

ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

Docket No. 12-0598 (R)

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

MARY BURNS

Submitted on Behalf of the Coalition of Property Owners and Interested Parties in Piatt, Douglas
and Moultrie Counties, and the Channon Family Trust

TABLE OF CONTENTS

WITNESS IDENTIFICATION	3
PURPOSE AND SCOPE	3
ROUTE COMBINATIONS	4
MCPO DESIGN METHODOLOGY	5
COST AND LANDOWNER IMPACT	11
PARALLEL ROUTING OPPORTUNITIES	12
PARALLEL TRANSMISSION LINES	15
OFF COURSE ROUTING	18
AGRICULTURAL IMPACT	22
PRIME FARMLAND DETERMINATION	25
RESIDENTIAL AND NON-RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURES	31
“PARTIES” FOR AND AGAINST ROUTES	36
CONCLUSION	38

WITNESS IDENTIFICATION

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Q. Would you please state your name, address and basic background relevant to this proceeding?

A. Yes. My name is Mary Burns and my address is 10 Oakwood Dr., Springfield, Illinois. I am a member of the PDM intervenor group and am working with the Channon Family Trust intervenor group.

Q. Are you the same Mary Burns who presented direct testimony and rebuttal testimony in this rehearing?

A. Yes, I am.

PURPOSE and SCOPE

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

A. The purpose of my testimony is to address the rebuttal testimonies of MCPO witnesses Mr. James Dauphinais and Mr. Rudolph Reinecke and of ATXI witness Ms. Maureen Borkowski.

Q. What is the scope of your testimony?

A. The scope of my testimony will be limited to proposed routes for the Mt. Zion to Kansas segment of the Illinois Rivers Project.

ROUTE COMBINATIONS

24

25

26 **Q. In Mr. Dauphinais' and Mr. Reinecke's rebuttal testimony how many route**
27 **combinations are identified and for which an analysis is presented?**

28 A. Mr. Dauphinais and Mr. Reinecke identify nine routes. For each of three routes (MZK,
29 ATXI Alternate Route and Channon Hybrid Route) with an assumed connection to each of three
30 proposed substation sites (ATXI, Staff Option 1 and Staff Option 2) nine combinations resulted.
31 (MCPO Ex. 1.0 (RH), pages 10-11, lines 214 to 252).

32

33 **Q. Have all nine route combinations and the detailed MCPO methodology and**
34 **principles used for routing design and analysis been introduced into evidence in this**
35 **rehearing proceeding?**

36 A. No. No party has submitted direct testimony in support of the ATXI Alternate Route.
37 Nine route combinations only serve to obfuscate the real reason for rebuttal in this case. There
38 are only two routes under consideration.

39

40 **Q. Does Mr. Reinecke criticize the route combinations you presented in your direct**
41 **testimony?**

42 A. Yes. Mr. Reinecke states that the MZK route and the Channon Hybrid Route should be
43 compared from the ATXI proposed substation site. (MCPO Ex. 2.0 (RH) page 12, lines 289-
44 293). My direct testimony was submitted in accordance with the route combinations in the
45 record. At that time the record indicated the MCPO route connected to the ATXI proposed

46 substation site and the Channon Hybrid Route was proposed as part of my direct testimony with
47 a connection to the Staff Option 1 site.

48

49 **Q. What route and substation combinations will you address in your rebuttal**
50 **testimony?**

51 A. For purposes of simplicity and clarity, I will limit my testimony to the MZK route and the
52 Channon Hybrid Route both connected to the Staff Option 1 substation site, the Staff preferred
53 site (Channon-ICC 1.04, attached to this testimony as PDM Ex. 8.1). This should address Mr.
54 Reinecke's concern regarding routes not connected to the same substation site.

55

56

MCPO DESIGN METHODOLOGY

57

58 **Q. Does Mr. Dauphinais perform a routing analysis of the nine route combinations and**
59 **describe the methodology of this analysis?**

60 A. Yes. Mr. Dauphinais states that his analysis is based on the same methodology and
61 principles described in his direct testimony. (MCPO Ex. 1.0 (RH), page 11, lines 262-264). Mr.
62 Dauphinais explains a Phase I and a Phase II analysis. (MCPO EX 1.0 (RH), page 12, lines 267-
63 279; page 13, lines 300-313)

64

65 **Q. Have Mr. Dauphinais' methodology and principles of route design and analysis**
66 **been the subject of criticism in these proceedings?**

67 A. Yes. ATXI witness Ms. Donell Murphy has presented extensive testimony regarding the
68 methodology and principles used by MCPO's Mr. Dauphinais and Mr. Reinecke in the

69 development of the MZK route, at ATXI Ex. 13.0 and at the hearing in the underlying
70 proceeding on May 16, 2013.

71

72 **Q. Was Ms. Murphy presented as an expert witness?**

73 A. Yes. ATXI witness Murphy was presented as the expert witness regarding environmental
74 routing issues and is well qualified to make an assessment of the methodology and principles
75 used by MCPO.

76 *May 16 Transcript, page 768, lines 16-21:*

77 **Q. And Ameren is tendering you as its testifying expert on the selection?**

78 A. *That is correct*

79 **Q. And Ameren had you provide specific testimony why MCPO's route is not**
80 **viable?**

81 A. *That is correct.*

82

83 **Q. Did Ms. Murphy identify reasons why the MZK route does not present a viable**
84 **alternative?**

85 A. Yes. ATXI witness Donell Murphy summarized the reasons why the MZK route does
86 not present a viable alternative.

87 *ATXI Ex 13.0 page 53, lines 1143-1150:*

88 **Q. Why do the alternatives proposed by MCPO not present viable alternatives for**
89 **the Mt. Zion-Kansas portion of the Project?**

90 A. *As discussed above, the alternatives identified by MCPO between Mt. Zion and*
91 *Kansas do not appear to have been developed with equal and non-subjective*

92 *consideration of all environmental routing criteria evaluated within ATXI's route siting*
93 *analysis. They do not fairly reflect public input. They extend outside of ATXI's study*
94 *area, on the basis only that doing so will increase geographic diversity, though the land*
95 *use and geography within MCPO's study area is no different than within ATXI's.*

96

97 **Q. What are some of the issues Ms. Murphy addressed regarding the MCPO**
98 **methodology and principles?**

99 A. Ms. Murphy presented extensive rebuttal testimony regarding the methodology and
100 principles used for the development and analysis of the two MCPO routes, Pana to Kansas and
101 Mt. Zion to Kansas (MZK) at ATXI Ex 13.0, pages 40-54. Ms. Murphy's rebuttal testimony
102 remains pertinent as Mr. Dauphinais states that his methodology and principles used during this
103 rehearing are the same as those used for the original proceeding.

104 *ATXI Ex. 13.0 page 41 lines 867-872:*

105 *Mr. Dauphinais and Mr. Reinecke developed the routes ultimately proposed by MCPO*
106 *using what they describe as either a four or two-step process (Mr. Dauphinais appears to*
107 *summarize Mr. Reinecke's four-step process into a two-step process). In summary, it*
108 *appears that their process generally involved developing corridors and then iteratively*
109 *refining them. Although both Mr. Dauphinais and Mr. Reinecke provide extensive*
110 *discussion and supporting data tables, it is not clear how they reached their conclusions.*

111

112 *ATXI Ex 13.0 page 41 lines 882-884, page 42 lines 885-887:*

113 *ATXI's approach began with review of all available opportunities and ATXI subsequently*
114 *removed opportunities iteratively, based on a review of sensitivities along these*

115 *opportunities (which influenced the individual strength of these opportunities) and the*
116 *incorporation of public input. The purpose of ATXI's Phase I criteria prioritization*
117 *exercise was to facilitate public input concerning a list of more than 30 environmental*
118 *sensitivities. MCPO, on the other hand, whittled this list of sensitivities down to as few as*
119 *six.*

120
121 *ATXI Ex 13.0 page 42 lines 897-907:*

122 ***Q. Can you further describe Mr. Dauphinais' performance ratings, averaging or***
123 ***simple averaging, scoring, weighting or ranking of criteria or routes?***

124 *A. I will attempt to describe this process in more detail below. Generally, not only*
125 *was Mr. Dauphinais' testimony not entirely clear in what each of these steps entailed (for*
126 *example, he discussed two different steps of weighting criteria but he only provided his*
127 *weighting values for one), it's also not entirely clear how each of these steps were*
128 *ordered, if consistently so, within his decision-making process. Mr. Dauphinais appears*
129 *to have failed to incorporate environmental routing criteria beyond the six or eight he*
130 *made repeated reference to. Mr. Dauphinais criticizes ATXI's route siting analysis,*
131 *methods of soliciting public input and the incorporation of this input. However, Mr.*
132 *Dauphinais' analysis contradicts his own statements in that he subjectively assigned*
133 *ratings, weights, scores and ranks to reach his desired conclusions.*

134

135

136

137

138 *ATXI Ex 13.0 page 43 lines 914-924:*

139 **Q.** *Mr. Reinecke suggested that ATXI's public process is sufficiently transferrable*
140 *to the scope of MCPO's study simply because the counties within ATXI's study area*
141 *are the same counties within MCPO's extended area of study. Do you agree?*

142 *A. No. MCPO's routing methodology is different than ATXI's, in that it first*
143 *eliminated sensitivities from consideration and takes into account as few as six of the 30*
144 *routing criteria identified at public meetings hosted by ATXI. It is not clear how the*
145 *results of ATXI's public process might have differed if only the six criteria used by MCPO*
146 *had been evaluated by the public. It is also unclear why Mr. Reinecke believes that the*
147 *results of ATXI's public input process apply to MCPO's routing analysis, since MCPO is*
148 *not relying on the results of ATXI's public process within its study. Moreover,*
149 *landowners along MCPO's alternative routes would not have received direct mail*
150 *invitation to open houses as landowners along ATXI's routes did.*

151

152 *ATXI Ex 13.0 page 43 lines 925-930, page 44 line 931:*

153 **Q.** *How did Mr. Reinecke refine his route corridors?*

154 *A. Mr. Reinecke stated that MCPO's routes were further refined after aerial survey*
155 *to better parallel certain linear features, increase distance from buildings and decrease*
156 *woodland and stream crossings. Mr. Reinecke subsequently explained that MCPO's*
157 *route comparison focused on lower impacts to structures and prime farmland. As*
158 *discussed above, it's not clear based on the differing lists of sensitivities discussed by Mr.*
159 *Reinecke as to how these sensitivities were evaluated within their route development*
160 *process.*

161 *ATXI Ex 13.0 page 45 lines 957-961:*

162 *However, after this calculation was complete, Mr. Dauphinais determined that there was*
163 *a problem with weighting the number of streams crossed the same as the number of*
164 *residences impacted. He therefore reduced the weighting applied to stream crossings in*
165 *the average of the high sensitivity factors by half. He claims that this process "introduced*
166 *clarity" because MCPO's primary route from Mt. Zion to Kansas emerged with the*
167 *highest score.*

168

169 *ATXI Ex 13.0 page 46, lines 990-998:*

170 ***Q.*** *Please respond to Mr. Dauphinais' assertion that section lines and roads are*
171 *not equally-appropriate routing factors because there is not a significant*
172 *environmental fragmentation associated with section lines.*

173 *A.* *I disagree with Mr. Dauphinais' assertion that section lines and roads are not*
174 *equally- appropriate routing factors. Routing a transmission line involves a balance of*
175 *trade-offs. Potential impacts cannot be avoided, or even necessarily reduced, along one*
176 *type of linear feature as opposed to another in all circumstances. Rather, a type of impact*
177 *may be less along one route than another, but another type of impact is in turn higher*
178 *along the other. Competing interests are inevitable.*

179

180 **Q.** **Did Ms. Murphy continue to support her testimony even after ATXI entered into a**
181 **stipulation with MCPO?**

182 A. Yes. In cross examination Ms. Murphy held firm in her criticism of the methodology and
183 principles used by MCPO during design and analysis. (Transcript of May 16, 2013 page 759,
184 line 5, to page 768, line 15; page 768, line 22; and page 769, lines 1-3).

185
186 COST AND LANDOWNER IMPACTS

187 **Q. Do both MCPO and ATXI acknowledge MZK is much more expensive than the**
188 **Channon Hybrid Route?**

189 A. Yes, MCPO Ex. 1.5 (RH), attached here as PDM Ex. 8.2, is a data response prepared by
190 ATXI witness Hackman attached to Mr. Dauphinais' rebuttal testimony which shows that from
191 Staff proposed Option 1 substation site, the baseline cost estimate for MZK is \$135,915,000, the
192 *most* expensive of all the route combinations. The baseline cost of the Channon Hybrid Route is
193 \$118,169,000, the *least* expensive of all the route combinations. The MZK route is \$17,746,000
194 more costly to construct than the Channon Hybrid Route.

195
196 **Q. Are there other factors besides baseline cost that make MZK even more expensive**
197 **than the Channon Hybrid Route?**

198 A. Yes, \$17.746 million is just the baseline cost differential. The MZK route is 9.5 miles
199 longer, so it will require 173 more acres of easement than the Channon route. This is based on
200 an easement area of 150 feet wide by 5280 feet (1 mile) long which is 792,000 square feet, or
201 18.2 acres, times 9.5 miles, which is 172.9 acres. There is a significant additional cost to
202 ratepayers for ATXI to acquire easements over an additional 173 acres, as such acquisition costs
203 must include not just the easement value, but also compaction damages and damage to the
204 remainder. Maintenance costs for an additional 9.5 miles of transmission line will also be a

205 significant, recurring additional expense. As ATXI witness Trelz testified, the 345kV line
206 averages 5.4 to 5.5 support structures per mile (Transcript of May 14, p. 406, l. 17). Therefore,
207 the MZK route will entail more than 50 additional support structures that must be maintained.

208
209 PARALLEL ROUTING OPPORTUNITIES

210

211 **Q. Have Mr. Dauphinais and Mr. Reinecke identified what they consider as the most**
212 **important parallel routing opportunity?**

213 A. Yes. MCPO's response to DR ATXI-MCPO 2.06 (Supp.), attached here as PDM Ex. 8.3,
214 lists the routing "opportunities" and routing "sensitivities" that Mr. Dauphinais and Mr. Reinecke
215 chose to consider, in order of importance. Mr. Dauphinais and Mr. Reinecke refer to this list as
216 "Ad Hoc criteria." "Minimization of length not parallel to existing known electric transmission
217 lines" is listed as the *most important* routing opportunity.

218 Additionally, Mr. Dauphinais indicates in his rebuttal testimony at MCPO Ex. 1.0 (RH),
219 page 16, lines 361-364, 376-378; page 17, lines 379-382, and in MCPO Ex. 1.4 (RH), attached
220 here as PDM Ex. 8.4, that paralleling of existing transmission lines is the *most important* routing
221 opportunity.

222

223 **Q. In Mr. Dauphinais' analysis, does he consider the public preference for siting**
224 **opportunities as obtained by ATXI during the public input process?**

225 A. No. Mr. Dauphinais' analysis does not reflect the public preferences on siting
226 opportunities. ATXI witness Murphy testified that "Feedback suggested that greater preference
227 be given to routing along roads" at ATXI Ex 4.0 page 7, lines 150-151. Also, ATXI Ex 4.3,

228 Appendix C, Part 8, page 6, attached here as PDM Ex. 8.5, shows that public preference for
229 routing along roads was rated at 57% and routing along property lines/section lines was rated at
230 34%. All other preferences were rated at 9%.

231

232 **Q. Has ATXI testified to the impact of placing a second transmission line upon**
233 **farmland already encumbered by a transmission line?**

234 A. Yes. ATXI witness Hackman addressed this issue in rebuttal testimony for this
235 rehearing.

236 *ATXI Ex 5.0 (RH), page 6, lines 128-130; page 7, lines 132-146:*

237 ***Q. The MSSCLPG witnesses take the position that because landowners along the***
238 ***existing 138 kV line already have a transmission line on their property, constructing a***
239 ***second one there will result in less of an impact on their land or farming operations.***

240 ***How do you respond?***

241 *A. I question whether it's fair to suggest that just because a landowner already has*
242 *transmission line poles on their property, they have no objection to a second set. Mr.*
243 *Leon Corzine, for example, is an owner of farmland who intervened in this proceeding*
244 *and who testified that there are transmission lines on his property. He testified that where*
245 *there is one set of lines, it does not affect his ability to use aerial application because, "if*
246 *there is one set of lines you can kind of run parallel to those, and with the equipment on*
247 *the aerial applicators now they can do that." (Tr. 275.) But, he testified, where there are*
248 *two sets of lines on his property, he cannot do aerial application. (Id.) Also, as ATXI*
249 *witness Ms. Murphy testified, during the public notice process for the Project,*

250 *landowners whose land already was encumbered by an existing transmission line*
251 *easement did not want another line on their property. (Tr. 935-36.)*

252 *The presence of two circuits can result in no-travel areas, affecting agricultural*
253 *production. Therefore, the MSSCLPG witnesses' suggestion that landowners who*
254 *already have a transmission line traversing their farms won't care or won't be impacted*
255 *as much as the MSSCLPG members if the Project's Transmission Line is constructed on*
256 *their property is not always accurate.*

257 Mr. Hackman's rebuttal testimony suggests that Mr. Dauphinais does not reflect the public
258 opinion of owners whose property would potentially be affected by multiple transmission lines.

259

260 **Q. Are Mr. Hackman's concerns relevant to the MZK route?**

261 A. Yes. Where the MZK route proposal parallels existing transmission lines, the MZK route
262 would parallel an existing 138kV line and then would also parallel an existing 345kV line. Thus,
263 affected property owners would be burdened with not just one or two transmission lines but with
264 two or three.

265

266 **Q. Does Mr. Dauphinais's analysis include all siting opportunities used by ATXI?**

267 A. No. Although Mr. Dauphinais lists section lines in MCPO Ex. 1.4 (RH), he suggests by
268 his presentation that section lines rank sixth among the six parallel siting opportunities listed. In
269 his rebuttal testimony Mr. Dauphinais does not discuss property lines and field lines although
270 these are included by ATXI as opportunities. ATXI witness Murphy stated:

271 *ATXI Ex 4.0, page 6, lines 113-117:*

295 *Transcript of May 14, page 369, lines 8-12:*

296 **Q.** . . . *So is it a standard practice that you use in the transmission line industry to*
297 *parallel these right-of-ways?*

298 *A.* *No, it is not. For maintenance purposes we like to separate them as much as*
299 *possible.*

300 Also on rehearing, a third ATXI witness, Donell Murphy, presented testimony regarding parallel
301 transmission line routing proposed by MSSCLPG:

302 *ATXI Ex. 3.0 (RH), page 9, lines 103-105:*

303 *In this area, it is ATXI's preference that the proposed Transmission Line not parallel the*
304 *existing 138 kV transmission line because other route options are available.*

305

306 **Q.** **Are there route options available, other than MZK, from Mt. Zion to Kansas that**
307 **would reduce the amount of parallel transmission lines?**

308 *A.* *Yes. ATXI designed the Mt. Zion to Kansas ATXI Primary and ATXI Alternate Routes*
309 *which entirely avoid parallel transmission line routing, except in a very limited area at the*
310 *Kansas substation. Based on Ms. Murphy's testimony, it is clear that ATXI's preference was to*
311 *minimize paralleling transmission lines because better route options were available.*

312

313 **Q.** **Has ATXI argued that the Commission should not approve routing proposals that**
314 **have parallel transmission lines?**

315 *A.* *Yes. ATXI has argued that in this proceeding. In its initial brief in this proceeding,*
316 *ATXI made this statement regarding MCPO's Pana to Kansas route:*

317 *ATXI Initial Brief, pages 62-63:*

318 *(iii) Difficulty and Cost of Operation and Maintenance*

319 *A portion of this route parallels an existing 138 kV transmission line. As explained by*
320 *ATXI witness Mr. Hackman, paralleling should only be done in limited circumstances*
321 *because of reliability and operational concerns, as discussed above. Further, this route*
322 *presents operational and maintenance concerns because it crosses an existing line due*
323 *east of the Pana substation. (MCPO Ex. 2.0, pp. 9-10.) This crossing increases the*
324 *reliability risks associated with one or more of the following: common structure, shield*
325 *wire failure affecting lower conductors, conductor or insulator failure resulting in*
326 *conductor vertical displacement, and external common-mode failure events. (See e.g.*
327 *ATXI Ex. 12.0 (Rev.), p. 42.)*

328

329 **Q. Based on ATXI's statement that crossing of transmission lines presents additional**
330 **operational and maintenance concerns, should the MZK route cause these same concerns?**

331 A. Yes. In the above quoted statement, ATXI expressed concern about one instance where
332 the transmission lines were designed by MCPO to cross paths. On the MZK route, there are
333 *three* such instances: (1) The MZK route crosses an existing 138 kV line approximately 14 miles
334 north of the Kansas substation. (2) At the location where the existing 345 kV line begins
335 paralleling the 138 kV line, the MZK line crosses the existing 345 kV line. (3) North of the
336 Kansas substation, the MZK line crosses back over the existing 345 kV line and runs between it
337 and the 138 kV line. These crossings are shown on MCPO's google earth overlay map,
338 Attachment 2 PDML-MCPO 1.1 (Part1).

339

340

OFF COURSE ROUTING

341

342

343 **Q. Did ATXI develop study routes north of US 36?**

344 A. No. ATXI explained why it did not develop routes north of US 36 in its response to DR
345 PDM-ATXI 1.02, attached here as PDM Ex. 8.6:

346 *The Kansas substation is located south and east of the Mt. Zion substation. As such,*
347 *ATXI did not evaluate any potential route alternatives north of Route 36 as any*
348 *alternatives north of Route 36 would require additional line length (which would*
349 *increase cost and create a greater potential for impact) to extend north and then back*
350 *south. There were instead multiple viable route alternatives including Route 36 but also*
351 *south of Route 36 that were studied.*

352

353 **Q. How many miles is the MZK route off course?**

354 A. The MZK route, connected to the Staff Option 1 substation site, is 13.5 miles off course,
355 as noted in PDM Ex 7.0, page 6.

356

357 **Q. Does Mr. Dauphinais offer testimony regarding what you have defined as “off-**
358 **course” routing?**

359 A. Yes. Mr. Dauphinais states:

360 *MCPO Ex. 1.0 (RH), page 20, lines 469-471:*

361 *Deviation from a straight line course is a common practice in transmission line routing*
362 *when the adverse impacts to the public are avoided by that deviation outweigh the*
363 *incremental adverse impacts associated with that deviation.*

364 Mr. Dauphinais acknowledges that the MZK route is longer, more costly, has more adverse
365 agriculture impact than the Channon Hybrid Route. Mr. Dauphinais also acknowledges, as noted
366 above, that his own analysis shows the MZK route is inferior to the Channon Hybrid Route on
367 overall paralleling opportunities. Yet all of these factors are dismissed in order to route the line
368 up and over Moultrie County.

369

370 **Q. Is avoidance of Moultrie County the reason for the MZK route being off-course 13.5**
371 **miles?**

372 A. That is the opinion of ATXI, and I agree with it. As stated by ATXI witness Kramer:

373 *ATXI Ex. 11.0 page 4, lines 87-88, 92-94:*

374 *Mr. Dauphinais' focus is exclusively upon attempting to prove that a new 345kV*
375 *transmission line does not need be constructed across Moultrie County. He also briefly*
376 *discusses the option of routing the Mt. Zion to Kansas 345kV transmission line around*
377 *Moultrie County or even using a single new 345kV transmission line from Pana*
378 *substation to serve the new Mt Zion substation.*

379

380 *ATXI Ex 11.0 page 12, lines 265-268:*

381 *It is my opinion his [Dauphinais] conclusion that there are alternatives is primarily*
382 *driven by a need to find a planning rationale to eliminate any new transmission line from*
383 *traversing Moultrie County and potentially impacting the members of the MCPO.*

384

385 **Q. Are there other reasons to question Mr. Dauphinais' justification for MZK's off**
386 **course routing?**

387 A. Yes. Mr. Reinecke developed a shorter route in northern Moultrie County that affected
388 fewer residences (which MCPO states is its most important sensitivity). Nevertheless, MCPO
389 pursued a longer, more off course route to avoid Moultrie County:

390 *Transcript of May 15, page 613, lines 11-22; and page 614, lines 1-17:*

391 **Q.** *You did study a route running one mile south of Route 36 that ran through*
392 *northern Moultrie County, didn't you?*

393 A. *Correct.*

394 **Q.** *And you sent an e-mail on December 19th to Mr. Robertson, your client, and*
395 *told him that this route on the south side of U.S. 36 appeared to be a better route for a*
396 *number of reasons, did you not?*

397 A. *Subject to check, yes.*

398 **Q.** *I'd like to show you that, and I've marked this document as PDM Cross Exhibit*
399 *1.0. Is this an e-mail you sent to Mr. Robertson on December 19th?*

400 A. *Yes.*

401 **Q.** *And in this e-mail, you told Mr. Robertson that you have a route on the south*
402 *side of U.S. 36 which appears to be better for a number of reasons, is that right?*

403 A. *Yes.*

404 **Q.** *And the first reason you stated as to why it would be a better route is because it*
405 *was shorter, is that right?*

406 A. *Correct.*

407 **Q.** *And the second reason you stated that this route would be better is because it*
408 *would have less impacts to structures than the northern route, is that correct?*

409 A. *In context, yes, that is the statement.*

410 MCPO never filed the preferred route Mr. Reinecke proposed. Also, Mr. Reinecke in cross
411 examination also noted all of the towns along the US 36 corridor are located entirely or
412 predominately on the north side of US 36, at Transcript of May 15, p. 611, lines 3-7. The MZK
413 route passes within a half-mile of Mt. Zion, within a half-mile of Casner, within a quarter-mile of
414 La Place, within a half-mile of Hammond, within a half-mile of Pierson Station, within three-
415 quarter-mile of Atwood, and within three-quarter-mile of Tuscola, all as shown on MCPO
416 Corrected Ex. 2.2. Therefore, avoidance of residential areas is not the reason for the MZK route
417 being 13.5 miles off course.

418

419 **Q. The MZK route parallels existing 138kV and 345 kV transmission lines. In theory,**
420 **would it have been possible for the MZK route to parallel these lines without going so far**
421 **off course to the north?**

422 A. Yes. Had Mr. Reinecke been allowed to file his preferred route through northern
423 Moultrie County, MCPO could have still included the parallel transmission line portion at the
424 eastern end of MZK, and that route would have been less off course.

425

426 **Q. How do the MZK route's off course miles compare to the MZK route's parallel**
427 **transmission lines?**

428 A. From the Staff's proposed Option 1 substation site, the MZK route has 13.5 off course
429 miles. The MZK route parallels existing transmission lines for 14 miles. Even if paralleling
430 existing transmission lines is deemed to be a beneficial design objective, such benefits are
431 completely offset by the unnecessary, off course miles.

432

AGRICULTURAL IMPACT

433

434

435 **Q. Does Mr. Dauphinais and Mr. Reinecke claim that you over-emphasize the severity**
436 **of adverse impacts to farmland?**

437 A. Yes, Mr. Dauphinais and Mr. Reinecke make this claim. Mr. Dauphinais fails to
438 acknowledge that farmland owners and farm operators bear the bulk of the burden when
439 transmission lines are sited. Mr. Reinecke does state that “The vast majority of the transmission
440 towers for the entire Illinois Rivers Project will be placed in farm tracts.” (MCPO Ex. 2.0 (RH)
441 page 13, lines 308-309). The public input sought by ATXI rated agricultural use sensitivities at
442 47%, the highest rating among all sensitivities, even higher than residences rated at 35%. The
443 emphasis placed on agricultural use sensitivities is a reflection of public input, and is
444 documented in ATXI Ex. 4.3, Appendix C, Part 8, page 5 (attached here as PDM Ex. 8.5).

445 Although a transmission line located on any agricultural property will affect that
446 property, the claim cannot be made that all routes will result in equal impact. In his rebuttal
447 testimony, Mr. Dauphinais does not mention property lines and field borders as siting
448 opportunities. Section lines as siting opportunities appear to rank last in importance on Mr.
449 Dauphinais’ list although public input rated property lines/section lines as the second most
450 important parallel routing opportunity at 34% in ATXI Ex. 4.3, Appendix C, Part 8, page 6
451 (PDM Ex. 8.5).

452

453 **Q. Does Mr. Reinecke claim that you did not refer to any other public input obtained**
454 **from public meetings held by ATXI?**

455 A. Yes, Mr. Reinecke makes this claim which I find an interesting comment. Mr. Reinecke
456 had significant involvement in the design of the MCPO route, a route of over 69 miles in length
457 and which would constitute approximately twenty percent of the entire Illinois Rivers Project,
458 but for which no public meetings were ever held, nor public input ever sought. Furthermore,
459 ATXI witness Murphy has confirmed that criteria used by MCPO does “not fairly reflect public
460 input” in ATXI Ex 13.0, page 53, lines 1143-1150.

461 I did not design the Channon Hybrid Route. The segments of this route were designed by
462 ATXI based on public input as testified to by Ms. Murphy. I performed a comparative analysis
463 of the MCPO route and the Channon Hybrid Route.

464 ATXI witness Murphy stated that public input rated agricultural use sensitivities as most
465 important and this is shown in ATXI Ex. 4.3, Appendix C, Part 8, page 5 (PDM Ex. 8.5).
466 However, Mr. Reinecke does not acknowledge this in his testimony. Mr. Reinecke does admit
467 that I reference length, off-course routing, parallel routing and visual impact. Mr. Reinecke does
468 not acknowledge that minimizing length and off course routing will reduce environmental and
469 societal impact. In fact, Mr. Reinecke does not even discuss a comparison of route length, off-
470 course routing, or cost – all very important aspects of route design.

471

472 **Q. Does Mr. Reinecke criticize your analysis of parallel routing using one-half section**
473 **lines and property lines?**

474 A. Yes. Mr. Reinecke suggests that these factors have not been previously used in this
475 proceeding and therefore, should not be used. However, ATXI was able to readily respond to
476 DR Channon-ATXI 1.01(j) and 1.02(j), attached here as PDM Ex. 8.7, with precisely this
477 information for the segments of the Channon Hybrid Route. As stated in my direct testimony,

478 my analysis of the Channon Hybrid Route is consistent with the information ATXI provided
479 from its own analysis.

480

481 **Q. Does Mr. Reinecke give a reason for not routing along ½ section lines?**

482 A. Yes. He states that ½ section lines were “not a defined opportunity in this proceeding” at
483 MCPO Ex. 2.0, page 8, lines 173-174. Further, Mr. Reinecke states that every section is not
484 divided into ½ sections. True, “every” section may not be so divided, but the vast majority of the
485 sections affected by the MZK route are divided into ½ sections, and provide another opportunity
486 to avoid bisecting properties when road and section line opportunities are not available.

487

488 **Q. Does Mr. Reinecke give reasons for not using property lines when determining**
489 **routing opportunities?**

490 A. Yes. Mr. Reinecke explains away the use of property lines because of the potential of
491 introducing bias or resources identifying properties might be out-of- date. Instead, Mr. Reinecke
492 uses “apparent property lines.” Note that Mr. Reinecke’s methodology has resulted in the
493 bisecting of a total of 103 properties, 80 properties along the MZK route that does not parallel
494 existing transmission lines (PDM Ex. 6.7) and approximately 23 additional properties where this
495 paralleling occurs (DR ATXI-PDM 3.16, attached here as PDM Ex. 8.8).

496

497 **Q. Is Mr. Reinecke correct in his statement regarding how you determined the length**
498 **of the routes paralleling property lines and the number of tracts bisected?**

499 A. No, Mr. Reinecke is incorrect. The FSA field border maps he references are a component
500 of the Surety mapping software used to determine soil Productivity Indexes. These FSA maps

501 were not used during my analysis to determine miles paralleling property lines or the number of
502 tracts bisected.

503

504 **Q. Does ATXI witness Murphy testify to Mr. Dauphinais' consideration of section lines**
505 **as a routing opportunity?**

506 A. Yes, as noted above, Ms. Murphy states:

507 *ATXI Ex 13.0 page 46 lines 990-998:*

508 *A. I disagree with Mr. Dauphinais' assertion that section lines and roads are not*
509 *equally appropriate routing factors.*

510

511 **Q. Does the MZK route reflect that section lines were not considered as equally**
512 **appropriate routing factors?**

513 A. Yes. Because many miles of the MZK route are located on neither section nor one-half
514 section lines, the MZK route cuts through a large number of agricultural properties.

515

516 **Q. Does Mr. Dauphinais acknowledge the potential impacts the MCPO route would**
517 **have on agricultural activities?**

518 A. Although Mr. Dauphinais does recognize that some land would be removed from
519 production because of pole placement, he does not acknowledge how pole placement impacts the
520 business of farming. Rather than following section lines and property lines, the MCPO route
521 cuts through a large number of cultivated fields where farm equipment must traverse. In several
522 instances, the route makes 90-degree turns within cultivated properties such that the poles are no
523 longer in a straight line such that equipment can parallel the line. The creation of obstacles

524 within a cultivated field reduces the productivity of the farm operator and results in the necessity
525 of maneuvering large equipment around obstructions. Staff has recognized and commented on
526 this issue, and the following is attached here as PDM Ex. 8.9:

527 *Data Request ATXI-ICC 3.03:*

528 *“Minimizing the number of support structures placed in the center of cultivated areas*
529 *reduces impacts and costs to farmers by allowing cultivation of fields without obstacles*
530 *(structures) and more efficient operation of farming equipment.”*

531

532 **Q. Does Mr. Reinecke acknowledge the potential impact of a transmission line on**
533 **agricultural activities?**

534 A. Yes. Mr. Reinecke acknowledges that a transmission line will negatively impact the ease
535 of farming. However, Mr. Reinecke’s comments minimize the impact of situations when
536 multiple transmission lines are routed through cultivated tracts. His observation that farming
537 activity may be maintained is true, however, there is no dispute that inefficiencies,
538 inconveniences and negative economic effects result when obstructions are placed within
539 cultivated tracts.

540

541 **Q. Does Mr. Dauphinais discount the use of severe turns (90-degree turns) within a**
542 **cultivated field?**

543 A. Yes. Mr. Dauphinais considers the number of support structures but not the location of
544 those structures. For example, when the MCPO route places two 90-degree turns one-quarter
545 mile apart within a single field, MCPO states that one tangent structure is required between the
546 turns. (DR Channon-MCPO 1.05, attached here as PDM Ex. 8.10). In addition to resulting in a

547 transmission line not in a straight line across a field, this results in two structures not contributing
548 to the advancement of the line in a straight path through the field.

549

550 **Q. Does Mr. Reinecke misconstrue your meaning of “splitting” a farm property?**

551 A. My meaning in this case is that a transmission line would be placed so as to bisect or cut
552 through a cultivated field as opposed to following a property line. My interpretation is that Mr.
553 Reinecke is implying that “splitting” a property means that the easement has been sold.
554 Nowhere in my testimony have I indicated that the easement for a transmission line would be
555 sold by the property owner. By definition an easement is not a sale.

556

557 **Q. Does the MZK route have an additional impact because it is longer?**

558 A. Yes. The increased length will add to the number of required easement acquisitions and
559 affect more prime acres of farmland. The MZK route connected to the Staff Option 1 substation
560 site is approximately 9.5 miles longer than the Channon Hybrid Route. (MCPO Ex 2.2 (RH)
561 page 1)

562

563 PRIME FARMLAND DETERMINATION

564

565 **Q. On what basis did Mr. Reinecke determine prime farmland?**

566 A. Mr. Reinecke used a Natural Resource Conservation Services (NRCS) table that
567 categorizes soils into two broad categories – either “Potential Prime Farmland” or “Hydric Soil.”
568 Some soils classified as hydric are considered “prime farmland, if drained.” Thus, with proper
569 drainage, these soils achieve prime status. (ATXI Ex. 4.3, Appendix A, pages 53-87).

570 As I stated in my direct testimony, the categorization of soils by this method understates
571 the amount of prime farmland and does not recognize long standing drainage practices. This
572 type of categorization assumes an unmanaged state of affairs for farmland, which simply does
573 not exist in central Illinois today. Mr. Reinecke ignores modern agricultural management and
574 the true productivity of farmland that will potentially be affected by a transmission line.

575

576 **Q. Please provide an example of how the predominate soils in the area would be**
577 **classified by the particular NRCS table utilized by Mr. Reinecke.**

578 A. As an example, two predominant soils in the area are Flanagan and Drummer. The
579 NRCS table utilized by Mr. Reinecke classifies Flanagan as “prime farmland, not hydric,
580 somewhat poorly drained.” The NRCS table classifies Drummer as “prime farmland if drained,
581 all hydric, poorly drained.” Each of these soils has an optimum PI of 144 (max 147), an average
582 PI of 127 (max 130) and are considered prime, Class A.

583 In this example, the route with the most Flanagan acreage would be considered as having
584 more prime farmland although both soils are ranked equally in terms of productivity. In the flat
585 lands of central Illinois, both soil types, not just Drummer, require drainage management
586 practices. Included among these practices are drainage districts to which farmland owners are
587 required to pay assessments in the form of taxes for purposes of upkeep and maintenance. Also,
588 included in these management practices are investments in field tiling. By not recognizing
589 drainage practices and that Drummer is “prime farmland if drained,” the quality of prime
590 farmland is unfairly understated, particularly based on the expenses landowners are required to
591 make or voluntarily make on behalf of their land.

592

593 **Q. Did NRCS have any association with the University of Illinois when the University**
594 **developed its Bulletin 811 referenced in your direct testimony?**

595 A. Yes. The authors of Bulletin 811 acknowledge the contributions and support of the
596 NRCS.

597

598 **Q. Does Mr. Reinecke suggest that the productivity indexes published by the University**
599 **of Illinois are not useful?**

600 A. Yes. Mr. Reinecke suggests that because productivity indexes classify nearly all farmland
601 as prime in the region of the proposed routes, then some methodology must be used to
602 differentiate routes. The facts are that nearly all farmland in this area is prime and indeed, is
603 some of the best farmland in the world. Regardless of what technique one uses, the soils remain
604 the same. There is no need to attempt to create a differential when none exists.

605

606 **Q. Mr. Reinecke states that "all one has to do is look at the length of the route to**
607 **estimate the approximate amount of prime farmland [that] will be impacted." (MCPO Ex.**
608 **2.0 page 12, line 275-277). Is this a correct conclusion?**

609 A. Yes. Mr. Reinecke has drawn a correct conclusion although he may not agree with me.
610 Mr. Reinecke seems to be driven by a supposed need to differentiate between the proposed
611 routes based on soil quality. Another factor to examine is the acres of cultivated crop. The MZK
612 connected to the Staff Option 1 substation site has 1,117.8 acres more of cultivated crop in the
613 500-foot corridor than the Channon Hybrid Route (MCPO Ex 2.2 (RH) page 1). Of this 98% is
614 prime.

615

616 **Q. Does Mr. Reinecke object to the use of productivity indexes for this proceeding?**

617 A. Yes. Mr. Reinecke objects because this method of soil quality analysis was not used
618 previously for the Illinois Rivers Project. Please note that Mr. Reinecke's and Mr. Dauphinais's
619 methodology and principles of route design and analysis and their consideration and ranking of
620 sensitivities and routing opportunities differ from ATXI's, and have not been used to evaluate
621 any other part of the Illinois Rivers Project. They desire to substitute their methods for
622 approximately twenty percent of the project while ATXI's design methods apply for the other
623 eighty percent.

624

625 **Q. Does Mr. Reinecke claim that his method of soil classification is more sensitive in**
626 **accounting for differences in soils?**

627 A. Mr. Reinecke claims this but I disagree. As stated earlier, the particular NRCS table used
628 by Mr. Reinecke classifies soils into two broad categories – prime or hydric which does not
629 reflect the true productivity. As I stated in my direct testimony, optimum productivity indexes
630 are an important consideration when pricing farmland for sale or when contemplating the
631 purchase of farmland. The productivity of soils is an important consideration when negotiating
632 leases involving cash. Farmland is not bought, sold, or leased based on whether it is broadly
633 categorized as prime or hydric.

634

635 **Q. Is there another use for productivity indexes?**

636 A. Yes. Average productivity indexes are used when agricultural land in Illinois is assessed
637 for tax purposes. The Illinois Department of Revenue directs all counties within Illinois to assess
638 farmland based on the average productivity index of the soils. See 35 ILCS 200/10-125(a):

639 “Cropland shall be assessed in accordance with the equalized assessed value of its soil
640 productivity index.” (Bulletin 810, Average Crop, Pasture, and Forestry Productivity Ratings for
641 Illinois Soils, by K. R. Olson and J. M. Lang, Office of Research, Collage of Agricultural,
642 Consumer and Environmental Sciences (ACES), University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign).
643 This endorsement of the use of productivity indexes by Illinois law should serve as sufficient
644 justification for using the productivity index in evaluating the quality of soils affected by utility
645 easements.

646

647 RESIDENTIAL and NON-RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURES

648

649 **Q. Do you have concerns regarding the accuracy of the residential and non-residential**
650 **structure counts initially reported by MCPO?**

651 A. Yes. First, MCPO and ATXI don't even agree on the count. MCPO reports 13
652 residences within the 500-foot corridor of its MZK route (MCPO Ex. 2.3, page 4). However,
653 ATXI reports 16 residences in DR Channon-ATXI 1.01 Attachment 1, attached here as PDM Ex.
654 8.7, and also reports 13 more non-residential structures than MCPO reports.

655 Second, DR CHANNON-MCPO 1.04(e), attached here as PDM Ex. 8.11, requested
656 MCPO provide the location by township and section for its 13 residences. MCPO responded that
657 it did not have this information.

658 Third, MCPO reported that if both the MZK route and the Channon Hybrid Route were
659 attached to a Staff option substation site rather than the ATXI site on Sulphur Springs Road, both
660 routes would avoid four residences within the 500-foot corridor. (MCPO Ex. 2.0 Table 1 and
661 Table 2, page 5). For the MZK route this deduction would result because of residences avoided

662 on Sulpher Springs Road. For the Channon Hybrid Route, this same deduction would apply for
663 the same residences on Sulpher Springs Road but, in addition a deduction would apply for a
664 residence avoided on Henry Road. This residence was confirmed by Staff (DR ATXI-ICC 3.11,
665 attached here as PDM Ex. 8.12). While that should be a deduction for the Channon Route, it
666 should be an addition for the MZK Route. Therefore, the residences on the Channon Route
667 would be reduced by 5, but the residences on the MZK Route would be reduced by only 3.

668 Fourth, in response to DR PDM-MCPO 1.1 (Part 1), PDM was provided Attachment 2, a
669 Google Earth route developed by MCPO. An examination of the MZK route using this overlay
670 suggests that there are more residences within the 500-foot corridor or very close to being within
671 this corridor than what either MCPO or ATXI have reported. When towers are 80 to 140- feet
672 tall, whether a residence is within 490-feet or 520-feet of the route center line is “hair-splitting.”

673

674 **Q. From Staff’s Option 1 substation site, how many residences did you identify that are**
675 **reasonably within the corridor, without any “hair-splitting,” for the MZK route and the**
676 **Channon Hybrid Route?**

677 A. Using the route centerline provided by MCPO, there appear to be 21 residences within
678 530 feet or less of the MCPO center line for the MZK route. I have provided the latitude and
679 longitude of each of these locations in PDM Ex. 8.13, attached to this testimony. Using ATXI’s
680 analysis, there are 30 residences within the same corridor on the Channon Hybrid Route. This is
681 based on 9 in the ATXI Primary Route segment, plus 26 in the Alternate Route Segment (both as
682 reported in DR Channon-ATXI 1.01 Attachment 1), less the 5 eliminated, as noted above, by
683 moving the substation south to Staff’s proposed location.

684 Therefore, the difference in affected residences is no more than 9. None of these
685 residences are required to be relocated. Based on Mr. Hackman's baseline cost estimates, the
686 MZK Route costs \$17,746,000 more than the Channon Hybrid Route, which means the reduction
687 of impact on 9 residences comes at a cost of \$1,971,778 per residence, not counting any of the
688 other costs associated with the extra length of MZK Route.

689

690 **Q. Are there other issues regarding the precision by which MCPO measured the route**
691 **distance from residences?**

692 A. Yes, because the precise location of the 150-foot wide easement is not known at this
693 stage of design, any movement of the centerline could potentially affect more residential
694 structures depending on which side of the center line those structures occur. ATXI witness
695 Murphy explained the flexibility in locating the easement (attached here as PDM Ex. 8.14):

696 *DR MCPO-ATXI 6.01:*

697 ***Q. Please explain why and how Ms. Murphy and ATXI determined that only***
698 ***property owners within 250 feet of any proposed route would be identified.***

699 *A. Only landowners with property upon or across which the right of way for a*
700 *proposed route runs must be identified to receive a notice from the Commission. ATXI*
701 *broadened the notice corridor to 250 feet (to) include landowners along these rights of*
702 *way where a construction easement may be required or to allow for flexibility in placing*
703 *the ultimate right of way.*

704

705

706

707 **Q. Does Mr. Reinecke take into account planned residential development?**

708 A. It does not appear so. The MZK route and ATXI's proposed substation location on
709 Sulphur Springs Road impact the new Silver Leaf subdivision in Mt. Zion, which is right across
710 the street from the proposed substation site. This development of high-end homes is laid out, the
711 roads have been built and water service has been extended. Four homes have already been built
712 in the subdivision. In addition, there are two large new homes outside of the Silver Leaf
713 subdivision but within 500 feet of Sulphur Springs Road and the MZK route. Planned residential
714 development is a sensitivity ATXI considers (ATXI Ex. 4.3, Appendix C, Part 8, p. 3, attached
715 here as PDM Ex. 8.5).

716

717 **Q. Does MZK avoid residential areas?**

718 A. No, as noted above, the MZK route passes within a mile of at least seven towns, in
719 several instances within 1500 feet.

720

721 **Q. Does Mr. Dauphinais reference Commission's May 16, 2007 order in Docket No. 06-**
722 **0179?**

723 A. Yes. Mr. Dauphinais states that the Commission approved a more costly route because it
724 placed fewer residences within 500-feet. (MCPO Ex. 2.0 (RH) page 19, line 427-429).

725

726 **Q. Was there an additional factor related to this case?**

727 A. Yes. The competing route would have passed through the Village of Baldwin city
728 limits.(ICC Docket No. 06-0179, page 12). The approved route had zero residences within 500-
729 feet, the approved route was \$3 to \$3.79 million more costly and 3.1 miles longer (ICC Docket

730 No. 06-0179, page 11). In comparison, the MZK route from the Staff Option 1 substation site or
731 the ATXI proposed substation site would pass through or be very close to the Village of Mt. Zion
732 city limits. In addition, the MZK route would be \$17,746,000 more costly (not \$3 million)
733 (MCPO Ex. 1.5 (RH)) and approximately 9.5 miles longer (not 3) than the Channon Hybrid
734 Route (MCPO Ex 2.2 (RH) page 1). No route proposal from Mt. Zion to Kansas has zero
735 residences within 500-feet. Therefore, if there is relevance between the order for ICC Docket
736 No. 06-0179 and this rehearing proceeding, then it would appear to be the issue of routing
737 through village city limits.

738

739 **Q. Do Mr. Dauphinais and Mr. Reinecke fairly represent public input in terms of**
740 **routing sensitivities?**

741 A. No, ATXI sought public input from across the State during numerous public meetings in
742 which routing sensitivities were identified and rated. This public input is not the opinion of a
743 small group or of an individual but reflects the consensus across the entire Illinois Rivers Project.
744 In my opinion rather than attempting to find a balance and trade-off among the sensitivities, Mr.
745 Dauphinais and Mr. Reinecke have selected one over all others and avoidance of that sensitivity
746 underlies their route design. ATXI witness Murphy states:

747 *ATXI Ex. 13.0 page 64, lines 1379-1381:*

748 *First, classification of a feature as a "sensitivity" does not imply or necessitate*
749 *avoidance. It would be impossible to completely avoid all features that fall into sensitive*
750 *categories. Instead, attempts were made during the route siting analysis to minimize*
751 *impacts on sensitivities.*

752

753 **Q. Based on Mr. Dauphinais' and Mr. Reinecke's rebuttal testimony, what do you**
754 **conclude?**

755 A. I conclude that MCPO has understated the MZK route's impact on residences and
756 ignored the route's impact on nearby residential areas, in an effort to find some basis to
757 overcome its significantly higher cost and longer, off course length. Even if impact to residences
758 is ranked as the highest sensitivity as Mr. Dauphinais and Mr. Reinecke suggest, the
759 extraordinary additional cost of the longer MZK route cannot justify the differential of 9
760 residences. In fact, impact to residences is not ranked as important by the public as agricultural
761 use sensitivities, sensitivities which the MZK route design does not respect.

762

763 "PARTIES" FOR AND AGAINST ROUTES

764

765 **Q. How many property owners does Ms. Borkowski identify as owning property along**
766 **the proposed routes between Mt. Zion and Kansas?**

767 A. Ms. Borkowski's statement refers to "parties" when she is referring to the number of
768 intervenor groups with members affected by one or more of the proposed routes between Mt.
769 Zion to Kansas. She states:

770 *ATXI Ex. 7.0 (RH) page 9, lines 186-188:*

771 *Of the 15 parties who own property along any of the routes proposed from Mt. Zion to*
772 *Kansas, only PDM and Channon Trust oppose the Stipulated Route from Mt. Zion to*
773 *Kansas.*

774

775

776 **Q. Does Ms. Borkowski understate the opposition to the MZK route?**

777 A. Yes. First, even if “parties” are defined as intervenor groups, Ms. Borkowski’s statement
778 is incorrect. PDM, Channon Family Trust and the Village of Mt. Zion have each filed testimony
779 opposing the MZK route. Second, Ms. Borkowski ignores the fact that some intervenor groups
780 include far more “parties” than others. PDM is by far the largest intervenor group in this
781 proceeding with over 500 individual members. Over 500 “parties” have stated their opposition
782 to the MZK route, and have joined PDM for that express purpose.

783

784 **Q. What is the position of other intervenor groups regarding the proposed Mt. Zion to**
785 **Kansas routes?**

786 A. PDM, Channon Family Trust and the Village of Mt. Zion all support the Channon Hybrid
787 Route. Only MCPO opposes the Channon Hybrid Route. During this rehearing, no party
788 opposed to the ATXI Primary Route, other than MCPO, has stated opposition to the Channon
789 Hybrid Route.

790 Among the groups opposed to the ATXI Primary Route are: Tarble Limestone
791 Enterprises, Coles County Landowners, Reed Interests, Coles and Moultrie County Land
792 Interest, Louise-Brock-Jones LTD Partnership, Copeland Family and Deborah Rooney and
793 MCPO. (ATXI Ex. 13.0 page 55, lines 1186-1193)

794 Only MCPO has stated opposition to the ATXI Alternate Route.

795 Shelby County Landowners Group is not affected by the Mt. Zion to Kansas route
796 segment.

797

798

CONCLUSION

799

800

801 **Q. What are your conclusions regarding your comparison of the MZK route to the**
802 **Channon Hybrid Route from the Staff Option 1 proposed substation site?**

803 A. The MZK route is 9.5 miles longer. The MZK route is much more costly. Just the
804 baseline construction cost is \$17,746,000 more than the Channon route. In fact, the MZK route
805 is the most expensive of all route combinations and the Channon route is the least expensive of
806 all route combinations. The MZK route places primary emphasis on paralleling existing
807 transmission lines, disregarding all of ATXI's testimony about the costs and risks of such
808 parallel lines. Even if that testimony is disregarded, the MZK route uses 13.5 miles of
809 unnecessary, off course routing just to avoid Moultrie County, and that mileage cancels any
810 perceived benefit of paralleling existing transmission lines. The MZK route fails to take
811 advantage of appropriate paralleling opportunities, such as ½ section lines; even under MCPO's
812 own analysis, the Channon route outperforms the MZK route on paralleling opportunities. By
813 not taking advantage of such appropriate paralleling opportunities, the MZK route bisects over
814 100 separate farm tracts. The MZK route with its unnecessary additional length affects more
815 cultivated crop acres and more prime farmland acres, regardless of how "prime" is defined.

816 The MZK route is inconsistent with the Commission's direction, and the Staff's proposal,
817 to move the substation site further south of Mt. Zion. Staff's proposal placed the substation
818 directly on ATXI's Primary Route to Kansas, so as to "use the Mt. Zion to Kansas segment route
819 alternatives that have already been submitted in this docket." DR Channon-ICC 1.03, attached
820 here as PDM Ex. 8.15.

821 The Channon Hybrid Route supports the Staff's preferred substation site and is consistent
822 with Staff's placement of the Mt. Zion substation on the ATXI Primary Route to Kansas. The
823 Channon Hybrid Route supports the Commission's mandate in that it is the least cost and most
824 efficient route.

825

826 **Q. Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?**

827 A. Yes.

828

829

830

831

832 STATE OF ILLINOIS)

833) SS.

834 COUNTY OF SANGAMON)

835 I, Mary Burns, after first being duly sworn on oath, depose and state that the testimony I
836 have given is true and correct.

837

Mary Burns

838

Mary Burns

839 SUBSCRIBED and SWORN TO before me

840 this 10th day of December, 2013

841

842

Adrienne Cappelli Ettinger

843 Notary Public

