks, trails, etc.).	A GIS shapefile containing federal and state properties or managed lands (refuges, wildlife /fisheries, parks, and trails) within the Project Area has been provided in the GIS data submittal. Submitted to PSCW on February 22, 2011.	No further response in this submittal.	Not Applicable
01-83	GIS Data/Digital Data	Pg. 4; 2.3.1.3	Provide shapefiles showing all DOT easements including scenic easements.	A GIS shapefile containing the approximate location of WisDOT scenic easements has been provided in the GIS data submittal. Submitted to PSCW on February 22, 2011.	No further response in this submittal.	Not Applicable
01-84	GIS Data/Digital Data	Pg. 4; 2.3.4	Provide zoning shapefiles for La Crosse and Trempeleau Counties.	Trempeleau and La Crosse County Zoning GIS shapefiles have been provided in the GIS data submittal. Submitted to PSCW on February 22, 2011.	No further response in this submittal.	Not Applicable

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

Item No.	Application Page	AFR	Information Requirement	Comments/Response	Location of Response	ERF Ref. No.
01-85	GIS Data/Digital Data	Pg. 4; 2.3.6	Flood plain shapefiles contain different information in the attribute tables. Different levels of flood plain zones are used. For example Buffalo County only has zone A while Trempeleau and La Crosse have many more flood plain zones. Explain why.	The complete Digital FIRM floodplain shapefiles from FEMA for Buffalo, La Crosse, and Trempeleau counties have been provided in the GIS data submittal. Submitted to PSCW on February 22, 2011.	No further response in this submittal.	Not Applicable
01-86	GIS Data/Digital Data	2.3.3	No apparent logical naming convention has been used for GIS digital data. Rename GIS files so that the names are logical and information-based.	An Excel spreadsheet containing a list of shapefiles, raster data, aerial photos, and other digital data has been provided in the GIS data submittal. All GIS digital data has been re-named according to examples provided by PSCW. Submitted to PSCW on February 22, 2011.	No further response in this submittal.	Not Applicable
01-87	GIS Data/Digital Data	2.3.3	Clearly label any obsolete route files or files with obsolete route segments. Provide proposed routes as separate shapefiles, and one shapefile that includes all route segments that are in play.	An Excel spreadsheet containing a list of shapefiles, raster data, aerial photos, and other digital data has been provided in the GIS data submittal. All GIS digital data has been re-named according to examples provided by PSCW. Submitted to PSCW on February 22, 2011.	No further response in this submittal.	Not Applicable
01-88	GIS Data/Digital Data	2.3.3	Separate Minnesota data from Wisconsin data and label clearly (e.g. MN_Route_XX or Wis_Route_XX).	An Excel spreadsheet containing a list of shapefiles, raster data, aerial photos, and other digital data has been provided in the GIS data submittal. All GIS digital data has been re-named according to examples provided by PSCW. Submitted to PSCW on February 22, 2011.	No further response in this submittal.	Not Applicable
01-89	GIS Data/Digital Data	2.3.3	Explain why the aerial photos for La Crosse County are in B&W.	The La Crosse County *.sid file containing the color 2008 NAIP aerial photography was included in the initial GIS data submittal. We have reviewed the file in GIS and it appears in color.	No further response in this submittal.	Not Applicable
01-90	GIS Data/Digital Data	2.3.3; 2.4.13.2 .2	Provide the NRCS soils shapefiles for Buffalo and La Crosse Counties.	NRCS soils GIS shapefiles for Trempeleau, Buffalo, and La Crosse County have been provided in the GIS data submittal. Submitted to PSCW on February 22, 2011.	No further response in this submittal.	Not Applicable
01-91		*Conser vation and Load Mgmt.	1. For each load serving entity for the La Crosse study area provide the following: A) The number of residential customers in the La Crosse study area that participate in a direct load program. Break out between air conditioning only and air conditioning with water heating. B) The percentage of residential customers in the study area that participate in a direct load program, broken out by air conditioning only and air conditioning with water heating. C) The coincident load reduction available from the residential customers participating in the these programs in the La Crosse study area.	c	Response 01-91, page 151.	Responses
01-92		*Conser vation and Load Mgmt.	2. For each load serving entity in the La Crosse study area provide the following: A) The number and percentage of commercial and industrial customers in the La Crosse study area that are on a Commercial Load Control Rider. How much load does this represent? B) The number and percentage of commercial and industrial customers in the La Crosse study area that participate in a Peak Control program. How much load does this represent?		See response to Item 01-91, page 151.	

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

Item No.	Application Page	AFR	Information Requirement	Comments/Response	Location of Response	ERF Ref. No.
01-93		*Conser- vation and Load Mgmt.	3. Was an energy efficiency analysis conducted to determine if additional energy efficiency is available in the La Crosse study that is not already reflected in the forecast? If so, describe the study method and provide the results.	Energy efficiency studies are periodically conducted by the load serving utilities and study results are incorporated into the load forecasts. No further energy efficiency study was conducted to determine if additional energy efficiency might be available in the La Crosse/Winona area. The Applicants' experience is that energy efficiency programs can slow load growth but are not effective in reducing existing demand levels. In the La Crosse/Winona area, 2010 demand for electricity exceeded the capability of the transmission system under contingency conditions. In addition, the Project is designed to also meet regional reliability and generation support needs which cannot be addressed by energy efficiency.	No further response in this submittal.	Not Applicable
01-94		*Conser- vation and Load Mgmt.	4. Has NSPW offered its Community Energy Efficiency program in any communities in the La Crosse study area? If so, which ones and when? (This is NSPW's energy efficiency program that provides additional services to residential and small business customers, including bonus incentives, on top of the Focus on Energy incentives, on a rotating basis.)	Yes. Sparta was the first community to utilize this program about 5 years ago. Xcel Energy's Community Conservation program is also being offered to residential and small business customers in the City of La Crosse for the period of 2011 and 2012. It is a possibility that the program will be offered to communities surrounding La Crosse in the upcoming years.	No further response in this submittal.	Not Applicable
01-95		*Conser- vation and Load Mgmt.	5. What energy efficiency services have any other load serving entities provided in the La Crosse study area?		Response 01-95, page 155.	
02-1	Appendix E	NA	Appendix E includes multiple technical studies addressing, among other things, the proposed project and its alternatives. Appendix E contains 462 pages. Some of these pages are not legible, and some of these pages contain substantially repetitive information. In place of the current Appendix E, please provide a stand-alone technical study that may include a collection of the pertinent portions of the current Appendix E that concisely address the justification for the proposed project in supporting the Wisconsin load serving need. This should cover the proposed project and applicants' and staff requested alternatives, detailed economic analyses of the proposed project and its alternatives, per mile transmission line construction costs, substation construction and equipment costs, equipment ratings, and any other relevant information.	At the PSCW Staff's request, Applicants prepared an updated Technical Studies Summary Report (TSSR) summarizing the engineering analyses supporting the need for the Hampton - Rochester - La Crosse 345 kV Transmission Project.	The TSSR will replace, in its entirety, Appendix E of the CPCN. Paper and electronic copies are enclosed. CPCN redline pages i-18, i-19, 1-9, 1-11, 1-12, 1-13, 2-30, 2-31, 2-34, 2-39, 2-42 thru 2-60, and 2-62,.	146252
*Conservation and load management information is required because of a Commission decision in docket 137-CE-140. The decision found that simply modeling existing energy efficiency is not adequate to meet the Energy Priorities Law.						

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.