

Decision Matrix
Dairyland Power Cooperative, Northern States Power Company-Wisconsin, and Wisconsin Public Power, Inc.
Docket 5-CE-136
April 20, 2012

ISSUE	TRANSCRIPT REFERENCE	POSITIONS OF PARTICIPANTS AND OTHER ALTERNATIVES
<p>1. Will the proposed project, if constructed, satisfy the reasonable needs of the public for an adequate supply of electric energy as required for Commission approval under Wis. Stat. § 196.491(3)(d)2, without substantially impairing the efficiency of utility service, providing facilities unreasonably in excess of probable future requirements, or adding to the cost of service without proportionately increasing the value or available quantity of service, pursuant to Wis. Stat. §§ 196.49(3)(b)1, 2, 3, and 196.491(3)(d)3t. and 5, considering:</p> <p>1a. Existing La Crosse local area critical load level;</p> <p>1b. Future load forecasts;</p> <p>1c. Local area load serving alternatives;</p> <p>1d. Regional benefits?</p>	<p>Applicants: Init. Br. at 3-13</p> <p>MISO: Init. Br. at 3-5</p> <p>CUB: Hahn, pp. D12-3; Init. Br. at 17-20</p>	<p>Alternative One: The applicants' proposed project meets the requirements for approval, considering the existing La Crosse local area critical load level, future load forecasts, local load serving alternatives, and regional benefits.</p> <p>Alternative Two: The applicants' proposed project does not meet the requirements for approval, and the Commission should order the applicants to study a hybrid 345/161 kV project.</p>

Decision Matrix
Dairyland Power Cooperative, Northern States Power Company-Wisconsin, and Wisconsin Public Power, Inc.
Docket 5-CE-136
April 20, 2012

ISSUE	TRANSCRIPT REFERENCE	POSITIONS OF PARTICIPANTS AND OTHER ALTERNATIVES
	NoCapX 2020/CETF: Init. Br. at 3-14	Alternative Three: The applicants' proposed project does not meet the requirements for approval, and La Crosse local area need can be addressed by reconductoring existing transmission lines in the area.
2. Are there technically feasible, and environmentally sound alternatives to building the proposed project, per Wis. Stat. §§ 1.12(4) and 196.025(1)? Specifically, is energy efficiency and conservation a reasonable alternative to the proposed project?	<p>Applicants: King, Tr. D21-2, King Ex. 10</p> <p>PSC Staff: Stemrich, Tr. D2-4, Stemrich Ex. 1</p> <p>Members of the public: Bechly, Rineer Ex. 2 at 468, Tr. O698-9; Muller, Rineer Ex. 2 at 218, Tr. O853-7; Schultz, Rineer Ex. 2 at 221, Tr. O865-6; Morse, Rineer Ex. 2 at 430, Tr. O980-2; Danielson, Rineer Ex. 2 at 435, Tr. O994-8; Larson, Rineer Ex. 2 at 445-6, Tr. O1022-5</p>	<p>Alternative One: No, energy efficiency and conservation is not a technically feasible, cost-effective alternative to the project.</p> <p>Alternative Two: Yes, energy efficiency and conservation, particularly if combined with local renewable resources, could offset the need for the project.</p>

Decision Matrix
Dairyland Power Cooperative, Northern States Power Company-Wisconsin, and Wisconsin Public Power, Inc.
Docket 5-CE-136
April 20, 2012

ISSUE	TRANSCRIPT REFERENCE	POSITIONS OF PARTICIPANTS AND OTHER ALTERNATIVES
<p>3. If approved, would the proposed project have a material adverse impact on competition in the relevant wholesale electric service market under Wis. Stat. § 196.491(3)(d)7?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Uncontested)</p>	<p>PSC Staff: Urban, Tr. D7-8, O647-51</p>	<p>Uncontested Alternative: The addition of the proposed project by the applicants will not have a material adverse impact on competition in the relevant wholesale electric service market.</p>
<p>4. Do the routes proposed by the applicants comply with Wis. Stat. §§ 1.12(6)?</p>	<p>Applicants: Hillstrom, Tr. D9-15, R13, O303, 306-312, Hillstrom Ex. 1 at 2-67, 2-73 to 97; Hillstrom Ex. 34; Init. Br. at 13-5</p> <p>DNR: Laatsch, Tr. D4;</p> <p>PSC Staff: Rineer Ex. 1 at 129</p> <p>Applicants: Hillstrom, Tr. O313-316, Hillstrom Ex. 23</p> <p>WisDOT: Fasick, Tr. 12-13; Init. Br. at 17-20</p>	<p>Alternative One: All the routes under consideration are viable and constructible and comply with the statutory requirements for issuance of a CPCN.</p> <p>Alternative Two: The Q1-Highway 35 Route may not be completely in compliance with the statute to the extent that Segment 8B deviates from the existing STH 35 corridor unnecessarily. While the Q1-Highway 35 Route would be parallel to STH 35, its ROW would not share any of the existing DOT ROW.</p> <p>Alternative Three: The Q1 routes may not be completely in compliance with the statute to the extent that the alignment relocations along the GRRNSB deviate from the existing STH 35 or Q1 ROWs unnecessarily.</p>

Decision Matrix
Dairyland Power Cooperative, Northern States Power Company-Wisconsin, and Wisconsin Public Power, Inc.
Docket 5-CE-136
April 20, 2012

ISSUE	TRANSCRIPT REFERENCE	POSITIONS OF PARTICIPANTS AND OTHER ALTERNATIVES
	NoCapX 2020/CETF: Init. Br. at 16-9 Applicants: Hillstrom Tr. O279-284	Alternative Four: A route selection in the public interest and in compliance with the Wisconsin Statutes and Administrative Code is not possible at this time.
5. If approved, would the proposed project comply with Wis. Stat. § 196.491(3)(d)6. and not unreasonably interfere with the orderly land use and development plans for the area involved?	Applicants: Init. Br. at 18 Members of the public: Carlson, Rineer Ex. 2 at 67-8; Procter, Rineer Ex. 2, at 226, Tr. O 877-8 Members of the public: Brott, Rineer Ex. 2 at 217, Tr. 849-52; Bassuener, Rineer Ex. 2 at 4; Waldenberger, Rineer Ex. 2 at 725	Alternative One: None of the route alternatives would unreasonably interfere with local land use and development plans. Alternative Two: Some route segments would unreasonably interfere with local land use and development plans, and route alternatives using those segments should be eliminated from consideration. Alternative Three: Route alternatives through or near the developed areas of the village of Holmen should be avoided.

Decision Matrix
Dairyland Power Cooperative, Northern States Power Company-Wisconsin, and Wisconsin Public Power, Inc.
Docket 5-CE-136
April 20, 2012

ISSUE	TRANSCRIPT REFERENCE	POSITIONS OF PARTICIPANTS AND OTHER ALTERNATIVES
6. Which substation site should be used for the eastern terminus of the project?	<p>Applicants: Stevenson, Tr. D10-D13, SD1-6, SSD1-4, TSD1-3, Stevenson Ex. 10, 11, 12; King Tr. SD1-4 , King Ex. 11; Hillstrom Tr. SD1-3, Hillstrom Ex. 28, 29, 30, 31; Kline R2-13, O148-158</p> <p>DNR: Koslowsky D5; Rineer Ex. 1 at 98</p> <p>Members of the public: Brady, Rineer Ex. 2 at 215, Tr. O845-6; Medinger, Rineer Ex. 2 at 213, Tr. O839-42; Mueller, Rineer Ex. 2 at 470-4, Tr. O703-6; Olson, Rineer Ex. 2 at 224, Tr. O872-5; Brott, Rineer Ex. 2 at 217, Tr. 849-52; Bassuener, Rineer Ex. 2 at 4; Waldenberger, Rineer Ex. 2 at 725</p>	<p>Alternative One: The Briggs Road Substation West Site should be used.</p> <p>The Briggs Road Substation East Site contains habitat that may be suitable for rare plant or bird species. The West Site does not.</p> <p>Alternative Two: The Briggs Road Substation East Site should be used.</p> <p>Alternative Three: Neither the Briggs Road East Site nor the West Site should be selected. The new substation should be located away from developed areas of the village of Holmen. In addition, route alternatives through or near the developed areas of the village of Holmen should be avoided.</p>

Decision Matrix
Dairyland Power Cooperative, Northern States Power Company-Wisconsin, and Wisconsin Public Power, Inc.
Docket 5-CE-136
April 20, 2012

ISSUE	TRANSCRIPT REFERENCE	POSITIONS OF PARTICIPANTS AND OTHER ALTERNATIVES
7. Is the use of the Alma Crossing of the Mississippi River appropriate?	<p>Applicants: Hillstrom, Tr. D16-17; Hillstrom Ex. 1 at 1-3, 1-14 to 1-15, 2-73, Appendix F; Stevenson, Tr. D20; Reply Br. at 15</p> <p>PSC Staff: Rineer Ex. 1 at 42-45</p> <p>NoCapX 2020/CETF: Init. Br. at 17-18</p> <p>Clean WI: Init. Br. at 8-9</p>	<p>Alternative One: Yes. Applicants will work closely with the DNR, the Minnesota DNR, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the USFWS to develop construction plans for the overhead crossing.</p> <p>Alternative Two: No, the process for choosing the crossing location is inadequate. Regardless of crossing location, the line across the Mississippi should be underground.</p>
8. Given the requirements for issuance of a CPCN under Wis. Stat. § 196.025(1m), and Wis. Stat. § 196.491(3)(d), which route, if any, does the Commission authorize?		
8a. Q1-Highway 35		
	<p>Applicants: Hillstrom, Tr. D12-13, R6-7, 16; Hillstrom Ex. 1 at 1-17, 2-2; Init. Br. at 13-30; Reply Br. at 4-15</p> <p>Members of the Public: Brancel, Rineer Ex. 2 at 140-5; Frie, Rineer Ex. 2 at 828-32, Tr. O708-13; LeMasters, Rineer Ex. 2 at 652-3; <i>et al</i></p>	<p>Alternative One: Yes, this route is viable and constructible and complies with the statutory requirements for issuance of a CPCN, and is applicants' preferred route.</p>

Decision Matrix
Dairyland Power Cooperative, Northern States Power Company-Wisconsin, and Wisconsin Public Power, Inc.
Docket 5-CE-136
April 20, 2012

ISSUE	TRANSCRIPT REFERENCE	POSITIONS OF PARTICIPANTS AND OTHER ALTERNATIVES
	<p>WisDOT: Fasick, Tr. D8; Init. Br. at 1-28; Reply Br. 3-14</p> <p>NoCapX 2020/CETF: Reply Br. at 14-5</p> <p>Members of the public: Plank, Rineer Ex. 2 at 513-4, Tr. O757-60; Stiers, Rineer Ex. 2 at 19, Galasinski, Rineer Ex. 2 at 197, Tr. 829-34; Helmueller, Rineer Ex. 2 at 32-3; Balk, Rineer Ex. 2 at 515, Tr. O760-2; Peterslie, Rineer Ex. 2 at 700-1; Smith, Rineer Ex. 2 at 674-6; <i>et al</i></p> <p>DNR: Laatsch, Tr. D9-12, Laatsch Ex. 1; Koslowsky, Tr. D4-10; Thompson, Tr. D3-7; R1-4; O538-71</p> <p>Clean WI: Mosca, Tr. D10-15; Init. Br. at 5-8; Reply Br. at 2-8</p> <p>Members of the public: Narveson, Rineer Ex. 2 at 51; Pederson, Rineer Ex. 2 at 194; Amundson, Rineer Ex. 2 at 681-2; Pelech; Rineer Ex. 2 at 705-6; Swanson, Rineer Ex. 2 at 214, Tr. O842-5; Van Art, Rineer Ex. 2 at 431, Tr. O892-5; <i>et al</i></p>	<p>Alternative Two: Yes, only if the transmission line is placed underground on all scenic easements and on any WisDOT ROW along the GRRNSB, STH 35, except for Segments 9 and 18H, and only if DNR permits construction in wetlands along Segment 8B.</p> <p>Alternative Three: No. This route alternative should not be selected because it relies on Segment 8B in the Black River bottoms/Van Loon State Wildlife Area, where adverse impacts to one of the state's higher quality wetlands and rare species would be too great. DNR does not intend to approve construction in any wetlands in Segment 8B because practicable alternatives to avoid impacts to these sensitive areas exist.</p>

Decision Matrix
Dairyland Power Cooperative, Northern States Power Company-Wisconsin, and Wisconsin Public Power, Inc.
Docket 5-CE-136
April 20, 2012

ISSUE	TRANSCRIPT REFERENCE	POSITIONS OF PARTICIPANTS AND OTHER ALTERNATIVES
8b. Q1-Highway 35 with STH 88 Option A		
	<p>Applicants: Hillstrom, Tr. D11; Hillstrom Ex. 1 at 1-18, Appendix W at 2-1 to 2-7; Init. Br. at 13-14</p> <p>WisDOT: Fasick, Tr. D8-9; Init. Br. at 1-28; Reply Br. at 3-14</p> <p>NoCapX 2020/CETF: Reply Br. at 14-5</p> <p>DNR: Laatsch, Tr. D9-12, Laatsch Ex. 1; Koslowsky, Tr. D4-10; Thompson, Tr. D3-7, R1-4, O538-71 Clean WI: Mosca, Tr. D10-5; Init. Br. at 5-8; Reply Br. at 2-8</p> <p>Members of the Public: Brancel, Rineer Ex. 2 at 140-5; Bechy, Rineer Ex. 2 at 469, Tr. O701-3; Dittrich, Rineer Ex. 2 at 72; Schiffli, Rineer Ex. 2 at 516, Tr. O762-6; <i>et al</i></p>	<p>Alternative One: Yes, this route is viable and constructible and complies with the statutory requirements for issuance of a CPCN.</p> <p>Alternative Two: Yes, but WisDOT permits or scenic easement releases would be done along Route Segments 8A, 8B, and 8C only if the DNR permits construction in wetlands along these segments.</p> <p>Alternative Three: No. This route should not be selected because it relies on Segment 8B in the Black River bottoms/Van Loon State Wildlife Area, where impacts to one of the state's higher-quality wetlands would be too great because practical alternatives to avoid impacts to these sensitive areas exist. DNR does not intend to approve construction in any wetlands on Segment 8B.</p> <p>Alternative Four: No. The STH 88 Options are not appropriate and have major environmental, agricultural, social, and aesthetic impacts.</p>
8c. Q1-Highway 35 with STH 88 Option B		
	<p>Applicants: Hillstrom, Tr. D11, Hillstrom Ex. 1 at 1-18, Appendix W at 2-1 to 2-7; Init. Br. at 13-14</p>	<p>Alternative One: Yes, this route is viable and constructible and complies with the statutory requirements for issuance of a CPCN.</p>

Decision Matrix
Dairyland Power Cooperative, Northern States Power Company-Wisconsin, and Wisconsin Public Power, Inc.
Docket 5-CE-136
April 20, 2012

ISSUE	TRANSCRIPT REFERENCE	POSITIONS OF PARTICIPANTS AND OTHER ALTERNATIVES
	<p>WisDOT: Fasick, Tr. D8-9; Init. Br. at 1-28; Reply Br. at 3-14</p> <p>NoCapX 2020/CETF: Reply Br. at 14-15</p> <p>DNR: Laatsch, Tr. D9-12, Laatsch Ex. 1; Koslowsky, Tr. D4-10; Thompson, Tr. D3-7, R1-4, O538-71</p> <p>Clean WI: Mosca, Tr. D10-15; Init. Br. at 5-8; Reply Br. at 2-8</p> <p>Members of the Public: Brancel, Rineer Ex. 2 at 140-5; Bechy, Rineer Ex. 2 at 469, Tr. O701-3; Dittrich, Rineer Ex. 2 at 72; Schiffli, Rineer Ex. 2 at 516, Tr. O762-6; <i>et al</i></p>	<p>Alternative Two: Yes, but permits or scenic easement releases would be done along Segments 8A, 8B, and 8C only if DNR permits construction in wetlands along these segments.</p> <p>Alternative Three: No. This route alternative should not be selected because it relies on Segment 8B in the Van Loon State Wildlife Area, where impacts to one of the state's higher-quality wetlands would be too great. DNR does not intend to approve construction in any wetlands in Segment 8B.</p> <p>Alternative Four: No. The STH 88 Options are not appropriate and have major environmental, agricultural, social, and aesthetic impacts.</p>
8d. Q1–Galesville		
	<p>Applicants: Hillstrom, Tr. D13, Hillstrom Ex. 1 at 1-18, 2-16; Init. Br. at 13-14</p> <p>WisDOT: Fasick, Tr. D9; Init. Br. at 1-28; Reply Br. at 3-14</p> <p>NoCapX 2020/CETF: Reply Br. at 14-5</p>	<p>Alternative One: Yes, this route is viable and constructible and complies with the statutory requirements for issuance of a CPCN.</p> <p>Alternative Two: Yes, only if the transmission line was placed underground on all scenic easements and on any WisDOT ROW along the GRRNSB except for Segment 18H. Otherwise WisDOT will not grant permits or written consent or sell or release scenic easements along or across the GRRNSB for this route.</p>

Decision Matrix
Dairyland Power Cooperative, Northern States Power Company-Wisconsin, and Wisconsin Public Power, Inc.
Docket 5-CE-136
April 20, 2012

ISSUE	TRANSCRIPT REFERENCE	POSITIONS OF PARTICIPANTS AND OTHER ALTERNATIVES
	Members of the Public: Anderson, Rineer Ex. 2, at 157-8; Hart, Rineer Ex. 2 at 677-9; Price, Rineer Ex. 2 at 95-9; <i>et al</i>	Alternative Three: No. Route alternatives that use the Galesville route segments (6 and 13A-E) should be avoided.
8e. Q1 - Galesville with STH 88 Option A		
	<p>Applicants: Hillstrom, Tr. D13; Hillstrom Ex. 1 at 1-18, Appendix W at 2-1 to 2-7; Init. Br. at 13-4</p> <p>WisDOT: Fasick, Tr. D9; Init. Br. at 1-3; Reply Br. at 5-6</p> <p>PSC Staff: Rineer, Tr. R3-4</p> <p>Members of the Public: Brancel, Rineer Ex. 2 at 140-5; Anderson, Rineer Ex. 2 at 157-8; Hart, Rineer Ex. 2 at 677-9; Price, Rineer Ex. 2 at 95-9; Bechy, Rineer Ex. 2 at 469, Tr. O701-3; Dittrich, Rineer Ex. 2 at 72; Schiffli, Rineer Ex. 2 at 516, Tr. O762-6; <i>et al</i></p>	<p>Alternative One: Yes, this route is viable and constructible and complies with the statutory requirements for issuance of a CPCN. WisDOT indicates that it would permit this route alternative.</p> <p>Alternative Two: No. The STH 88 Options are not appropriate and have major environmental, agricultural, social, and aesthetic impacts. Route alternatives that use the Galesville route segments (6 and 13A-E) should be avoided.</p>

Decision Matrix
Dairyland Power Cooperative, Northern States Power Company-Wisconsin, and Wisconsin Public Power, Inc.
Docket 5-CE-136
April 20, 2012

ISSUE	TRANSCRIPT REFERENCE	POSITIONS OF PARTICIPANTS AND OTHER ALTERNATIVES
8f. Q1-Galesville with STH 88 Option B	<p>Applicants: Hillstrom, Tr. D13; Hillstrom Ex. 1 at 1-18, Appendix W at 2-1 to 2-7; Init. Br. at 13-4</p> <p>WisDOT: Fasick, Tr. D9; Init. Br. at 1-3; Reply Br. at 5-6</p> <p>PSC Staff: Rineer Tr. R3-4</p> <p>Members of the Public: Brancel, Rineer Ex. 2 at 140-5; Anderson, Rineer Ex. 2 at 157-8; Hart, Rineer Ex. 2 at 677-9; Price, Rineer Ex. 2 at 95-9; Bechy, Rineer Ex. 2 at 469, Tr. O701-3; Dittrich, Rineer Ex. 2 at 72; Schiffli, Rineer Ex. 2 at 516, Tr. O762-6; <i>et al</i></p>	<p>Alternative One: Yes, this route is viable and constructible and complies with the statutory requirements for issuance of a CPCN. WisDOT indicates that it would permit this route alternative.</p> <p>Alternative Two: No. The STH 88 Options are not appropriate and have major agricultural, environmental, social, and aesthetic impacts. Route alternatives that use the Galesville route segments (6 and 13A-E) should be avoided.</p>

Decision Matrix
Dairyland Power Cooperative, Northern States Power Company-Wisconsin, and Wisconsin Public Power, Inc.
Docket 5-CE-136
April 20, 2012

ISSUE	TRANSCRIPT REFERENCE	POSITIONS OF PARTICIPANTS AND OTHER ALTERNATIVES
8g. Arcadia	<p>Applicants: Hillstrom, Tr. D13; Init. Br. at 13-14</p> <p>DNR: Laatsch, Tr. D9; Koslowski, Tr. D7</p> <p>WisDOT: Fasick, Tr. D9-10; Init. Br. at 1-3</p> <p>PSC Staff: Rineer Tr. R3-4</p> <p>Members of the Public: Brancel, Rineer Ex. 2 at 140-5; Winey, Rineer Ex. 2 at 177-8; Ziegeweid, Rineer Ex. 2 at 499, Tr. O723-5; <i>et al</i></p>	<p>Alternative One: Yes, this route is viable and constructible and complies with the statutory requirements for issuance of a CPCN. It is a route that DNR considers permissible and it would have the least overall impact to endangered resources and rare species. WisDOT agrees to permit overhead installation for scenic easement or highway ROW sharing and crossing along this route.</p> <p>DNR considers this route permissible, and to have the least overall impact to endangered resources and rare species.</p> <p>WisDOT agrees to permit overhead installation for scenic easement or highway ROW sharing and crossing along this route.</p> <p>Alternative Two: No. Route alternatives that use the Arcadia route segments (Segments 10C1-11G2) should be avoided.</p>

Decision Matrix
Dairyland Power Cooperative, Northern States Power Company-Wisconsin, and Wisconsin Public Power, Inc.
Docket 5-CE-136
April 20, 2012

ISSUE	TRANSCRIPT REFERENCE	POSITIONS OF PARTICIPANTS AND OTHER ALTERNATIVES
8h. Arcadia–Ettrick	<p>Applicants: Hillstrom, Tr. D13; Hillstrom Ex. 1 at 1-16 to 1-18, Appendix W at. 2-1 to 2-6, 2-14; Init. Br. at 13-4</p> <p>WisDOT: Fasick, Tr. D10; Init. Br. at 1-3</p> <p>PSC Staff: Rineer Tr. R3-4</p> <p>Members of the Public: Brancel, Rineer Ex. 2 at 140-5; Winey, Rineer Ex. 2 at 177-8; Ziegeweid, Rineer Ex. 2 at 499, Tr. O723-5; Congdon, Rineer Ex. 2 at 118-9; Zollweg, Rineer Ex. 2 at 132-6; <i>et al</i></p>	<p>Alternative One: Yes, this route is viable and constructible and complies with the statutory requirements for issuance of a CPCN.</p> <p>WisDOT would permit overhead installations on scenic easements or highway ROW sharing and crossing.</p> <p>Alternative Two: No. This route affects more farmland than any other route alternative except the Q1-Galesville with STH 88 Option B. Route alternatives that use the Arcadia route segments (Segments 10C1-11G2) and Ettrick route segments (Segments 1ET-4ET) should be avoided.</p>
8i. Original Q1	<p>Applicants: Hillstrom, Tr. D20-21; Hillstrom Ex. 1 at 1-16 to 1-17, Appendix N; Init. Br. at 1-2</p> <p>PSC Staff: Rineer Ex. 1, at 37-8, Appendix F at 6</p>	<p>Alternative One: No, because a USFWS permit to construct the project along the original Q1 Route in the Upper Mississippi National Wildlife Refuge is not obtainable.</p>

Decision Matrix
Dairyland Power Cooperative, Northern States Power Company-Wisconsin, and Wisconsin Public Power, Inc.
Docket 5-CE-136
April 20, 2012

ISSUE	TRANSCRIPT REFERENCE	POSITIONS OF PARTICIPANTS AND OTHER ALTERNATIVES
	<p>WisDOT: Fasick, Tr. D8; Init. Br. at 1-3; Reply Br. at 3-14</p> <p>NoCapX 2020/CETF: Reply Br. at 14-5</p> <p>DNR: Laatsch, Tr. D10-12; Laatsch Ex. 1; Koslowsky, Tr. D4-10; Thompson, Tr. D3-7, R1-4, O538-71</p> <p>Clean WI: Reply Br. at 2-8</p> <p>Members of the Public: Brancel, Rineer Ex. 2 at 140-5; Bremer, Rineer Ex. 2 at. 139; Drogemiller, Rineer Ex. 2 at 615-8; Killian, Rineer Ex. 2 at. 261-2, Tr. O961-2; Brott, Rineer Ex. 2 at 217, Tr. 849-52; Bassuener, Rineer Ex. 2 at 4; Waldenberger, Rineer Ex. 2 at 725; <i>et al</i></p>	<p>Alternative Two: Yes, only if the transmission line is placed underground on all scenic easements and on any WisDOT ROW along the GRRNSB except for segment 18H.</p> <p>Alternative Three: No. DNR will not permit any segment of 345 kV line that follows the existing Q1 line through the Black River bottoms area.</p> <p>Alternative Four: Yes. It is one of two routes that affect the least amount of farmland or prime farmland. WisDOT scenic easements do not seem to prohibit the routing of the line. Also, the original Q1 Route alternative is the only alternative that avoids the developed areas of the village of Holmen.</p>

Decision Matrix
Dairyland Power Cooperative, Northern States Power Company-Wisconsin, and Wisconsin Public Power, Inc.
Docket 5-CE-136
April 20, 2012

ISSUE	TRANSCRIPT REFERENCE	POSITIONS OF PARTICIPANTS AND OTHER ALTERNATIVES
<p>9. Should any portion of the routes under consideration be constructed underground?</p>	<p>Applicants: Hillstrom, Tr. D33, R9-13, Hillstrom Ex. 1 Appendix F, 19, 36; Stevenson, Tr. R3-7, SR1-2, SSR2-4, Stevenson Ex. 16, 17, 20, 21; Init. Br. at 23-30; Reply Br. at 4-13</p> <p>WisDOT: Fasick Tr. O333-8, 346-99, Fasick Ex. 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17</p> <p>PSC Staff: Rineer Ex. 1 at 45</p> <p>WisDOT: Fasick, Tr. D6-15, R1-2, SR1-5, O412-20, O437-9, Fasick Ex. 1; Init. Br pp. 1-2</p> <p>PSC Staff: Rineer R3-4;</p> <p>Applicants: Hillstrom Tr. O296-301</p> <p>NoCapX 2020/CETF: Init. Br. 19-20</p> <p>Members of the Public: Plank, Rineer Ex. 2 at 513-4, Tr. O757-60; Stiers, Rineer Ex. 2, at 19, <i>et al</i></p>	<p>Alternative One: No.</p> <p>Alternative Two: Yes, for any new transmission construction along the GRRNSB as part of the Q1-Highway 35 Route, the Q1-Galesville Route, and any crossings of the GRRNSB by the line.</p> <p>Alternative Three: Yes. The cost of undergrounding for portions of the line in this case is reasonable. The Mississippi River crossing should be installed underground.</p> <p>Alternative Four: Yes. The proposed project should be constructed underground to avoid aesthetic impacts.</p>

Decision Matrix
Dairyland Power Cooperative, Northern States Power Company-Wisconsin, and Wisconsin Public Power, Inc.
Docket 5-CE-136
April 20, 2012

ISSUE	TRANSCRIPT REFERENCE	POSITIONS OF PARTICIPANTS AND OTHER ALTERNATIVES
<p>10. What general conditions, if any, should be attached to construction of the proposed project to meet the requirements of Commission approval?</p>	<p>Members of the public: M. Delany, Elmaro Farms, Rineer Ex. 2 at 22-3, Tr. O619-20; J. Ecker, Ecker's Apple Farm, Rineer Ex. 2 at 20-1, 451, Tr. O1029-34; B. Franklin, Rineer Ex. 2 at 511, Tr. O746-49; A. Schaub, Rineer Ex. 2 at 479-84, Tr. O713-6; L. Docken, Rineer Ex. 2 at 711-8; <i>et al</i></p> <p>Members of the public: D. Miller, Rineer Ex. 2 at 267, Tr. O967-9; E. Stahl, Rineer Ex. 2 at 707; R. Benusa, Rineer Ex. 2 at 447, Tr. O1025-8; <i>et al</i></p> <p>Members of the public: A. Kube, Rineer Ex. 2 at 455, Tr. O684-5; G. Hohman, Rineer Ex. 2 at 457, Tr. O688-9; G. Howe, Rineer Ex. 2 at 500, Tr. O725-33; West Wisconsin Land Trust, Inc., Rineer Ex. 2 at 35; Rineer Ex. 1 at 150-3, Fig. Vol. 2-1</p>	<p>Alternative One: None.</p> <p>Alternative Two: Any or all of the following conditions are appropriate:</p> <p>10a. Require that the applicants work with operators of organic farms and agri tourism businesses to minimize the likelihood injury to crops or loss of organic certification from herbicide application within the authorized route ROW. The Commission could require that the applicants work with the operators to determine the most effective techniques for minimizing the likelihood of injury to crops or loss of organic certification.</p> <p>10b. Require that the applicants to work with residents to detect and mitigate radio communications interference.</p> <p>10c. Require that the applicants work with landowners and holders of conservation easements regarding facilities placement to minimize the effects on properties under conservation easement.</p>

Decision Matrix
Dairyland Power Cooperative, Northern States Power Company-Wisconsin, and Wisconsin Public Power, Inc.
Docket 5-CE-136
April 20, 2012

ISSUE	TRANSCRIPT REFERENCE	POSITIONS OF PARTICIPANTS AND OTHER ALTERNATIVES
<p>11. What route-specific conditions, if any, should be attached to construction of the proposed project to meet the requirements of Commission approval?</p>	<p>Members of the public: F. Allen, Rineer Ex. 2 at 737; J. Scheidegger, Rineer Ex. 2 at 666-71</p> <p>Members of the public: S. Suhr, Rineer Ex. 2 at 519-30, Tr. O771-9</p> <p>Members of the public: S. Wright, Rineer Ex. 2 at 731</p>	<p>Alternative One: None.</p> <p>Alternative Two: Any or all of the following conditions are appropriate:</p> <p>11a. Require that the applicants work with landowners, to the extent practicable, regarding the placement of facilities on their properties.</p> <p>11b. Require the applicants to use best construction practices to avoid impacts to drinking water wells.</p> <p>11c. Require the applicants to work with operators of center pivot irrigation systems, to the extent practicable, to avoid impacts from project facilities on operations of those systems</p>

Decision Matrix
Dairyland Power Cooperative, Northern States Power Company-Wisconsin, and Wisconsin Public Power, Inc.
Docket 5-CE-136
April 20, 2012

ISSUE	TRANSCRIPT REFERENCE	POSITIONS OF PARTICIPANTS AND OTHER ALTERNATIVES
<p>12. Should the Commission require independent environmental monitors?</p>	<p>PSC Staff: Rineer Tr. D7-10, S1-2, O592-593, O597-598, Rineer Ex. 1 at 57, 65, 281-283; Laatsch Tr. D10</p> <p>Members of the public: Rineer Ex. 2 at 140-5, Brancel letter</p> <p>Clean WI: Mosca Tr. D22; Init. Br. at 14-15</p> <p>Applicants: Stevenson Tr.D17-18 ; Hillstrom Tr. R3, Hillstrom Ex. 1 at 2-62</p>	<p>Alternative One: Environmental monitors should be employed that would be independent of the applicants and their contractors and report to the Commission and other state agencies. The independent environmental monitors should have the authority to stop work at a site until a problem is rectified.</p> <p>Alternative Two: No independent environmental monitor is needed.</p>
<p>13. Assuming minor routing flexibility may be needed if the project is approved, what process should be followed? (Uncontested)</p>	<p>Applicants: Hillstrom Tr. D50; Init. Br. at 30</p> <p>PSC Staff: Rineer Tr. D5-7</p>	<p>Uncontested Alternative: Applicants should follow the process and communications required of the applicants in previous 345 kV dockets and should be granted the minor routing flexibility granted by the Commission in those dockets if the process is followed.</p>

Decision Matrix
Dairyland Power Cooperative, Northern States Power Company-Wisconsin, and Wisconsin Public Power, Inc.
Docket 5-CE-136
April 20, 2012

ISSUE	TRANSCRIPT REFERENCE	POSITIONS OF PARTICIPANTS AND OTHER ALTERNATIVES
<p>14. What is the cost of the proposed project? (Uncontested)</p>	<p>PSC Staff: Rineer Ex. 1 at 48</p>	<p>Uncontested Alternative: The proposed project costs estimated as the sum of year of occurrence dollars range from about \$195 million to about \$234 million, depending upon the transmission line route selected. These costs include the new substation cost, distribution line relocation cost, and allowance for funds used during construction (AFUDC).</p>
<p>15. What are the appropriate high-voltage impact fees?</p>	<p>Applicants: Stevenson Tr. D26-27, R2, Stevenson Ex. 8</p> <p>PSC Staff: Weiss, Tr. D2-4, O601-602; docket 137-CE-147 Supplemental Order, PSC REF#: 144226</p>	<p>Alternative One: Exclude all lower voltage construction costs from the base cost for the calculation of the high-voltage impact fees.</p> <p>Alternative Two: Include some or all of the lower-voltage construction costs in the base cost for the calculation of the high-voltage impact fees:</p> <p>15a. Costs for 161 and 69 kV substation components at the Briggs Road Substation.</p> <p>15b. Costs for 161 kV and 69 kV lines near the Briggs Road Substation.</p>

Decision Matrix
Dairyland Power Cooperative, Northern States Power Company-Wisconsin, and Wisconsin Public Power, Inc.
Docket 5-CE-136
April 20, 2012

ISSUE	TRANSCRIPT REFERENCE	POSITIONS OF PARTICIPANTS AND OTHER ALTERNATIVES
		<p>15c. Costs for 161 kV line facilities along segments using the existing Q1 route, because DPC will reconstruct Q1 regardless of which route alternative the Commission selects. (If the Q1 line is reconstructed but not selected by the Commission for the Alma–La Crosse 345 kV project, no high-voltage impact fees would be collected because the facilities would operate below 345 kV.)</p> <p>15d. Costs for relocation of lower-voltage and distribution lines.</p>
<p>16. Has the Commission complied with the Wisconsin Environmental Policy Act (WEPA) pursuant to Wis. Stats. § 1.11 and Wis. Admin. Code ch. PSC 4?</p>	<p>PSC Staff: Rineer, Ex. Rineer 1, Rineer, Tr. D2-D4, D10, O577-O580</p> <p>DNR: Laatsch, Tr. D7</p> <p>Applicants: Applicants’ Reply Br. at 14-5</p>	<p>Alternative One: Yes, the Commission’s analysis and review of the proposed project meets the requirements of Wis. Stats. § 1.11 and Wis. Admin. Code ch. PSC 4.</p>

Decision Matrix
Dairyland Power Cooperative, Northern States Power Company-Wisconsin, and Wisconsin Public Power, Inc.
Docket 5-CE-136
April 20, 2012

ISSUE	TRANSCRIPT REFERENCE	POSITIONS OF PARTICIPANTS AND OTHER ALTERNATIVES
	<p>Clean WI: Mosca Tr. D3-D22; Clean WI Init. Br. at 8-14</p> <p>NoCapX: NoCapX/CETF Init. Br. at 17-18</p> <p>WisDOT: Waldschmidt Tr. S3</p> <p>Members of the public: Plank, Rineer Ex. 2 at 513-4, Tr. O757-60</p>	<p>Alternative Two: No, the Commission's analysis and review of the proposed project does not meet the requirements of Wis. Stats. § 1.11 and Wis. Admin. Code ch. PSC 4.</p>
<p>17. Should the Commission grant a CPCN for the proposed project?</p>	<p>Applicants: Hillstrom Ex. 1 at 1-22; Init. Br. at 2-3, 30</p> <p>ATC: Init. Br. at 1-11</p> <p>MISO: Init. Br. at 7</p> <p>Members of the public: Wind on the Wires, Rineer Ex. 2 at 222, Tr. 867-71; D. Oekers, Rineer Ex. 2 at 230, Tr. O887-91; <i>et al</i></p> <p>Wis. Stat. § 196.491(3)(e)</p> <p>Clean WI: Init. Br. at 14-5</p> <p>Members of the public: D. Olson, Rineer Ex. 2 at 5-6</p>	<p>Alternative One: Grant a CPCN.</p> <p>Alternative Two: Grant a CPCN, with conditions.</p> <p>Alternative Three: Deny a CPCN, and decide this project at a later date, concurrent with the Badger-Coulee decision.</p>

Decision Matrix
Dairyland Power Cooperative, Northern States Power Company-Wisconsin, and Wisconsin Public Power, Inc.
Docket 5-CE-136
April 20, 2012

ISSUE	TRANSCRIPT REFERENCE	POSITIONS OF PARTICIPANTS AND OTHER ALTERNATIVES
	Clean WI: Init. Br. at 9-14 CUB: Init. Br. at 1-16 NoCapX 2020/CETF: Init. Br. at 1-23 Members of the public: D. Severson, Rineer Ex. 2 at 59-61; K. Goodman, Rineer Ex. 2 at 560, Tr. O800-6; <i>et al</i>	Alternative Four: The application does not meet the requirements of Wis. Stats § 196.491, and should be denied.