SHEET 1	
STATE OF WISCONSIN DIVISION OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS	1 APPEARANCES (Continued) 2 WISCONSIN WILDLIFE FEDERATION, by 3 George Meyer, Executive Director
In the Matter of Manual Code 3565.1 for the Approval Authorizing the Department of Natural Resources to Grade More Than 10,000 Square Feet on the Bank of North Lake, Install a Boat Ramp Structure and Two Outpost Structures on the Bed of North Lake, Install Four Culvert Crossings Over Wetlands, Fill Up To .16 Acres of Wetlands for Construction of a Public Boat Launch on North Lake and Adjacent Property Located in the Town of Merton, Waukesha County Case Nos. IP-SE-2009-68-05745 through 05750	4 5 WAUKESHA COUNTY CONSERVATION ALLIANCE, by 6 Ronald Gray, President LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 3
Jeffrey Boldt Administrative Law Judge, Presiding Hearing held November 1, 2011 Waukesha, Wisconsin LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES	
(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 1	
1 APPEARANCES 2 WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES, by 3 Attorney Edwina C. Kavanaugh 4 Attorney Megan E. Correll 5 101 South Webster Street 6 Madison, WI 53707-7921 7 7 8 NORTH LAKE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT, by 9 Attorney Carolyn A. Sullivan 11 Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren, S.C. 12 N16 W23250 Stone Ridge Drive, Suite 1 13 Waukesha, WI 53187-2265 14 Storney William C. Gleisner 15 REDLAND ROAD NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION, INC., by 16 Attorney William C. Gleisner 17 Law Offices of William C. Gleisner 18 4230 North Oakland Avenue, Suite 333 19 Milwaukee, WI 53211-2042 20 and by 21 Attorney William H. Harbeck 22 Quarles & Brady, LLP 23 411 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 2040 24 Milwaukee, WI 53202-4426 LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 2 <td>1INDEX2WitnessesExamination byPage3Andy HudakAttorney Gleisner-Cross</td>	1INDEX2WitnessesExamination byPage3Andy HudakAttorney Gleisner-Cross
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 4

ALJ BOLDT: Okay. We're back on the ord. Today is Tuesday. I believe it's ember 1st. Remind you you're still under oath we're continuing on with the ss-examination of Mr. Hudak. MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Your Honor. CROSS-EXAMINATION LEISNER: n we stopped yesterday you had confirmed ot a hydrologist, correct sir? lso not an engineer, correct? ave any training in flood flow analysis? raining, no. ood flow analysis done anywhere on the Krause ? y knowledge. ard to the riparian owners you didn't ate in any studies with regard to the effect rause property on the people living on Road, did you? be more specific with studies? I MR. GLEISNER: If we could just remove that
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 7
st exhibit. Thank you very much. I reciate I appreciate that very much. ard to the bottom green circle, we were about yesterday whether or not there had been ies done on the effect of that navigable if it got surcharged with water on Road and my question is did you participate any studies with regard to that yourself? MS. CORRELL: Objection again as to whether not such a study is required under the ulatory framework that is actually at issue this proceeding. It's a continuing objection this line of questioning. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. MR. GLEISNER: Subject to that ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, subject to that ection, go ahead. ve not. hank you. Now, let me clarify something you tified to yesterday. I believe you stated had not done or that you're not aware of any ng done on the access road to the west of the he lower green, circle or as it turns east to hwest of the lower green circle? You're not any work being done on whether or not a
o bj ha T es ou ei t

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	cert, but not under Chapter 30 for the access road.Q So the answer to the question is there was no Chapter 30 permit acquired for any of the fill that's going to be needed with regard to the access road, is that correct?A None of the fill within the access road for wetland impact required a Chapter 30 permit.	1 A 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 10 11 A 12 0 13 14 15 0 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 0 24 25 A	<pre>That's not accurate. Basically, I we never I don't believe I don't I haven't I don't know if we've ever taken and developed a bank determination for North Lake and what portions of the site are grading on the bank of North Lake and what portions of the site are grading on the banks of these other additional waterways minus the wetland fill areas. So the answer is no?</pre>
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 9		LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 11
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q With regard to the access road that is going to run from Redland Road north for about 1,500 feet I believe to where the proposed parking lot is going to be located was there the equivalent of a Chapter 30 permit for the fill that will be needed in connection with that access road? Is that clear enough? A As far as the area of disturbance needed for the access road I do not believe the original manual code may have covered that under the grading on the banks of North Lake and so there may have been a besides grading, that would be the only authority I could see under Chapter 30 that would be regulated on the fill for that access road minus the areas of wetland impact.	1 2 3 4 0 5 6 A 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	<pre>banks of North Lake and associated wetland fill, culvert crossings, placement of a boat ramp and two outfall structures. Doesn't that conflict with what Mr. Wakeman testified to, sir? Not to my knowledge. ALJ BOLDT: Is there any condition that would have been in a Chapter 30.19 grading permit that in retrospect you wish was in the manual code approval? THE WITNESS: When we reviewed the Chapter 30.19 permit for associated land disturbances it wasn't limited to just the parking lot area. We looked at the entire project and really, the grading disturbance on the bank, if we were to consider the entire access road on the bank we would have looked very similar we would have required proper erosion control techniques, storm water management, and basically those same and similar impacts were assessed by the resource managers when we were out on site and taken into consideration with this manual code decision. ALJ BOLDT: So the short answer is no? THE WITNESS: The short answer is no, that</pre>
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 10		LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 12

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 4	
1I wouldn't see any other additional conditions2with grading for the access road.3ALJ BOLDT: Okay.4MR. HARBECK: Could I just ask a couple5follow-up questions on this?6ALJ BOLDT: Sure, you bet.7CROSS-EXAMINATION8BY MR. HARBECK:9And I'm going back to what maybe you're not aware10of what Mr. Wakeman testified to at deposition, but11I'm going back to your testimony yesterday on this12and you talked about four areas for which the Chapter1330 permit equivalent had been issued and one was14grading, correct?15A16Q17about grading with respect to the parking lot,18correct? That's what you were talking about19yesterday and that's what Mr. Wakeman in his20deposition talked about so I want to make sure when21you were talking about the Chapter 30 equivalent22permit that related to grading, it related to grading23to the parking lot, correct?24AI can clarify. I don't want to say correct or not.25Grading on the banks of a waterway is required to be	 assert jurisdiction over the wetland fill in connection with the access road because that was under the Army that was done pursuant to the Army Corps of Engineer permit, correct? A We asserted jurisdiction under the water quality cert review process for DNR. Q Okay. But it's only under that process that you examined the wetland fill, correct? A That'd be correct.
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 13	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 15
1reviewed under 30.19 when it is disturbing in excess2of 10,000 square feet.3QI understand that.4ASo the extent of where that 10,000 square feet5extended to, we didn't develop that because we knew6that we were already disturbing over 10,000 square7feet so we review it under 30.19 as a grading permit.8QBut DNR's position here is that they did not need to9obtain a Chapter 30 equivalent permit for the fill10associated with the access road because that was fill11into a wetlands and therefore it was the Army Corps12permit that13MS. CORRELL: Objection, speculative.14Q15MR. HARBECK: Please let me finish my16question.17Q17Q18corps permit that had jurisdiction18over that and DNR didn't have jurisdiction. That's19the whole jurisdictional argument we've been hearing20for the last couple days, correct?21MS. CORRELL: Objection, you're speculating22as to DNR's position and you're putting words in23the witness' mouth. It's argumentative.	
ALJ BOLDT: I think it's cross-examination and go ahead and answer it if you can. LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI	the white book. It's your manual code approval and you're familiar with Paragraph 1 of the Findings of Fact, are you not sir? LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

	HEET 5		
1 A 2 Q	Yes, I am. You drafted them, correct?	1 A 2 Q	I do not. Do you have a master's degree in anything?
3 A	Yes, I did.	3 A	I do not.
4 5	MR. GLEISNER: And we're looking at, just for the record, Exhibit 1-002, Judge.	4 Q 5 A	And when did you graduate from the university? In 2006.
6 Q	It says there am I correct, it says there that you	6 Q	And when did you start working for the DNR?
7	have obtained approval to grade more than 10,000	7 A	Or, excuse me, in 2005. I started working for the
8 9	square feet on the bank of North Lake, is that correct sir?	8 9 0	Department in 2006. Thank you. Now
10 A	That's what that states, yes.	10	ALJ BOLDT: I think we may have a math
11 Q 12	Can you help us understand what constitutes the bank of North Lake?	11 12	error. MS. KAVANAUGH: Yes, that's more than two
13 A	Bank definitions can be defined by two ways, whether	13	years.
14 15	or not it's a designated waterway or a non-designated	14 15	ALJ BOLDT: That's almost three years of between
15 16	waterway. North Lake is a designated waterway which means it has a 300-foot bank so 300 feet landward	16	MS. KAVANAUGH: January 10 almost three.
17	from the ordinary high water mark or if the slopes	17	It's November 2010.
18 19	exceed ten percent at that 300-foot it would extend. There's also provisions if there would be a complete	18 19	MR. GLEISNER: You're right, Your Honor. ALJ BOLDT: January 2009 would be one
20	interruption that it could be shortened. And like I	20	year
21 22	just testified to before, we had not done a complete bank determination because it was already determined	21 22	MR. GLEISNER: That's why I went to law school, Judge.
23	that in excess of 10,000 square feet would be	23	ALJ BOLDT: January 2010 would be two
24 25	disturbed within easily 300 feet of North Lake so we	24 25	years and then it's November 2010. Just so the record
20	reviewed Chapter 30.19 grading authority over the	20	record
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES		LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES
	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 17		(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 19
1	project and we asserted Chapter 30.19 authority over	1	MR. GLEISNER: I apologize. It's three
1 2 3 Q	project and we asserted Chapter 30.19 authority over the project. Thank you. You did not seek a permit under 30.19 for	1 2 3 Q	years, Judge, you're correct. I'm sorry.
3 Q 4	the project. Thank you. You did not seek a permit under 30.19 for the access road, correct?	2 3 Q 4	years, Judge, you're correct. I'm sorry. Did you yesterday you testified that you'd made nine site visits to the area, not including the visit
3 Q	the project. Thank you. You did not seek a permit under 30.19 for the access road, correct? As I previously stated, we reviewed the entire	2 3 Q	years, Judge, you're correct. I'm sorry. Did you yesterday you testified that you'd made nine site visits to the area, not including the visit that we made, is that correct?
3 Q 4 5 A 6 7	<pre>the project. Thank you. You did not seek a permit under 30.19 for the access road, correct? As I previously stated, we reviewed the entire project under 30.19. MR. MEYER: Objection, asked and answered.</pre>	2 3 Q 4 5	years, Judge, you're correct. I'm sorry. Did you yesterday you testified that you'd made nine site visits to the area, not including the visit that we made, is that correct? Yeah, I had a list of and as I've looked at it again it may have been eight. I think I put the
3 Q 4 5 A 6 7 8	<pre>the project. Thank you. You did not seek a permit under 30.19 for the access road, correct? As I previously stated, we reviewed the entire project under 30.19.</pre>	2 3 Q 4 5 6 A 7 8	years, Judge, you're correct. I'm sorry. Did you yesterday you testified that you'd made nine site visits to the area, not including the visit that we made, is that correct? Yeah, I had a list of and as I've looked at it again it may have been eight. I think I put the public notice as a or, I'm sorry, the public
3 Q 4 5 A 6 7 8 9 10	<pre>the project. Thank you. You did not seek a permit under 30.19 for the access road, correct? As I previously stated, we reviewed the entire project under 30.19.</pre>	2 3 Q 4 5 6 A 7	years, Judge, you're correct. I'm sorry. Did you yesterday you testified that you'd made nine site visits to the area, not including the visit that we made, is that correct? Yeah, I had a list of and as I've looked at it again it may have been eight. I think I put the public notice as a or, I'm sorry, the public informational meeting as a site visit which was inaccurate, but roughly about eight or nine.
3 Q 4 5 A 6 7 8 9 10 11	<pre>the project. Thank you. You did not seek a permit under 30.19 for the access road, correct? As I previously stated, we reviewed the entire project under 30.19.</pre>	2 3 Q 4 5 6 A 7 8 9 10 11 Q	years, Judge, you're correct. I'm sorry. Did you yesterday you testified that you'd made nine site visits to the area, not including the visit that we made, is that correct? Yeah, I had a list of and as I've looked at it again it may have been eight. I think I put the public notice as a or, I'm sorry, the public informational meeting as a site visit which was inaccurate, but roughly about eight or nine. But you testified in your deposition you'd made six
3 Q 4 5 A 6 7 8 9 10	<pre>the project. Thank you. You did not seek a permit under 30.19 for the access road, correct? As I previously stated, we reviewed the entire project under 30.19.</pre>	2 3 Q 4 5 6 A 7 8 9 10	years, Judge, you're correct. I'm sorry. Did you yesterday you testified that you'd made nine site visits to the area, not including the visit that we made, is that correct? Yeah, I had a list of and as I've looked at it again it may have been eight. I think I put the public notice as a or, I'm sorry, the public informational meeting as a site visit which was inaccurate, but roughly about eight or nine.
3 Q 4 5 A 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 Q 14	<pre>the project. Thank you. You did not seek a permit under 30.19 for the access road, correct? As I previously stated, we reviewed the entire project under 30.19. MR. MEYER: Objection, asked and answered. MS. CORRELL: Multiple times. ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, I think we need to move on. I think you've asked that question at least four times. MR. GLEISNER: All right. Now, you became a water quality specialist in 2008, is that correct?</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 8 9 10 11 2 13 8 14	years, Judge, you're correct. I'm sorry. Did you yesterday you testified that you'd made nine site visits to the area, not including the visit that we made, is that correct? Yeah, I had a list of and as I've looked at it again it may have been eight. I think I put the public notice as a or, I'm sorry, the public informational meeting as a site visit which was inaccurate, but roughly about eight or nine. But you testified in your deposition you'd made six visits? That could have been. After reviewing my calendar more thoroughly I probably was able to identify
3 Q 4 5 A 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 Q	<pre>the project. Thank you. You did not seek a permit under 30.19 for the access road, correct? As I previously stated, we reviewed the entire project under 30.19. MR. MEYER: Objection, asked and answered. MS. CORRELL: Multiple times. ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, I think we need to move on. I think you've asked that question at least four times. MR. GLEISNER: All right. Now, you became a water quality specialist in 2008,</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 A 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 A	years, Judge, you're correct. I'm sorry. Did you yesterday you testified that you'd made nine site visits to the area, not including the visit that we made, is that correct? Yeah, I had a list of and as I've looked at it again it may have been eight. I think I put the public notice as a or, I'm sorry, the public informational meeting as a site visit which was inaccurate, but roughly about eight or nine. But you testified in your deposition you'd made six visits? That could have been. After reviewing my calendar more thoroughly I probably was able to identify exactly how many visits I made to the site.
3 Q 4 5 A 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 Q 14 15 A 16 Q 17	<pre>the project. Thank you. You did not seek a permit under 30.19 for the access road, correct? As I previously stated, we reviewed the entire project under 30.19.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 A 7 8 9 10 11 Q 12 13 A 14 15 16 Q 17	years, Judge, you're correct. I'm sorry. Did you yesterday you testified that you'd made nine site visits to the area, not including the visit that we made, is that correct? Yeah, I had a list of and as I've looked at it again it may have been eight. I think I put the public notice as a or, I'm sorry, the public informational meeting as a site visit which was inaccurate, but roughly about eight or nine. But you testified in your deposition you'd made six visits? That could have been. After reviewing my calendar more thoroughly I probably was able to identify exactly how many visits I made to the site. Thank you. Now, you stated yesterday that you had made I don't know if it was you personally or the
3 Q 4 5 A 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 Q 14 15 A 16 Q 17 18 A	<pre>the project. Thank you. You did not seek a permit under 30.19 for the access road, correct? As I previously stated, we reviewed the entire project under 30.19. MR. MEYER: Objection, asked and answered. MS. CORRELL: Multiple times. ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, I think we need to move on. I think you've asked that question at least four times. MR. GLEISNER: All right. Now, you became a water quality specialist in 2008, is that correct? My title in 2008 was water management specialist. And when in 2008 did you become a water management specialist? It would have been January.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 A 7 8 9 10 11 0 12 13 A 14 15 16 0 17 18	years, Judge, you're correct. I'm sorry. Did you yesterday you testified that you'd made nine site visits to the area, not including the visit that we made, is that correct? Yeah, I had a list of and as I've looked at it again it may have been eight. I think I put the public notice as a or, I'm sorry, the public informational meeting as a site visit which was inaccurate, but roughly about eight or nine. But you testified in your deposition you'd made six visits? That could have been. After reviewing my calendar more thoroughly I probably was able to identify exactly how many visits I made to the site. Thank you. Now, you stated yesterday that you had made I don't know if it was you personally or the DNR, made representations to the Army Corps of
3 Q 4 5 A 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 Q 14 15 A 16 Q 17 18 A 19 Q 20	<pre>the project. Thank you. You did not seek a permit under 30.19 for the access road, correct? As I previously stated, we reviewed the entire project under 30.19. MR. MEYER: Objection, asked and answered. MS. CORRELL: Multiple times. ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, I think we need to move on. I think you've asked that question at least four times. MR. GLEISNER: All right. Now, you became a water quality specialist in 2008, is that correct? My title in 2008 was water management specialist. And when in 2008 did you become a water management specialist? It would have been January. And when did you you issued the manual code approval on November 4th, 2010, is that correct?</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 A 7 8 9 10 11 Q 12 13 A 14 15 16 Q 17 18 19 20 21 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	years, Judge, you're correct. I'm sorry. Did you yesterday you testified that you'd made nine site visits to the area, not including the visit that we made, is that correct? Yeah, I had a list of and as I've looked at it again it may have been eight. I think I put the public notice as a or, I'm sorry, the public informational meeting as a site visit which was inaccurate, but roughly about eight or nine. But you testified in your deposition you'd made six visits? That could have been. After reviewing my calendar more thoroughly I probably was able to identify exactly how many visits I made to the site. Thank you. Now, you stated yesterday that you had made I don't know if it was you personally or the DNR, made representations to the Army Corps of Engineers, correct, regarding wetland and wetland delineation?
3 Q 4 5 A 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 Q 14 15 A 16 Q 17 18 A 19 Q 20 20 21 A	<pre>the project. Thank you. You did not seek a permit under 30.19 for the access road, correct? As I previously stated, we reviewed the entire project under 30.19. MR. MEYER: Objection, asked and answered. MS. CORRELL: Multiple times. ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, I think we need to move on. I think you've asked that question at least four times. MR. GLEISNER: All right. Now, you became a water quality specialist in 2008, is that correct? My title in 2008 was water management specialist. And when in 2008 did you become a water management specialist? It would have been January. And when did you you issued the manual code approval on November 4th, 2010, is that correct? That'd be correct.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 A 7 8 9 10 11 0 12 13 A 14 15 16 0 17 18 19 20 21 A	<pre>years, Judge, you're correct. I'm sorry. Did you yesterday you testified that you'd made nine site visits to the area, not including the visit that we made, is that correct? Yeah, I had a list of and as I've looked at it again it may have been eight. I think I put the public notice as a or, I'm sorry, the public informational meeting as a site visit which was inaccurate, but roughly about eight or nine. But you testified in your deposition you'd made six visits? That could have been. After reviewing my calendar more thoroughly I probably was able to identify exactly how many visits I made to the site. Thank you. Now, you stated yesterday that you had made I don't know if it was you personally or the DNR, made representations to the Army Corps of Engineers, correct, regarding wetland and wetland delineation? I don't understand your question.</pre>
3 Q 4 5 A 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 Q 14 15 A 16 Q 17 18 A 19 Q 20 21 A 22 Q 23	<pre>the project. Thank you. You did not seek a permit under 30.19 for the access road, correct? As I previously stated, we reviewed the entire project under 30.19. MR. MEYER: Objection, asked and answered. MS. CORRELL: Multiple times. ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, I think we need to move on. I think you've asked that question at least four times. MR. GLEISNER: All right. Now, you became a water quality specialist in 2008, is that correct? My title in 2008 was water management specialist. And when in 2008 did you become a water management specialist? It would have been January. And when did you you issued the manual code approval on November 4th, 2010, is that correct? That'd be correct. So less than two years after you became a water management specialist, is that correct?</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 A 7 8 9 10 11 Q 12 13 A 14 15 16 Q 17 18 19 20 21 A 22 Q 23	<pre>years, Judge, you're correct. I'm sorry. Did you yesterday you testified that you'd made nine site visits to the area, not including the visit that we made, is that correct? Yeah, I had a list of and as I've looked at it again it may have been eight. I think I put the public notice as a or, I'm sorry, the public informational meeting as a site visit which was inaccurate, but roughly about eight or nine. But you testified in your deposition you'd made six visits? That could have been. After reviewing my calendar more thoroughly I probably was able to identify exactly how many visits I made to the site. Thank you. Now, you stated yesterday that you had made I don't know if it was you personally or the DNR, made representations to the Army Corps of Engineers, correct, regarding wetland and wetland delineation? I don't understand your question. Did you did you MR. GLEISNER: Strike that.</pre>
3 Q 4 5 A 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 Q 14 15 A 16 Q 17 18 A 19 Q 20 21 A 22 Q 23 24 A	<pre>the project. Thank you. You did not seek a permit under 30.19 for the access road, correct? As I previously stated, we reviewed the entire project under 30.19. MR. MEYER: Objection, asked and answered. MS. CORRELL: Multiple times. ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, I think we need to move on. I think you've asked that question at least four times. MR. GLEISNER: All right. Now, you became a water quality specialist in 2008, is that correct? My title in 2008 was water management specialist. And when in 2008 did you become a water management specialist? It would have been January. And when did you you issued the manual code approval on November 4th, 2010, is that correct? That'd be correct. So less than two years after you became a water management specialist, is that correct? That'd be correct.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 A 7 8 9 10 11 Q 12 13 A 14 15 16 Q 17 18 19 20 21 A 22 Q 23 24 Q	<pre>years, Judge, you're correct. I'm sorry. Did you yesterday you testified that you'd made nine site visits to the area, not including the visit that we made, is that correct? Yeah, I had a list of and as I've looked at it again it may have been eight. I think I put the public notice as a or, I'm sorry, the public informational meeting as a site visit which was inaccurate, but roughly about eight or nine. But you testified in your deposition you'd made six visits? That could have been. After reviewing my calendar more thoroughly I probably was able to identify exactly how many visits I made to the site. Thank you. Now, you stated yesterday that you had made I don't know if it was you personally or the DNR, made representations to the Army Corps of Engineers, correct, regarding wetland and wetland delineation? I don't understand your question. Did you did you MR. GLEISNER: Strike that. Did the DNR make representations to the Army Corps of</pre>
3 Q 4 5 A 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 12 13 Q 14 16 Q 17 18 A 19 Q 20 21 A 22 Q 23 23 23	<pre>the project. Thank you. You did not seek a permit under 30.19 for the access road, correct? As I previously stated, we reviewed the entire project under 30.19. MR. MEYER: Objection, asked and answered. MS. CORRELL: Multiple times. ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, I think we need to move on. I think you've asked that question at least four times. MR. GLEISNER: All right. Now, you became a water quality specialist in 2008, is that correct? My title in 2008 was water management specialist. And when in 2008 did you become a water management specialist? It would have been January. And when did you you issued the manual code approval on November 4th, 2010, is that correct? That'd be correct. So less than two years after you became a water management specialist, is that correct?</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 A 7 8 9 10 11 Q 12 13 A 14 15 16 Q 17 18 19 20 21 A 22 Q 23	<pre>years, Judge, you're correct. I'm sorry. Did you yesterday you testified that you'd made nine site visits to the area, not including the visit that we made, is that correct? Yeah, I had a list of and as I've looked at it again it may have been eight. I think I put the public notice as a or, I'm sorry, the public informational meeting as a site visit which was inaccurate, but roughly about eight or nine. But you testified in your deposition you'd made six visits? That could have been. After reviewing my calendar more thoroughly I probably was able to identify exactly how many visits I made to the site. Thank you. Now, you stated yesterday that you had made I don't know if it was you personally or the DNR, made representations to the Army Corps of Engineers, correct, regarding wetland and wetland delineation? I don't understand your question. Did you did you MR. GLEISNER: Strike that.</pre>
3 Q 4 5 A 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 Q 14 15 A 16 Q 17 18 A 19 Q 20 21 A 22 Q 23 24 A	<pre>the project. Thank you. You did not seek a permit under 30.19 for the access road, correct? As I previously stated, we reviewed the entire project under 30.19. MR. MEYER: Objection, asked and answered. MS. CORRELL: Multiple times. ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, I think we need to move on. I think you've asked that question at least four times. MR. GLEISNER: All right. Now, you became a water quality specialist in 2008, is that correct? My title in 2008 was water management specialist. And when in 2008 did you become a water management specialist? It would have been January. And when did you you issued the manual code approval on November 4th, 2010, is that correct? That'd be correct. So less than two years after you became a water management specialist, is that correct? That'd be correct.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 A 7 8 9 10 11 Q 12 13 A 14 15 16 Q 17 18 19 20 21 A 22 Q 23 24 Q	<pre>years, Judge, you're correct. I'm sorry. Did you yesterday you testified that you'd made nine site visits to the area, not including the visit that we made, is that correct? Yeah, I had a list of and as I've looked at it again it may have been eight. I think I put the public notice as a or, I'm sorry, the public informational meeting as a site visit which was inaccurate, but roughly about eight or nine. But you testified in your deposition you'd made six visits? That could have been. After reviewing my calendar more thoroughly I probably was able to identify exactly how many visits I made to the site. Thank you. Now, you stated yesterday that you had made I don't know if it was you personally or the DNR, made representations to the Army Corps of Engineers, correct, regarding wetland and wetland delineation? I don't understand your question. Did you did you MR. GLEISNER: Strike that. Did the DNR make representations to the Army Corps of</pre>
3 Q 4 5 A 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 Q 14 16 Q 17 18 A 19 Q 20 21 A 22 Q 23 24 A	<pre>the project. Thank you. You did not seek a permit under 30.19 for the access road, correct? As I previously stated, we reviewed the entire project under 30.19. MR. MEYER: Objection, asked and answered. MS. CORRELL: Multiple times. ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, I think we need to move on. I think you've asked that question at least four times. MR. GLEISNER: All right. Now, you became a water quality specialist in 2008, is that correct? My title in 2008 was water management specialist. And when in 2008 did you become a water management specialist? It would have been January. And when did you you issued the manual code approval on November 4th, 2010, is that correct? That'd be correct. So less than two years after you became a water management specialist, is that correct? That'd be correct.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 A 7 8 9 10 11 Q 12 13 A 14 15 16 Q 17 18 19 20 21 A 22 Q 23 24 Q	<pre>years, Judge, you're correct. I'm sorry. Did you yesterday you testified that you'd made nine site visits to the area, not including the visit that we made, is that correct? Yeah, I had a list of and as I've looked at it again it may have been eight. I think I put the public notice as a or, I'm sorry, the public informational meeting as a site visit which was inaccurate, but roughly about eight or nine. But you testified in your deposition you'd made six visits? That could have been. After reviewing my calendar more thoroughly I probably was able to identify exactly how many visits I made to the site. Thank you. Now, you stated yesterday that you had made I don't know if it was you personally or the DNR, made representations to the Army Corps of Engineers, correct, regarding wetland and wetland delineation? I don't understand your question. Did you did you MR. GLEISNER: Strike that. Did the DNR make representations to the Army Corps of</pre>
3 Q 4 5 A 5 A 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 Q 14 A 16 Q 17 A 16 Q 17 A 20 20 21 A 22 Q 23 24 A	<pre>the project. Thank you. You did not seek a permit under 30.19 for the access road, correct? As I previously stated, we reviewed the entire project under 30.19. MR. MEYER: Objection, asked and answered. MS. CORRELL: Multiple times. ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, I think we need to move on. I think you've asked that question at least four times. MR. GLEISNER: All right. Now, you became a water quality specialist in 2008, is that correct? My title in 2008 was water management specialist. And when in 2008 did you become a water management specialist? It would have been January. And when did you you issued the manual code approval on November 4th, 2010, is that correct? That'd be correct. So less than two years after you became a water management specialist, is that correct? That'd be correct. And do you have a Ph.D. in anything? LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 A 7 8 9 10 11 Q 12 13 A 14 15 16 Q 17 18 19 20 21 A 22 Q 23 24 Q	<pre>years, Judge, you're correct. I'm sorry. Did you yesterday you testified that you'd made nine site visits to the area, not including the visit that we made, is that correct? Yeah, I had a list of and as I've looked at it again it may have been eight. I think I put the public notice as a or, I'm sorry, the public informational meeting as a site visit which was inaccurate, but roughly about eight or nine. But you testified in your deposition you'd made six visits? That could have been. After reviewing my calendar more thoroughly I probably was able to identify exactly how many visits I made to the site. Thank you. Now, you stated yesterday that you had made I don't know if it was you personally or the DNR, made representations to the Army Corps of Engineers, correct, regarding wetland and wetland delineation? I don't understand your question. Did you did you MR. GLEISNER: Strike that. Did the DNR make representations to the Army Corps of Engineers regarding wetland delineation? LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES</pre>
3 Q 4 5 5 A 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 12 13 13 Q 14 A 15 A 16 Q 17 A 18 A 19 Q 20 20 21 A 22 Q 23 24	<pre>the project. Thank you. You did not seek a permit under 30.19 for the access road, correct? As I previously stated, we reviewed the entire project under 30.19.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 A 7 8 9 10 11 Q 12 13 A 14 15 16 Q 17 18 19 20 21 A 22 Q 23 24 Q	<pre>years, Judge, you're correct. I'm sorry. Did you yesterday you testified that you'd made nine site visits to the area, not including the visit that we made, is that correct? Yeah, I had a list of and as I've looked at it again it may have been eight. I think I put the public notice as a or, I'm sorry, the public informational meeting as a site visit which was inaccurate, but roughly about eight or nine. But you testified in your deposition you'd made six visits? That could have been. After reviewing my calendar more thoroughly I probably was able to identify exactly how many visits I made to the site. Thank you. Now, you stated yesterday that you had made I don't know if it was you personally or the DNR, made representations to the Army Corps of Engineers, correct, regarding wetland and wetland delineation? I don't understand your question. Did you did you MR. GLEISNER: Strike that. Did the DNR make representations to the Army Corps of Engineers regarding wetland delineation?</pre>

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 6 1 A I was not involved with the wetland delineation 2 process. 3 Q I just want to be clear. You, yesterday, referenced 4 the water specialty book, the water law book I 5 believe, for a definition of marsh. Was that the 6 correct am I correct, is that the book you 7 referenced? 8 A No, that's incorrect. 9 Q Okay. I apologize. What was the book again that you 10 referenced? 11 A The book that I referenced was Wetland Plant 12 Communities of Minnesota and Wisconsin. 13 Q And you did testify at your deposition since you	1between two different types of systems, whether it be2a system of a lake or a system of a stream, and3having in that situation a difficult bed and bank4determination because of the characteristic and5nature of the aquatic plants that would be growing in6that particular setting." Did you receive that7question and give that answer, sir?8MR. MEYER: I'm going to object. I mean I9think this is being used to impeach the witness10and the question you asked in the deposition is11not the same question you asked at this hearing.12MS. KAVANAUGH: Yes.13MR. GLEISNER: Well, I think it was,
raised it again yesterday, you did testify at your deposition that a marsh has a bed and bank, correct? If A I don't recall that portion of testimony of saying that a marsh has a bed and bank. If you would go to Page 37 of your deposition. Is it still in front of you? I'm sorry. A Yes, it is. A Line 16 the question was MS. CORRELL: Could you wait until we can locate that? MR. GLEISNER: I'm sorry, Counsel, I apologize.	14Counsel.15MS. KAVANAUGH: You asked whether he16testified that a marsh had a bed and bank and17that's not what you asked18MR. MEYER: This is a marsh outlet which is19a different question.20MS. KAVANAUGH: And he's not even saying in21his answer it has a bed and bank, what he's22saying is that the determination of a bed and23bank is difficult in those circumstances.24MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor, I think that25I I don't believe anybody has testified that
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 21	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 23
1 MS. CORRELL: Which binder? 2 MS. KAVANAUGH: I think it's Binder 1, but 3 I'm not positive. Which exhibit is your 4 deposition? 5 MS. CORRELL: Can you give us an exhibit 6 number, please? 7 MS. KAVANAUGH: Here it is. 8 ALJ BOLDT: I don't think it is an exhibit. 9 MS. KAVANAUGH: It's Exhibit 111. 10 MR. GLEISNER: It's not an exhibit. 11 MS. CORRELL: It's Exhibit 111 actually. 12 MS. CORRELL: It's Exhibit 111 actually. 13 Thank you. 14 MR. HARBECK: Oh, that may be right. 15 MR. GLEISNER: I think Mr. Gallo marked it 16 as an exhibit now that I think about it. We 17 didn't. 18 MS. CORRELL: What page are you on? 19 MR. GLEISNER: I'm on Page 37, Counsel. 20 Thank you, Counsel. 21 Q 22 At Line 16 you were asked the following question, "Do 23 you know as you're sitting here whether or not a 24 marsh outlet has a bed and bank?" And at Line 20 you <tr< td=""><td>1there's a difference between a marsh and a marsh outlet so I stand by the reason for going to the deposition.4MS. KAVANAUGH: But what you're doing is characterizing the response he gave as different from the response here and asking him to agree that that's the he gave the response that's in here.9MS. CORRELL: Sir, could I also object to relevance please because I don't think anybody opined that there is a marsh outlet. My understanding of the grove of trees was MS. CORRELL: I's a stream.14MS. CORRELL: your expert defined it as a stream and I did not hear any testimony that defined anything as a marsh outlet so I'm confused as to the relevance.18MR. GLEISNER: Judge, this is is not going back to the original reason we called him adversely. All I'm doing is making certain that the record is complete with regard to the discussion of marsh, whether it be a marsh outlet or otherwise. I just want to make</td></tr<>	1there's a difference between a marsh and a marsh outlet so I stand by the reason for going to the deposition.4MS. KAVANAUGH: But what you're doing is characterizing the response he gave as different from the response here and asking him to agree that that's the he gave the response that's in here.9MS. CORRELL: Sir, could I also object to relevance please because I don't think anybody opined that there is a marsh outlet. My understanding of the grove of trees was MS. CORRELL: I's a stream.14MS. CORRELL: your expert defined it as a stream and I did not hear any testimony that defined anything as a marsh outlet so I'm confused as to the relevance.18MR. GLEISNER: Judge, this is is not going back to the original reason we called him adversely. All I'm doing is making certain that the record is complete with regard to the discussion of marsh, whether it be a marsh outlet or otherwise. I just want to make
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 22	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 24

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 7	
Image: Strength of the stream of the strea	1 A As I had testified, when I was at the site on 9/22, water in the lake and, again, in my opinion water in the lake had receded below that elevation and water was (inaudible) flowing over these two particular locations. The one probably on the this would be the the north was the greater of the two channels where water was again, it was trickling basically over is kind of a good way to describe it. 10 Did you identify when you made your field visit did you identify the existence of a culvert underneath the berm or the high point? 13 A I had not. 14 Have you since? 15 A I have not, but I had heard that there was a culvert located somewhere in that vicinity. Again, I haven't been able to look at it or been able to identify exactly where that's located. 19 Okay. You don't disagree with testimony that there is such a culvert? 14 There may be, but its exact location, its functionality, direction, all that, I can't testify to. 20 Now, you testified yesterday with regard to that grove of trees and you stated, as I recall, that you
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 25	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 27
<pre>1 recall that? 2 A I never defined it as a blockage, but 3 Q What would you define it as, sir? 4 A Well, it really in the observations I made at that 5 site was that it was just kind of a natural deposit 6 of sand, gravel material, associated plant material 7 that grew probably over many, many years, that had 8 formed an edge I'll call it, an edge of North Lake, 9 where you could really define the where the lake edge really existed. And I would classify that was 11 within the approximate location of where the channel 2 exited and entered the lake and that when water would 3 actually get to a certain elevation within the swale 14 or within the lake it would flow over in either 15 direction once it waved above that elevation. 16 Q Now thank you. Is that it? I didn't mean to 17 interrupt you. 18 A Yep. 19 Q Now, directing your attention to Exhibit 211 and 10 looking at the southwest quadrant of 211, you have an 11 oval circle which you've identified as the high point 12 between flow paths and then you've identified some 13 vegetation that grows there and you have arrows going 14 to either side of that high point. Does that 15 indicate the flow of water?</pre>	 did not see any evidence of a that would indicate to you that there was an accumulation of water ordinarily in that grove of trees, is that correct? A I believe I testified that I didn't see any characteristics indicative of advantageous roots, water staining Q Water staining. Thank you. And if there is photographic evidence of that water staining you haven't seen it, is that correct? A I had not observed any conditions where water staining had occurred on any of the plant species or any of the plants present in the grove of trees. Q Now, you're aware that there is a public access right now at Corey Oil, is that correct? Yes, I am. Q And are you aware that there is a I don't recall your testimony yesterday so did you testify that there was not a permit for that? MR. GLEISNER: It's pretty obvious. MS. KAVANAUGH: No, it's not. I mean you don't require a permit MS. CORRELL: I think we can let him answer that.
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 26	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 28

	SHI	EET 8			
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q	<pre>MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor, if they're going to object they should object, otherwise let me ask my questions, please. MS. CORRELL: I think you asked Mr. Wakeman some questions so I think you should go ahead. MR. MEYER: I'll object to relevance. Are you aware of any permit for the Corey Oil site? MR. MEYER: Objection, relevance. MR. MEYER: Objection, relevance. MR. GLEISNER: He just nodded his assent yes, he is. ALJ BOLDT: Well, I know, but what is the relevance? MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor, we want to establish that there already is public access to North Lake. MR. HARBECK: I mean they talked about it. ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, okay. Yeah, no, I think that's right. The objection is overruled. MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Your Honor. I want to just touch back on the last question. Sure. You asked if there was public there was a public boat launch at the Corey Oil site. It's not a public boat launch, it's a private boat launch, just to clarify.</pre>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q A	ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, let's I mean let's get back in form too where we have one lawyer for each I mean I've allowed both sides a little latitude there, but let's get back in form and, I agree, let's keep this thing moving. MR. GLEISNER: We're trying to, Your Honor. We are trying to. Did you talk to any neighbors MR. GLEISNER: I'm sorry, were you done, Your Honor? ALJ BOLDT: Uh-huh. Did you talk to any neighbors about the Krause site? The only neighbors I had conversations with I believe was actually Fritz Hanson when we were doing our tour of the site back in September, with maybe some occasional off-the-cuff type conversations at some of the public informational meetings (inaudible), but nothing that I can recall. MR. MEYER: Can I ask for clarification? The term neighbors is a very broad term. Is it the neighbors MR. GLEISNER: That's a fair request for clarification, Counsel. I would limit that to the people who live contiguous to the Krause
		LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 29			LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 31
1					
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	Okay. And, yes, I am aware of permits issued for that boat launch. Do you remember or do you know when the first permit was issued? It was in the early '90s. I don't have the exact date and time, but I've located that for a couple different individuals over the last couple months so Thank you very much. And that access point, does the owner of Corey Oil charge for the opportunity to launch boats there? Yes, they do. And how much, do you know? Last I launched there it was \$3. Okay. Thank you. That site at Corey Oil is available to anyone who wishes to launch a boat there, is that correct? To the best of my knowledge. MS. CORRELL: I hope you're wrapping up because this is all duplicative to his direct testimony. MS. KAVANAUGH: I mean if we're going to get done today, going over the same stuff over and over LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 3 24 25	Q A Q A Q Q	<pre>site, Mr. Peters, Mr. Hanson, the people on lower Redland Road. MR. MEYER: Thank you. That helped a lot. Thank you. ALJ BOLDT: Was that your understanding when THE WITNESS: That was my understanding, but it was pretty broad. That's why I brought in the meetings too because I'm sure I had conversations there. Did you see any swamp cabbage anywhere on the site? MR. MEYER: Clarification again. Which site, please? MR. GLEISNER: I apologize. I'm referring to the Krause site. I believe I identified one swamp cabbage or I believe what you would be referring to as swamp cabbage on the site. And where was that located, sir? Within the grove of trees. Thank you for that. MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor, if I can just have one moment? ALJ BOLDT: Sure. Could you go to 216? LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI</pre>

SHEET 9			
2Honor, and then we3QDo you recall yesterday4yesterday that you wey5and on direct and the6or not there was hydro7site by either the DNF8Engineers. Do you recommon9MR. MEYER:10Krause site?11MS. KAVANAUC12MR. GLEISNEF13MS. CORRELL:14moment, please?15A16Q17entitled North Lake Bo18Wetland Delineations.19presented to you yester20A21Q23sentence beginning, "H4has not established" -	ay or my recollection is re asked about this exhibit the question related to whether applytic vegetation found on the sor the Army Corps of sall that? And, once again, this is the GH: And which exhibit, sir? St: Exhibit 216. 216. Can you just give me a Okay. What's your question? tease? the record, Exhibit 216 is boat Launch DNR Krause Site Do you recall that being	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Go ahead and answer it if you can. I was not aware of a mowing schedule on the site, but it's a DNR-maintained site so I'm aware mowing has occurred. At this time I am going to MS. CORRELL: Is this a new exhibit? Who is MR. GLEISNER: Yes, it is. Who is Pat Truckel (phonetic)? MS. CORRELL: I would object to additional exhibits being submitted at this date. MR. GLEISNER: This is cross-examination, Your Honor, and something came up yesterday that we would like to have the record clarified on. MS. CORRELL: Sir, the record speaks for itself in terms of what the Army Corps determination is. Arguments that were made to the Army Corps of Engineers and were not successfully determined by the Army Corps of Engineers cannot be redone without redress at the Army Corps of Engineers at the federal level. You're bringing in information that was presented to the Army Corps of Engineers with respect to wetland delineations and the
LEGAL VI (608) 279-5295	DEO SERVICES Prairie du Sac WI 33		LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 35
<pre>2 hydrologic alteration. 3 into the record yester 4 A Yes. 5 Q Okay. I'm now going t 6 MR. GLEISNEF 7 Q Are you aware that jus 8 the Army Corps of Engi 9 May 5th of 2010, are yo 10 A I do not know the exact 11 but I know that they H 12 Q Take a look at the sect 13 bottom on Page 2 of Ex 14 May 4th the Corps of H 15 independent on-site ref 16 delineation and the in 17 submitted by the Corps 18 Engineers conducted a 19 see that, sir? 20 A Yes. 21 Q Are you aware that jus 22 area on the Krause sit 23 MS. CORRELL: 24 MR. GLEISNEF 25 relevance in a mon 27 Not set the sect of the sect of</pre>	to show you R: Get that over to Counsel. It before you are aware that ineers visited this site on you not? It dates of their site visit, and done multiple site visits. sond paragraph up from the thibit 216 and it says there on Engineers conducted an eview of the SEWRPC DNR water offormation which has been S. On May 5th the Corps of follow-up site visit. Do you At before the site visit the ise was mowed? Objection, relevance. R: And we'll establish	$ \begin{array}{c} 1\\ 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ 25\\ \end{array} $	<pre>management of that site. MR. GLEISNER: I suggest not. MR. HARBECK: They raised this issue yesterday. They pointed out the sentence in this Army Corps wetland delineation where they, the Army Corps, delineation said there's an absence of hydrophytic vegetation. They brought that up. The site was mowed just prior to the Army Corps analysis and evaluation and the question is, is he aware of whether or not that's contrary to DNR guidance to mow a site before you do a wetlands delineation. All he's going to do is he's not aware it was mowed and just produce the guidance memo that says you're not supposed to mow a site and then we're done with that. MS. CORRELL: That exhibit isn't necessary to ask that question. MR. HARBECK: Well, we try, but ALJ BOLDT: No, ask the question and that's fine. MS. CORRELL: Yeah, you can't produce that exhibit. You can ask those questions if that's all you're trying to establish. MR. GLEISNER: We would like these exhibits</pre>
(608) 279-5295	Prairie du Sac WI		(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 36

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 10	
1in the record, Your Honor.2ALJ BOLDT: What's that?3MR. GLEISNER: We would like these exhibits4in the record because they relate to DNR policy.5They were obtained in response to an open6records request. They are highly germane to the7question of or questions that were asked8yesterday with respect to Exhibit 216.9MS. CORRELL: Objection10MR. MEYER: Your Honor, I'm going to11object12ALJ BOLDT: Wait, wait, hold on. What13issue that I have to decide are they relevant14to?15MR. GLEISNER: Well, they're not. The DNR16was forthcoming with the Army Corps of Engineers17with respect to this property.18ALJ BOLDT: Again, what am I going19to I'm going to make a finding they were20forthcoming, they weren't forthcoming? Come on,21that's not relevant.22MR. HARBECK: No but, Judge, if they're23going to make an argument that the absence of24hydrophytic vegetation means that the area does25not on an intermittent basis have a lot of	1try and leave those fallowed to allow wetland2plants or the native species or seed bank to3grow and not be manipulated.4ALJ BOLDT: So is it the same division? I5know DNR is a big entity. Is it the same6division that are the groundskeepers as are7involved in a wetlands delineation process?8THE WITNESS: Not to my knowledge.9ALJ BOLDT: Okay. And subsequent to that10have you seen any evidence of hydrophytic11vegetation in that area? We were just out12there.13THE WITNESS: You know, there are varying14degrees of hydrophytic vegetation and there are15occurrences of when they grow in those16conditions. To my knowledge there are various17species (inaudible) that could be classified as18somewhat wet but, again, when they're going19through the delineation process they rank those20on their occurrences within the area to be able21to determine if the site qualified and meet22wetland status.23ALJ BOLDT: And we had a SEWRPC expert, we24had a DNR expert, we had an expert for the North25Lake Management District and I'm not sure if
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 37	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 39
1water, then this is to show that there could be2vegetation there. I mean I don't know where3they're going, what the point of that whole4ALJ BOLDT: I mean I agree you can ask the5question, it's fair cross, but I don't see how6that document is relevant to any issue that I7have to decide apart from the fact that it8hasn't been disclosed.9MR. GLEISNER: Well, the only thing is10it11ALJ BOLDT: If you want to put it in your12rebuttal case that might be appropriate, but if13you want to ask a question about it14MR. GLEISNER: Fair enough, Your Honor.15MR. GLEISNER: I will. Fair enough, Your16DNR guidance.17MR. GLEISNER: I will. Fair enough, Your18Honor.19ALJ BOLDT: And ask him if he is20aware or I'll ask him. Are you aware of DNR21guidance relative to the issue of mowing in22anticipation of a wetlands delineation?23THE WITNESS: Typically, when you have24atypical or disturbed sites such as farmed25wetlands or other disturbed sites, it's best to	1anybody else was involved in a wetlands2delineation. That's settled and I had thought3that we had a I thought we had a stipulation4that we had a I thought we had a stipulation4that we had a I thought we had a stipulation4that we had a I thought we had a stipulation4that we had a I thought we had a stipulation4that we had a I thought we had a stipulation5that wetland issues are not part of the hearing.6MR. HARBECK: It was only in response to7their bringing this up and making a point of it.8ALJ BOLDT: All right. Okay. So then I9think we've covered it.10MS. CORRELL: And I didn't refer to other11parts of the memo that had to do with the12wetland and the mowing was answered in this13memo. I only referred to portions that had to14do with navigability because that is the issue15we're here to decide.16MR. GLEISNER: May I please, Your Honor?17ALJ BOLDT: Yeah.18MR. GLEISNER: I'm done with the cross. If19I just may make a record?20ALJ BOLDT: Sure.21MR. GLEISNER: We are and an offer of22proof. We are going to establish in our23rebuttal that the guidance says they shouldn't24cut it and we're going to establish that it was25cut by the direction of a very high level member
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 38	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 40

s	HEET 11			
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	<pre>MBD1 11 of the DNR who is responsible for the site and was cut again just a couple of days before our on-site visit to this location. And my only point in raising it isn't to show wetlands, Your Honor, it's to show that the area of the grove of trees is often saturated with water. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. If you want to present it as part of your rebuttal case then MR. GLEISNER: And that's it, Your Honor. ALJ BOLDT: just on that discreet point, I think that MR. GLEISNER: And we're done with our cross, Your Honor. MS. CORRELL: I would still object to relevancy because this has been asked and answered and the Division doesn't actually have jurisdiction to undo a federal wetland permit. So you can bring those arguments to circuit court, but they're really not relevant to the issues to be decided here. MR. GLEISNER: I think we'll wait for our rebuttal if it's all right, Judge. ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, I agree. Let's take that up then. Okay. Any other Mr. Gallo, cross? MR. GALLO: Yes.</pre>	1 2 3 4 5 6 6 7 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q A Q	MS. CORRELL: No, I'm confused. Are there two there's two 108's. MS. KAVANAUGH: The first B. MS. CORRELL: The first B and the first 108, okay. This is a public comment submitted to the DNR and the first question is did you review this as part of the process to evaluate your decision or come up with your decision on the manual code permit? Yeah, if I well, I don't want to make any assumptions, but if this was included in a packet submitted by you to the for the public comment period then I could stipulate that it may have been part of that packet that I reviewed. Okay. Turn to Page 9. One of many concerns that we expressed on behalf of the North Lake Management District was storm water drainage interference and diversion with this project and its MS. CORRELL: Objection again to relevance, not the issue for this hearing. MS. KAVANAUGH: They've got a separate judicial review going MR. GALLO: It goes to whether or not there's the deposit for the access road materially reduced the flood flow capacity of
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 41			LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 43
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 A 12 13 Q 14 15 A 16 Q 17 18 19 20 A 21 Q 22 23 24 A	<pre>analysis of the Standard Number 3, the structure or deposit would not materially reduce the flow flood flow capacity of a stream. So if you'll bear with me a little bit, I want to identify the hydraulic flow regime flowing through the system. So we're looking at going back to Exhibit 108B, this is a public comment dated October 31st to Jim Ritchie. Can you just let me know what book that's in? Is it in I'm sorry, it's a black book 108. ALJ BOLDT: Right here. And 108? The first page is dated October 31st. It's a letter addressed to Jim Ritchie and I think it's public comment on behalf of North Lake Management District. Do you have it? Well, the 108 I have is December 10th, 2008. Okay. Flip back to Appendix forward, I'm sorry. No, I'm sorry, back. Appendix B. This one right here.</pre>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q	<pre>the stream. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Well, keep it in that context. MS. CORRELL: What stream are we talking about? MR. GALLO: The swale that Andy is talking about, the blue swale, and the stream that's within the north wetlands. MS. CORRELL: What activity is taking place in that water body? MR. GALLO: You're filling that MS. CORRELL: We're not touching that swale. MR. GALLO: No, you're the north wetlands you're filling the stream area with the access road. MS. KAVANAUGH: What stream? MR. GALLO: Let's go to another exhibit. ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, I think we have to be precise for that exact reason. I'm referring to Exhibit 143 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Actually, he needs to be near a microphone when he says this. ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, I think we better have a mic.</pre>
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 42			LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 44

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 121 QI'm referring to Exhibit 1432MR. GALLO: Thank you. Thank you.3 QAnd if I'm correct, I'm just trying to point out this4is the proposed route of the new access road and we5have testimony in the record from Don Reinbold and6Neal with regard to a depression in here that is what7we're saying is the stream in the north wetlands. So8that's impacting flood flow capacity?9MS. CORRELL: Still objection to relevance.10ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Are you saying assuming	1 Q No, no, your own knowledge of the site. 2 A Okay. My knowledge of the site and my opinion of how 3 this waterway really is functioning is that you have 4 any number of sources of water flowing to it. During 5 localized events you would have inflow, that I would 6 agree with, out of the similar to what is drawn on 7 this map where you have watershed draining from the 8 west to the east, but not solely confined to the 9 south than to the north. I believe there's as 10 this depicts too, there's adequate drainage to the
11that's a stream does it affect the flood flow12capacity of that stream? Is that basically what13you're asking?14MR. GALLO: No.15ALJ BOLDT: Okay. I'm sorry.16MR. GALLO: I'm just trying to establish17the flow regime, first of all.18ALJ BOLDT: Okay.19MR. GALLO: And the question they asked was20what relevance was this line of questioning with21regard to flood flow capacity. Let me continue22on the development of the flood or the flow23regime.24ALJ BOLDT: Okay.25QNow, if you'll look at the map in Exhibit E on in	11 northern wetland at the same time as to the southern 12 portion of the wetland. Again, you know, I don't see 13 any differences of water being trapped behind that 14 road and flowing over that direction, but the general 15 flow of this waterway is when it would come to the 16 elevation of the area closest to the lake and fill up 17 before it would discharge into the lake. 18 Q Okay. When you reviewed the manual code approval and 19 the Kapur design of this access road, you permitted 20 four culverts and I'm going to refer to the DNR 21 exhibits. I believe it's Exhibit 1, the application 22 materials, and it's Bates Number 041. 23 A What was the first exhibit again? 24 Q It's the first exhibit in the DNR package. 25 A 200?
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 45	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 47
<pre>1 that book. This map 2 MS. CORRELL: Can you just give me a 3 moment? Exhibit E to your first Exhibit 108? 4 MR. GALLO: Yeah, it's this one right here. 5 MS. KAVANAUGH: That one? Okay. 6 MR. GALLO: Exactly. 108B, E. 7 Q This map was submitted in support of our comment with 8 regard to the flood drainage interference and 9 diversion. Now, in your deposition, Mr. Hudak, you 10 said that you were familiar with plans and drawings 11 and contours, is that correct? 12 A That's correct. 13 Q So I'm presuming that when you evaluated the manual 14 code approval that you reviewed this hydraulic 15 regime? 16 A I've seen it, yes. 17 Q Okay. Now, I just want to do a little bit more 18 follow-up with regard to Exhibit 2-002. If you look</pre>	1 Q 200. 2 A Okay. 3 Q Exhibit 200, and Kapur drawing, design drawing, 041. 4 MR. GALLO: Does everybody have that? 5 A So Bates stamp 041? 6 MR. GLEISNER: So we can be clear on the record, it does not have a Bates stamp? Does it follow 9 MR. GALLO: It's 041 and it's C101-2 from the drawing. 10 the drawing. 11 MR. GALLO: And just one more minute. 13 MS. CORRELL: It's got to be around here. 14 MS. CORRELL: I know. 101 dash what? 15 MR. GALLO: Let's see, what number is this 17 one? That's the one. That's the right one. 18 MS. CORRELL: It does have a Bates number
19 at this exhibit with regard and the map that has 20 the flow drainage. Correct me if I'm incorrect here. 21 The flow flows into this wetland and then it flows 22 across the existing roadway into this north wetland, 23 is that correct? 24 A Would you like me to answer that related to how I'm 25 reading this diagram or from my own opinion?	19of 041?20MR. GALLO: Yes.21Q22okay. Andy, I'm going to refer you to this drawing23and from Station 20 plus 00 which is the east/west23leg of the new proposed access road there are four24eight-inch PVC cross-culverts identified between the25top of the hill which is 20 plus 00 to the parking

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 13	
<pre>1 lot area. Are you MS. CORRELL: Objection or not 3 objection, really just a clarification that this 4 is the 2008 plans. Do you need to be using I 5 understand that these are in the application, 6 but do you need to be using the plans from 7 December that you submitted in your exhibits? 8 Q Are these the plans that you reviewed for the manual 9 code approval? 10 MS. CORRELL: Because these are the 11 original plans before the road alignment for 12 Mr. Hanson's property and as you can see in his 13 decision it refers to different plans that are 14 more substantially similar to 15 Q Let me ask you a more basic question. Are these the 16 four culverts that you referred to in your approval? 17 A These would be the four culverts, yes. 18 Q And the purpose of those culverts is to convey the 19 water from the south wetlands to the north wetlands, 20 is that correct? 21 A And vice versa. 22 Q And vice versa. So it flows both directions in these 23 culverts? 24 A Correct. That would be my understanding of how these 25 culverts will function.</pre>	 of area and flow for a 100-year event in your analysis of the manual code approval? No. So there's no written documentation in the DNR record with regard to projected water and rain event flow? Not within any of my records I would have reviewed for this decision. And I'm not trying to ask this again, I'm just trying to be clear. So there's nothing in the manual code application or in the approval with regard to supporting documentation on the projection of flood flows in this defined hydraulic regime? To my understanding, yes. Okay. MS. CORRELL: DNR just has, again, the same continuing objections to flood plain and storm water issues being addressed here when there are other matters that are addressing those issues. This is not what the case is about. MR. GALLO: I think it's relevant, Your Honor, with regard to MS. CORRELL: To a degree. MR. GALLO: evaluation of flood flow impacts to flood flow capacity. MS. CORRELL: If there were a stream, yes.
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 49	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 51
1QDid you ever calculate or do you have any written2documents with regard to the drainage area that goes3into this system this hydraulic system?4MR. MEYER: Clarification of what hydraulic5system?6MR. GALLO: We just defined a hydraulic7system by these maps and8MR. GALLO: and the two wetlands10and11MR. GALLO: the swale going out to13North Lake14MR. MEYER: Thank you.15MR. GALLO: and we've been discussing16flow back and forth.17Q18No.19Q19There's no documentation with regard to the area of20drainage or the flow based on like a 100-year21flow or storm event?22A23I don't know what calculations Kapur may have done to24size those culverts. Again, that wasn't any material25Q26So the question is did you rely on any calculations	1ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Objection is noted and2the ruling stands. The testimony stands.3QTurn to the North Lake Management District4Exhibit 106. It's a historical aerial photo.5MR. GALLO: Is everybody there?6MS. CORRELL: Yes, thank you, Don.7Q7Okay. 106 and also 107 which is the photo right8behind it. Mr. Hudak, during your deposition I9presented you with these two figures that I obtained10from the Wisconsin Department of Transportation11website. 106 is an aerial photo of the Krause12property showing the north wetlands, the south13wetlands, and the area that you called the swale in14the winter of 1968 and Exhibit 107, again,15from it's a Department of Transportation aerial16photograph of the Krause property predevelopment17dated 1937. During your deposition you indicated18that you had not seen or reviewed these photographs19with regard to stream history, is that correct?20AThat's correct. These were not air photos that I had21access to or utilized.22Q kay. Thank you. With regard to this hydraulic23regime, including the drainage area to the west on24the hillside, the wetlands north and south and the25swale, would you consider that a tributary to
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 50	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 52

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 14 1 North Lake? 2 A I'll tell you a contributory source of North Lake. A 2	MR. GALLO: Well, what I'm looking for is whether or not DNR and Secretary Meyer is taking
3 tributary, I would have difficulty classifying it as 4 that only as I don't I still have difficulty 5 classifying this as a stream and I really associate a	the position that there are no other practical alternatives to this site. MS. CORRELL: That's not an issue in this
6 tributary as a flowing system into a stream, whether 7 it be intermittent or permanent. 8 Q In your testimony you have referred to the blue 8	hearing. MR. GALLO: Okay, withdraw the question. MS. CORRELL: That's why we didn't go
9 segment as a swale and stated that has a defined bed 9 10 and bank, is that correct? 10 11 A I defined that it does have a defined bed and bank 11 12 A I defined that it does have a defined bed and bank 11	through that. MR. GALLO: No further questions. ALJ BOLDT: Thank you, Mr. Gallo.
12and swale is a term loosely used, I'll call it.1213QLet's turn to Exhibit 129. This is a large fold-out1314map that we produced prepared by Lake Country1415Engineering.15	Redirect? MS. CORRELL: Yeah, just a couple of questions. REDIRECT EXAMINATION
16AI need the second book.16B17QDo you need help?I'm happy to help you.17Q	Y MS. CORRELL: Thank you for your patience, Mr. Hudak. You were asked a lot of questions regarding flood studies and
19 MS. CORRELL: I think it's the third, yeah. 19 v 20 A And 129? 20 w 21 Q Yes. 21 w	various studies that you'd be conducted or you vould I guess the question would assume that you vould conduct flood studies in your review of
23copy. We gave ours back.23a24QThis document was a survey that was conducted on24a	Chapter 30 or a water quality certification application. In your experience, is that a required analysis in order to reach a determination? It is not.
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 53	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 55
2QAnd did you observe Lake Country doing this survey2p3measurements? It was actually an elevation survey to3w	are there occasions when a site has significant flood plain or floodway issues such that you might consult with the flood plain engineer at DNR? Yes.
5the channel?5QA6AI observed a few of the locations. I didn't observe6a7every single point that they made and sampled or7b	and as I believe I or I asked you earlier, are you ware of whether or not a flood plain analysis is being done by a DNR employee for this site?
9 Q Okay. Thank you. 10 MR. GALLO: I'd like to go into another 10 m	I'm aware that our flood plain engineer is working with Waukesha County to ensure that this project will weet Waukesha County flood plain zoning requirements.
11area and I'm certainly willing to debate this1112and if DNR wants to make a stipulation, that1213would be fine. It would save time. But13	MR. GLEISNER: Objection, relevance. I'm not sure where this is going. MS. CORRELL: I'm responding to your
14Secretary Meyer raised an issue with regard to1415the denial of the Highway 83 access site and I1516would like to ask a few questions regarding that1617because it goes to the availability of17	irrelevant questions. MR. GLEISNER: My point is my point is that the question is relating to zoning ordinances, etcetera, not whether there was a
17Decause it goes to the availability of1718alternative sites and to the alternative1819analysis that was conducted. And, you know, I'm1920sure20	flood plain analysis done, Your Honor. I'm having a little difficulty understanding. I got shot down for zoning yesterday.
203d12202021ALJ BOLDT: The problem is we don't have2122the wetlands issues in this case.2223MS. KAVANAUGH: In front of us. You23	ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, it's exactly like MS. CORRELL: We're having trouble understanding why you keep asking these
24stipulated wetlands were not part of this. You2425stipulated navigability was the only issue.25	questions. I'm simply responding. ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, he was shot down as he
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES
(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 54	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 56

SHEET 15 1 said or he was the objection was sustained 2 more precisely. We'd never think to shoot down 3 Mr. Gleisner, but particularly now in this	
4new era. People might be packing here. Okay, go ahead. The objection was sustained. MS. CORRELL: I'm sorry, my colleague was a klj mathemediate individual permit process would require so said.4specific notice to some landowners and, if you describe who those landowners are?7talking to me and I didn't hear what you just s said.4specific notice to some landowners are?9ALJ BOLDT: The objection is sustained. 96ATypically, the notice requirements for the individual permit process would require so to the immediate riparian owners on either 910MS. CORRELL: So I don't need to do this?9project of the waterway. I believe we eve10MS. CORRELL: So I don't need to do this?10this to a few of the other adjacent ripari in close proximity to it as well as the No12questions are relevant? MS. CORRELL: Okay.11in close proximity to it as well as the No13ALJ BOLDT: The objection was ustained on that one.13groups, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wauk and whether or not DNR had assessed grading on the understood your testimony to mean10MR. GLEISMER: Objection, leading.1011understood your testimony to mean20Oh, Exhibit 213 in the DNR book.12QDid you assert 30.19 grading authority over the manual code.21a blank here of where this what paper t now. Oh, the Waukesha Freeman. The Wauke on 9/16/2010 and we had certified copies m24And if your 30.19 grading authority were larger than25on 9/16/2010 and we had certified copies m	yuires so, could Chapter 30 me notice side of a n extended an owners of Lake vation esha County ge of rrea. nat, I'd for the is notice? c state it 'm drawing mis was in gha Freeman
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 57 59 LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac 59	NI
1only those activities that are included on the2parking lot, would 30.19 require any additional3protections for the environment or the navigable4waters, any type of navigable waters including5wetlands, lakes, streams, any navigable waters, on6the site?7MR. GLEISNER: Objection, leading.8MS. CORRELL: I asked him whether or not9any additional conditions, I don't see that10that's leading, or requirements would be11necessary.12MR. GLEISNER: That's just my objection,13Your Honor. I will argue it if you want.14MS. KAVANAUGH: I think it's similar to the15question the Judge asked.18A In this case there's no additional requirements that19we would have instilled upon the design, the20construction, of this of these activities based on21not reviewing it or not having reviewed it under2230.19. Basically, all of the all of the23requirements that were instilled within the24conditions of this manual code addressed the entire25site and the review under the 30.19 activity.	nonetic) Oman operty she may e wetland the Army read the lot easier at out to con. Now I s another the North tesha La Freibel cy Wurst Action are those
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 58 LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac 60	VI

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

 6 stream, I don't believe there would be a material 7 reduction of the flood flow capacity of that stream, 8 given the nature that there is the higher elevation 9 within that 15-foot area that I observed along the 10 lakeshore. And the only I'm sure there may be 11 certain conditions exist on a localized event that 	2 Q Sorry.	
(608) 279-5295 61Prairie du Sac WI 61(608) 279-5295 63Prairie du Sac WI 631done a flood flow analysis.1been this reference to I think it's been called an 1 independent site visit by the Corps of Engineers to 3 look at wetlands. Did you have knowledge of that 4 A Provided assuming that there was a defined channel 5 with flow that is perceivable and we'd call it a 6 stream, I don't believe there would be a material 7 reduction of the flood flow capacity of that stream, 8 given the nature that there is the higher elevation 9 within that 15-foot area that I observed along the 10 lakeshore. And the only I'm sure there may be 11 certain conditions exist on a localized event thatImage and the stream is a stream in a localized event that	 4 Q So it appears to be both petitioners' position that the wetland, because it has a channel in the northern quadrant of the wetland and continuing easterly to the lake, constitutes a stream and therefore analysis that's the allegation and therefore the analysis would require that flood flow capacity would be addressed in this permit review. If I ask you to assume that as a fact, that this is a stream, have you considered any decrease in whether or not there is a decrease, a material decrease, in flood flow capacity of this navigable water body? Or since it's a hypothetical, I'm asking you to consider that now. 17 A Yeah. 18 MR. HARBECK: Object, Your Honor, there's no foundation, there's no expertise, he hasn't done it, so I think for him to now give an opinion that he's not either qualified for or that he hasn't looked at before is improper. MS. CORRELL: I think you have opened the door. 	<pre>2 proposed in this project? 3 A Currently there's about .14 acres of overall fill 4 being placed in this waterway and there's been talk 5 of two culverts. I'm aware of one that, again, I'm 6 not positive of its functionality, but from 7 everything I can observe it doesn't appear to be a 8 highly functioning culvert and be replaced with four 9 additional culverts spread along the road to try and 10 convey flow to either side. 11 MS. CORRELL: I don't have any further 12 redirect. Thank you. 13 ALJ BOLDT: Okay. 14 MR. MEYER: Two very brief, if I may? 15 RECROSS-EXAMINATION 16 BY MR. MEYER: 17 Q Mr. Hudak, Attorney Gleisner asked you the question 18 can anyone use the Corey Oil boat site, boat access, 19 on his cross-examination. Do you recall the 20 question? 21 A Yes. 22 Q In this record, have you previously testified on the 23 limitations of launching from that site? 24 A Yes, I have.</pre>
2ALJ BOLDT: The objection is noted but overruled. Go ahead.2independent site visit by the Corps of Engineers to look at wetlands. Did you have knowledge of that4AProvided assuming that there was a defined channel with flow that is perceivable and we'd call it a 63look at wetlands. Did you have knowledge of that5with flow that is perceivable and we'd call it a 65AYes, I knew that there was the dispute of the wetland areas and that the Corps requested a day to be out reduction of the flood flow capacity of that stream, 8 given the nature that there is the higher elevation 96areas and that the Corps requested a day to be out there without outside influences to evaluate the site prior to having I think a second day to bring the 910lakeshore. And the only I'm sure there may be 1110It can't testify that's exactly how it happened, but	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI
 out. My opinion is the greater likelihood of the source of water for these waterways is actually the flooding of the lake system and the Oconomowoc River coming down and back-flowing into these systems. Again, there may be resident water that is there from spring rains or snow melts but, again, it needs to be I think a highly localized event that would cause water to discharge from this and not be higher than the lake or cause conditions where the discharge of this is higher than the lake elevations. Q And, again, in this hypothetical, apparently the structure would be the placement of fill in the Did you know the date of that visit before it happened? Did you know the date of that visit before it happened? A It may have been the day before. It may I think they may have been back-to-back days. Okay. So you heard about it I'm asking as for clarification. I'm not trying to put words A Yeah. Q in your mouth. Heard about it one day, it happened the next. Is that your knowledge? A Well, I think I heard about it much sooner than that, you know. 	2 ALJ BOLDT: The objection is noted but 3 overruled. Go ahead.	 independent site visit by the Corps of Engineers to look at wetlands. Did you have knowledge of that independent visit before it occurred? A Yes, I knew that there was the dispute of the wetland areas and that the Corps requested a day to be out there without outside influences to evaluate the site prior to having I think a second day to bring the other scientists together to discuss their findings. That was what I thought the process was going to be. I can't testify that's exactly how it happened, but
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 62 64 LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 64	with flow that is perceivable and we'd call it a stream, I don't believe there would be a material reduction of the flood flow capacity of that stream, given the nature that there is the higher elevation within that 15-foot area that I observed along the lakeshore. And the only I'm sure there may be certain conditions exist on a localized event that may cause these to fill up to that elevation to flow out. My opinion is the greater likelihood of the flooding of the lake system and the Oconomowoc River coming down and back-flowing into these systems. Again, there may be resident water that is there from spring rains or snow melts but, again, it needs to be I think a highly localized event that would cause water to discharge from this and not be higher than the lake or cause conditions where the discharge of this is higher than the lake elevations. And, again, in this hypothetical, apparently the structure would be the placement of fill in the	 13 Q Did you know the date of that visit before it happened? 15 A It may have been the day before. It may I think they may have been back-to-back days. 17 Q Okay. So you heard about it I'm asking as for clarification. I'm not trying to put words 19 A Yeah. 20 Q in your mouth. Heard about it one day, it happened the next. Is that your knowledge? 22 A Well, I think I heard about it much sooner than that, you know. 24 Q Okay.

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

1 Use capacity of the water management specialist. If a was for the related defination for any concurrences. I was latting the scienciass duramine duration of water galaxies will dark as to assert if purisistics over as is as the forcil record. as a part of the forcil record. as part of the forcil record. a part of the forcil record.	SHEET 17	
(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 65 MS. KAVANAUGH: The deposition speaks for 67 1 MS. KAVANAUGH: The deposition speaks for 67 2 itself. It's in the record. 3 MR. GLEISNER: Well, Page 27. It's not in 4 the record. 3 MS. KAVANAUGH: (Inaudible). 6 Q Page 27 of your deposition. MS. KAVANAUGH: It has also said there are 7 MS. KAVANAUGH: The Judge can read the MR. GLEISNER: Well, actually, he can't 1 deposition. MS. KAVANAUGH: The supercord officially. 14 MR. GLEISNER: Well, actually, he can't MS. KAVANAUGH: It is in our record. 15 MS. CARELL: It is is t's an exhibit. MS. GLEISNER: Well, res an exhibit. 16 MR. GLEISNER: Well, to be safe then, Your MK met and are im asked. He didn't draw the blue 18 ALJ BOLDT: It hasn't been received yet, MK have may asked me to draw a blue line was drawn on 18 ALJ BOLDT: Meth, to be safe then, Your MK my you asked me to draw a blue line was drawn on 18 ALJ BOLDT: 111? I assume there's no Did you ever talk to those people personall? 24 ALGELNUT: MEth deposition?	2wasn't reviewing the wetland delineation for any concurrences. I was letting the scientists determine 42ALJ BOLDT: 1113concurrences. I was letting the scientists determine 4as part of the forma as part of the forma4what's the most appropriate wetland area to assert jurisdiction over as far as the federal wetlands and also for our water quality cert review and use that for the permit decision.4QAnd then the question was and referring back to Exh 68QThank you.9MR. MEYER: No further questions.7and on the Krause propert 810MR. GLEISNER: No further questions.9with that?11Honor, and I'll keep it as brief as I can. RECROSS-EXAMINATION9with that?12RECROSS-EXAMINATION12MS. CORRELL: C13BY MR. GLEISNER:13you're on?14QMr. Hudak, did you testify at your deposition that 1515Q15the blue line on Exhibit 2-002 was a stream?16MR. GLEISNER:17have at one time called it a stream or a waterway or 1717MS. CORRELL: Y18a swale. I might have used those terms many times, 1919blue pen and referring ba deposition what that water body actually is.20Do I need to reference your attention to the part of 22the deposition where you said it was a stream? I'll 232024MR. MEYER: Objection, he answered the24With the luceation"	is received as an exhibit l record. , using this light blue pen ibit 2, tell me, if you y stream on that property y and then you drew that o there. Do you disagree that, you referenced there's an you tell me what page I'm on Page 27 at Line 23. I'm sorry, everyone there? es, thank you. tion was, "Using this light ck now to Exhibit 2" that RNA Exhibit 2 at the label. "If you would, I've messed that up. h and referring back now to would the location of any
2 itself. It's in the record. 2 and initialed it. 3 MR. GLEISNER: Well, Page 27. It's not in the record. 3 MS. KAVANUGH: (Inaudible). 4 4 the record. 3 MS. KAVANUGH: (Inaudible). 6 9 6 Q Page 27 of your deposition. 7 MS. CORRELL: Nach he also said there are other areas referred to as different things so what's the relevance? 6 MR. HARBECK: Can he just answer the question that was posed? Did he draw that blue line in response to that question? 10 MS. KAVANUGH: The Judge can read the deposition. 10 MS. KAVANAUGH: But that's not all the questions he asked. He didn't draw the blue line until you get to Page 29. 13 because it's not part of the record officially. 13 MS. KAVANAUGH: It is in our record. 14 MR. GLEISNER: Well, actually, he can't 13 MS. KAVANAUGH: It is in our record. 15 MS. CORELL: It is. It's an exhibit. 15 ALJ BOLDT: It hasn't been received yet, 19 but the deposition of a party can be used for any purpose so 10 ALJ BOLDT: What was an enter deposition. 13 ALJ BOLDT: 111? I assume there's no of Mr. Andrew Hudak the entire deposition. 14 Ause this entiticate and in the admission of the deposition. 14 MR.	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI (608) 279-5295	
2 itself. It's in the record. 2 and initialed it. 3 MR. GLEISNER: Well, Page 27. It's not in the record. 3 MS. KAVANUGH: (Inaudible). 4 4 the record. 3 MS. KAVANUGH: (Inaudible). 6 9 6 Q Page 27 of your deposition. 7 MS. CORRELL: Nach he also said there are other areas referred to as different things so what's the relevance? 6 MR. HARBECK: Can he just answer the question that was posed? Did he draw that blue line in response to that question? 10 MS. KAVANUGH: The Judge can read the deposition. 10 MS. KAVANAUGH: But that's not all the questions he asked. He didn't draw the blue line until you get to Page 29. 13 because it's not part of the record officially. 13 MS. KAVANAUGH: It is in our record. 14 MR. GLEISNER: Well, actually, he can't 13 MS. KAVANAUGH: It is in our record. 15 MS. CORELL: It is. It's an exhibit. 15 ALJ BOLDT: It hasn't been received yet, 19 but the deposition of a party can be used for any purpose so 10 ALJ BOLDT: What was an enter deposition. 13 ALJ BOLDT: 111? I assume there's no of Mr. Andrew Hudak the entire deposition. 14 Ause this entiticate and in the admission of the deposition. 14 MR.		
	2itself. It's in the record.2and initialed it.3MR. GLEISNER: Well, Page 27. It's not in3MS. KAVANAUGH:4the record.3MS. KAVANAUGH: (Inaudible).45MS. KAVANAUGH: (Inaudible).5accurate6QPage 27 of your deposition.6MR. HARBECK: C7MS. CORRELL: And he also said there are7question that was po8other areas referred to as different things so9what's the relevance?10MS. KAVANAUGH: The Judge can read the10MS. KAVANAUGH:11deposition.10MS. KAVANAUGH:12MR. GLEISNER: Well, actually, he can't11questions he asked.13because it's not part of the record officially.14can do that. He's e14MS. CORRELL: It is. It's an exhibit.14can do that. He's e15MS. CORRELL: It is. It's an exhibit.15and have him answer16MLJ BOLDT: It hasn't been received yet,19that Exhibit 2-002.19but the deposition of a party can be used for20Thank you. Now, you refe20any purpose so20QThank you. Now, you refe21MR. GLEISNER: Well, to be safe then, Your20Thank you. Now, you refe22Honor, I'll move the admission of the deposition24A si I had stated previousl	I think you need to read next page to get an an he just answer the sed? Did he draw that blue that question? That's the But that's not all the He didn't draw the blue o Page 29. If they want to recross they ntitled to ask a question it. n, go ahead. a blue line at the location , the blue line was drawn on renced Exhibit or, sorry, enced Exhibit 213 and all of of that particular notice. e people personally? y, the only person that I

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 18			
2another3visit.4QAnd I h.5I'm not6plain f.7AThat's G.8QOkay.9question10in North11wetland.12A14exist f.15an occu:16Q17North L.18A19wetland.20North L.212222tin2323	Now, but you did testify in response to the h by Counsel for the DNR that when the water h Lake gets high enough it will flow into the s. Did I understand that testimony? timony provided was that based on my tions and based on the elevations that I know or North Lake at that location, that that is rrence that happens. at constitute the wetlands therefore part of ake, if you know? buld believe that the area in question in the s would be a portion of the flood plain of	1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 0 12 13 14 F 15 16 17 0 18 19 20 F 21 0 22 23 24 F 25 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	 Can you just ask the first part of that question? Yeah. Are you familiar with a flood flow capacity study and how that would be conducted? I have limited knowledge regarding what goes into that. I have very small minor bits and pieces of what would go into it, but other than that I don't conduct those or review those. Thank you. You just stated that the northern wetlands and I believe the southern wetlands too are part of the flood plain? Based on one of the exhibits that were produced the entire portion of I believe both of those are within the flood plain. And the fill for the access road which you granted approval for in the manual code is material fill within the flood plain, is that correct? Yes, as I understand it. So that would have some effect, we don't know how much effect, but it would have some effect on flood flow capacity?
(60)	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES 8) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 69		LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 71
5 question 6 conduct 7 Waukesh, 8 not sol. 9 your fin 10 correct 11 A I don't 12 comment 13 develop 14 Q So the sin 15 Waukesh, 16 manual 17 A I don't 18 plain sin 19 reviewin 20 plain to 22 plain on	ak, in response to Counsel for the DNR's h with regard to your knowledge regarding the of a flood plain study by Waukesha County, a County did not offer an opinion and you did icit an opinion from Waukesha County prior to hal decision on the manual code, is that believe I received any comments during the period from Waukesha County regarding the ment of the site. flood plain study that's being conducted by a County is totally after-the-fact of your code decision? believe Waukesha County is doing a flood tudy. What I stated was that the DNR is ng the Waukesha County requirements for flood to make sure that our project will comply with hore land or, excuse me, with their flood cdinances. familiar with the conduct of a flood plain	1 C 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 P 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 C 16 17 18 19 20 21 21 P 22 23 24 25	<pre>the hydraulic flow regime relating to the four culverts and I think you referred to that as four culverts. A hydraulic engineer would look at that somewhat differently. They would look at diameter and flow capacity of those culverts as opposed to the number of culverts, is that correct? To my understanding yes, that's what would be assessed. MR. GALLO: No further questions. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Now redirect. MS. CORRELL: Okay. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Since Attorney Gallo was just asking you, again, about the flood plain analysis being conducted at this time, if there were any impact based on the engineering and County's assessment of the project design isn't it possible that the final design plans could be amended? A That is a typical occurrence with projects with I'll call it fluid designs until the project is actually constructed where amendments would be issued for plan changes or different design elements of it.</pre>
(60)	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES 8) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 70		LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 72

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 19 1 if you can taking this light blue pen, could you draw A Sorry. 2 a line with that understanding where that", pause, -- which would have been what would the DNR do then Q 3 if there were any changes to the design that required 3 "understanding it's going to be an approximation 4 4 a -- or -where the stream or that waterway was or is?" You 5 MS. CORRELL: Strike that. 5 asked, "On Exhibit 2? Yes, ma'am -- yes, sir. Sorry 6 about that, yes." And then you answered after I'm 6 Q What would the DNR do if those design changes altered 7 7 the jurisdiction or created new impacts on the assuming you drew the line, "That was a location 8 8 where a defined waterway was present." Was that your project site? 9 MR. GLEISNER: Objection, foundation. Does 9 testimony? 10 he have the knowledge of what the DNR in this A Yes, it was. 11 area would do I think is --11 And did you opine that legally and in your 0 12 MS. CORRELL: He does. He's the permit 12 professional opinion that that area was a stream? 13 13 Based upon my deposition and what I've stated here reviewer. A 14 MR. GLEISNER: Okay. All right. 14 today, I had not opined that that is a stream, only 15 Withdrawn. 15 that it was a waterway that had navigable 16 Typically, if there's no new associated activities 16 characteristics. A 17 and there's just plan changes or new impact areas, 17 And I believe you testified earlier that that blue Q 18 those type of things, we would review the plans, make 18 area is included within the federal wetland 19 sure they're still consistent with the original 19 delineation that the Army Corps of Engineers 20 20 concurred with? findings of our decision and then offer a permit or I 21 guess a manual code amendment in this particular 21 А That is. 22 22 MS. CORRELL: I have nothing further. case. 23 0 Okay. And is it --23 MR. GLEISNER: One short question on 24 A Which would only -- sorry. Which would only specify 24 recross, Your Honor. 25 probably a new change in the plans and date set, 25 RECROSS-EXAMINATION LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 73 75 BY MR. GLEISNER: 1 those type of things. 2 Q And is it your understanding that the plans that you 2 0 So you did not do or you're not aware that any flood 3 have to date are the last final plans that you'll 3 flow analysis was done before you --MS. CORRELL: Asked and answered. 4 4 see? MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'm just trying to 5 5 I anticipate there being additional plans to review А 6 and have to issue a different amendment (inaudible). clarify the timing. 6 7 7 Q And is that fairly typical in a lot of the projects ALJ BOLDT: It's not totally asked yet, but 8 8 you review? go ahead. 9 9 It occurs. I wouldn't say it's a norm for every MR. GLEISNER: All right. I just wanted to A 10 project, but it happens often. 10 get it on the record. Okay. You were also asked to refer to your When you issued the manual code approval there was no 11 11 Q Q 12 deposition and specifically where you had marked the 12 flood flow analysis, correct? 13 blue line on the large Exhibit 2-002. I'm going to 13 MS. CORRELL: Again, asked and answered. 14 14 call you back to Page 28 of your deposition ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, I think we've --15 testimony. Mr. Gleisner had asked you to identify MS. CORRELL: We've beat that horse. 15 16 streams on the map, as I believe he just went through ALJ BOLDT: -- asked that question a 16 17 with you and you asked at Line 6, "Would you like me 17 number of times. to identify streams or". Mr. Gleisner said, "I would MR. GLEISNER: Okay. 18 18 19 like -- I'm sorry, I apologize. Go ahead", you said. ALJ BOLDT: One more for Mr. Gallo who 19 20 Mr. Gleisner said, "I apologize. I would like to 20 doesn't repeat, so go ahead. 21 MR. GALLO: My re-recross. know first of all are there any streams on the Krause 21 22 property. Let's start there." You answered, "An 22 RECROSS-EXAMINATION 23 area identified as a waterway that had potential 23 BY MR. GALLO: 24 navigable characteristics was located on the northern 24 Q Andy, I like where this is going. Attorneys for the 25 portion of the property boundaries. Would you mind 25 DNR probed in questions with regard to new impacts LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 74 76

	SHEET 20	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	<pre>that may occur during the construction process or during further evaluation and I believe their question was with regard to if the flood plain study indicates that there is impact for loss of storage for which you would have to then create new storage on this site. Couple that with additional wetland impacts that were testified to with regard to the road construction. At what point are you so committed to the project that during construction that you don't have any options but to renew the manual code approval despite the fact that the balancing test is in play and should be reconsidered? MS. CORRELL: Objection as to relevance and foundation. Mr. Hudak is not the project proponent, he is the permit reviewer. This is a regulatory review permit hearing. MR. GALLO: No, this is not a permit, it's an approval. ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, overruled. Go ahead and answer it if you can. THE WITNESS: I'll try to remember it all. A In light of the question, in search of either the I guess if a flood plain study was done to show no impacts were associated or if, as you stated, compensatory storage would be offered, there's a</pre>	 under oath. THE WITNESS: Yes. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GLEISNER: Dr. O'Reilly, could you put up that Exhibit 10, please? Now, Dr. O'Reilly, you heard Mr. Wakeman testify yesterday, I believe I'm characterizing it properly, that there was no evidence of a bed and bank near or adjacent to the grove of trees, correct? Correct. Do you agree or disagree with that statement? A I disagree. I believe, as I testified several weeks ago, that there is a bed and bank in the area where the proposed parking lot is proposed. Q Now, I'm going to direct your attention to Exhibit 10 first of all which is an excerpt from the NRC report which I believe is I believe is part of the evidence that has been admitted. MS. KAVANAUGH: Which exhibit? I'm sorry. MS. CORRELL: Exhibit 10. Q Exhibit 10 is an excerpt from the NRC report. Is there anything on Exhibit 10 which supports your belief? A Yes. Mr. Wakeman testified yesterday that he noticed there was no change in vegetation to indicate that
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 77	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 79
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	<pre>wide from my understanding, there's a wide array of options of where that can be located, whether it needs to be on the site or on adjacent properties, as long as it meets the requirements of providing that same storage of lost area. And, again, depending upon where that may occur, if there's additional permits needed for that, if it's again on the site, on a different site, we'd probably determine how extensive of a change is that and whether or not we need to, like you say, kind of scrap it and issue something new or if it's something that we can handle by a permit amendment. I believe that's how I tracked your question. I'm not sure if I touched on everything you asked there. 0 Thank you. 0 ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Any other questions of Mr. Hudak? Hearing none, thank you very much. Let's take a break now. (Recess taken) ALJ BOLDT: Okay. On the record and after our break Counsel has agreed to call a witness out of order so long as that witness can be the exam can be done in ten minutes or so. So let's go ahead and do that and if it's Dr. O'Reilly I'll remind you that you're still</pre>	there was a bank. I've had an opportunity to review the NRC report. I've had this reviewed by my senior ecologist who is a partner of mine. He has also been on the site twice, has done his own independent plant community delineation, and we concur with the NRC report. As you look at Exhibit 10, Your Honor, there's a green hatched area shown on there which the NRC and my experts have identified as a wetland plant community. It's been heavily disturbed because of the mowing, but they believe there's enough remnant of wetland plants there to indicate. And if you remember in our site visit in September when Mr. Wakeman asked me to point out where the bank was of that area, it's interesting that when I walked over, based on the topography, I pointed to the northern edge of that green line where there is a change in vegetation. So can you just for the record and I don't think you need to mark on this because the green delineation is fairly clear on Exhibit 10. Can you for the record state where the boundary would be of the bed and bank precisely? Where is the bank? Let's put it that way. A Sure. The bank would be represented by the northern edge of this green hatched area. The bed is going to
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 78	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 80

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHI	ЕЕТ 21		
1 2 3 4 4 5 0 6 7 8 9 10 11 A 12 0 13 14 A 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 0 22 23 24 A 25 0 2 2 2 3 2 4 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	<pre>be within this shaded area. And the shaded area is what? Is that grove of trees within that The grove of trees is within that green hatched area. Let the record show that Dr. O'Reilly has identified the green hatched area on Exhibit 10 as constituting, in his opinion and his ecologist's opinion, as wetland and that the boundary of that green line to the north and east is the bank of the stream that you identified previously, is that correct Doctor? That's correct. Doctor, would you take a look at Exhibit 16-002? Is that the exhibit that you were referring to before? That is an exhibit that Mr. Wood produced at his deposition showing a topographic depression based on a contour survey that DNR had done by Kapur and Associates. And I believe that that line, while there was some irregularities, matches reasonably close to the green line shown on the NRC Exhibit Number 10. So then having referenced to Exhibit 16-002, there is a red line that has been placed there by the DNR, is that correct? Yes. And that red line, it's your testimony, is comparable</pre>	1 2 3 4 A 5 Q 6 7 8 A 9 10 11 12 Q 13 14 15 A 16 17 Q 18 19 20 A 21 22 23 24 Q 25	that the bed and bank of this water body follows the green border with included hash areas in the middle as marked on Exhibit 10, is that correct? That is correct. And it's your testimony, if I understand it correctly, that those are approximately the same areas? Yes, if you overlaid if you would overlay those two drawings on top of each other, while there would be some slight irregularities along the boundary, those two areas overlay with each other. Okay. And is it am I understanding your testimony correct, now you're also testifying that the hashed area within Exhibit 10 is wetland? I've always not on this record, but it's always been my position that that green area is wetland. Okay. And is it also your position and expert opinion that that green area also constitutes a stream? It constitutes navigable waters based on the navigable in fact test that we saw, based on Page Hanson's navigation and Mr. Peters' testimony that he had navigated it. But you did not specifically opine during the proceeding during the case in chief of Redland Road
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 81		LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 83
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	<pre>to the green hash line on Exhibit 10, is that correct? Correct. And the red line on Exhibit 16-002 would also be roughly comparable to the bank of the stream that you've identified? That's correct.</pre>	1 2 3 4 5 9 4 5 0 6 7 8 9 A 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 Q 24 25 A	Neighborhood Association that that water body was a stream? Yes, I believe it acts at times of high water as a stream. It acts as a stream or it is a stream? I'm confused because I have a recollection of what your testimony was and I want to clarify what your testimony is today. My testimony today is that area is a navigable wetland. Let me back up. I think it's improper for us to attach these terms. It is a wetland. It is a navigable body of water based on testimony of two previous witnesses who have navigated that area in fact. It was the testimony of Mr. Wood, based on Exhibit 16-002, that there is flow of water from that depressional area to the west to the main wetland area. The contour lines show that there is a gradient from the east to the west and that at times when you have high enough head of water in that area it is going to flow to the west. My opinion is that when you have flowing water that is a definition of a stream. Isn't it a fact of life that water tends to roll downhill or down gradient? Yes.
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 82		LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 84

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 22 1 Q It doesn't take a hydrologist to figure that out, 2 does it? 3 A No. 4 Q Even though you are a very esteemed hydrologist. And 5 I also have some other questions in terms of your 6 determination of the green area as a wetland and you 7 testified that your ecologist concurred in that 8 opinion. So your testimony today is that you	<pre>1 streams. 2 Q Okay. But isn't it true that you haven't provided 3 any indicia of other probative factors in terms of 4 identifying a watercourse other than the navigability 5 in fact test? 6 A And Exhibit 16-002 which is a topographic map showing 7 that there is a gradient 8 Q An elevation change?</pre>
9 disagree with the SEWRPC delineation which is located 10 within DNR Exhibit 200 from Bates Number 95 through I 11 believe it is 141 if I'm hold on. No, it doesn't 12 go that far. Oh, yes it does. 13 MR. GLEISNER: Counsel, can you wait while 14 he finds the exhibit? 15 MS. CORRELL: Uh-huh. I also have a 16 separate copy of it if that's easier. 17 MR. GLEISNER: That might be helpful. 18 A I have it in front of me. 19 Q And so you disagree with Dr. Don Reid? 20 A Yes. 21 Q Who is the chief biologist for SEWRPC, 22 Dr. Lawrence Litener (phonetic), principal biologist, 23 Mr. Christopher Yours (phonetic), biologist, 24 Ms. Jennifer Dietz (phonetic), research analyst, and 25 also the DNR staff, Ms. Joann Cline?	 9 A Yes. 10 Q Okay. Thank you for clarifying my understanding. 11 Where does the stream emanate from? What's the water 12 source? Are there springs present? I didn't hear 13 any testimony regarding any springs. Could you I 14 guess I'll just ask one question at a time. 15 A Okay. 16 Q Where does the stream emanate from? 17 A Depends on the water level. As we've heard testimony 18 by several witnesses already, water flows in and out 19 of that entire complex. 20 Q I don't think that's exactly the question I asked. 21 A Well, I'm trying to get there. 22 Q Okay. 23 A At times you have a large watershed to the west which 24 flows in, fills in this whole depressional area which 25 includes this large lobe which was marked in green on
25 also the DNR staff, Ms. Joann Cline? LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 85	<pre>25 includes this large lobe which was marked in green on LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 87</pre>
1 A Yes. 2 Q And is it also your knowledge that the Army Corps of Engineers has already opined on the delineation dispute between the green hashed area and the yellow line existing on Exhibit 10? 6 A Yes. 7 Q Could you explain how a landscape feature MS. CORRELL: Strike that. 9 Are you opining that this sort of oblong feature is a stream and also at the same time a wetland? 11 A Yes. 12 Q Okay. And that is based largely, if I understand your testimony correctly, on the navigability in fact 15 A Yes. 16 Q test? 17 A No, I believe the navigability in fact test is separate. It doesn't 19 Q Separate from go ahead. 20 A What the definition of the water body is. I navigate in fact, I've navigated, you know, I've complied with well, I won't quote the case law. But you can have a wetland that also will function as a stream during right water level conditions. My point is there is not a distinct line between wetlands and	Exhibit 2-002. As this area fills with water and drains to the west, this area shown on Exhibit 10 also fills with water. As that area drains down, water is going to flow back out so it flows into here and it flows back out of here depending on water levels. We also have heard testimony that when North Lake has high elevations water backs up this channel into this whole complex and also can flood this area. In fact, we've seen photographs where the entire (inaudible) is under water. So where does it emanate? It depends on elevations of North Lake, depends on rainfall on the watershed to the west. Q Can I ask you to turn to Exhibit 215. It's the back of the Page 2. Not every page was marked with a page number unfortunately. A This is a jurisdictional determination form from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Q That's the correct exhibit yeah, and I'm referring to the back of Page 2 O A Okay. Q which is the original document is marked as a 4. MR. GLEISNER: Pardon me, Your Honor, may I go over to Counsel's table because I don't have a complete copy?
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 86	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 88

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 23	
1ALJ BOLDT: Sure.2MS. CORRELL: Oh, that's right. I3apologize. Everyone is at the right page,4right?5QI'll refer you to within the Number 2,6characteristics of wetlands adjacent to non-TNW's7that flow directly or indirectly into TNW's. The8Army Corps did an analysis probably required for9their jurisdictional determination and part of that10analysis in subsection (i) (b), general flow11relationship with non-TNW, there are two factors I12wanted you to acknowledge. Isn't it true that the13general flow relationship is determined as an14intermittent flow as identified by the Army Corps of15Engineers?16MR. GLEISNER: Counsel, brief17clarification? What's TNW?18MS. CORRELL: Traditional navigable waters.19MS. CORRELL: Thank you, Counsel.20Is that the flow that is in bold listed under21(j)(b)?23Q24You're on Page 2?25A26have a 4 on it.25A26have a 4 on it.	Engineers in terms of what this water presence is, is that correct? A Just let me clarify what is water what is Wetland 2? G I can help you with that. On Exhibit 10, Wetland Number 2 is the yellow portion identified by the SEWRPC delineation. A Okay. MS. KAVANAUGH: But just for clarification, I think what they were looking at was that whole green hatched area based on statements from North Lake and assertions MS. CORRELL: I think that's clear. A Could you repeat your question again now that I know the area we're discussing? G Sure. Yep. I'm asking you if your opinion that the presence of water in the general area of the grove of trees is a water body, specifically you've opined it's a stream, is different from the Army Corps of Engineers' opinion here that it constitutes overland sheet flow and that surface water occasionally fills and eventually overflows Wetland 2 and flows overland? A I don't disagree with that. The real question is does it overland flow deep enough to be navigable.
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 89	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 91
<pre>1 at Page 2. 2 Q Right. Yeah, it has a 4 on it. The original 3 document has a 4 on it. 4 A I apologize. I the page number is confusing. 5 Q No, it's confusing. It is confusing. 6 A Okay. 7 Q What I'm referring to 8 A 2(b) 9 Q Yep, so 2(i)(b). 10 A Yep. 11 Q And it identifies in bold the flow 12 A Yes. 13 Q as 14 A Intermittent. 15 Q intermittent flow? 16 A Yes. 17 Q And further down it refers to the surface flow and 16 identifies what that surface flow is. Could you read 17 that for the record the bold language? 20 A Yes. It states, "Overland sheet flow." 21 Q It's overland sheet flow. So it goes on to describe 22 that surface water occasionally fills and eventually 23 overflows Wetland 2 and flows overland into 24 North Lake following heavy precipitation events. So 25 your opinion also differs from the Army Corps of 27 A res. Army Corps of 28 Army Corps of 29 Army Corps of 20 Army Corps of 20 Army Corps of 20 Army Corps of 21 Army Corps of 22 Army Corps of 23 Army Corps of 24 Army Corps of 25 Army Corps of 26 Army Corps of 27 Army Corps of 28 Army Corps of 29 Army Corps of 20 Army Corps of 21 Army Corps of 22 Army Corps of 23 Army Corps of 24 Army Corps of 25 Army Corps of 26 Army Corps of 27 Army Corps of 28 Army Corps of 29 Army Corps of 20 Army Corps of 21 Army Corps of 22 Army Corps of 23 Army Corps of 24 Army Corps of 25 Army Corps of 25 Army Corps of 26 Army Corps of 27 Army Corps of 28 Army Corps of 29 Army Corps of 20 Army Corps of 21 Army Corps of 22 Army Corps of 23 Army Corps Or 24 Army Corps Or 25 Army Corps Or 26 Army Corps Or 27 Army Corps Or 28 Army Corps Or 28 Army Corps Or 29 Army Corps Or 20 Army Corps Or 20 Army Corps Or 20 A</pre>	<pre>1 Q That's not what they 2 A But that's the issue at this hearing. 3 Q provided here. They provided that it was 4 overland flow. 5 A Correct, but they're not looking at conformity with 6 Chapter 30 of the Wisconsin State Statutes, they're 7 looking at conformity to Section 404 of the Clean 8 Water Act. 9 Q That's not what this portion of the jurisdictional 9 determination analyzes, it analyzes characteristics. 1 MR. GLEISNER: Objection, argumentative. 1 MS. CORRELL: How is that argumentative? 1 I'm asking a question. 4 Q When the Army Corps of Engineers identifies what the 5 surface flow is they describe what the water presence 16 is in and around the wetland being identified because 17 they need to make a federal jurisdictional 18 determination with respect to how the waters 19 ALJ BOLDT: Is that your understanding? 20 Let's get to a question. Is that your 21 understanding? Do you agree with Counsel's 22 THE WITNESS: Restate because there was too 33 much too many discussions happening. 44 MR. GALLO: I think Counsel is testifying 45 for the Army Corps of Engineers as to what they 46 Or the Army Corps of Engineers as to what they 47 MR. GALLO: I think Counsel is testifying 48 for the Army Corps of Engineers as to what they 40 Army Corps of Engineers as to what they 41 Army Co</pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 90	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 92

SHEET 24	
1are intending here.2MS. CORRELL: I think the docume3for itself and all I'm asking Dr. O'R4his opinion different than the opinio5recorded here.6MR. HARBECK: And he already tes7consistent and he explained why it's8because they're apples and oranges.9ALJ BOLDT: I don't think he sai10and oranges.11MR. HARBECK: He didn't say that12trying to sum it up in just a five se13a three hour.14ALJ BOLDT: Okay.15Q16Adjacent to Non-Traditional Navigable Wate17Flow Directly or Indirectly into Tradition18Navigable Waters, is that correct?19A11Relationship with Non-Traditional Navigabl12is that correct?13ALT BOLDT: Okay.	eilly is3MR. GLEISNER: We're on the same page now In that's4think, Counsel.5MS. CORRELL: I apologize for that copyingerror.6consistent,7Q8reading of the title of Section 2 on Exhibit 2159which is on the fourth page of the original document,10but is on the back page of the exhibit marked 215,11Page 2, and we will get everyone that needs a copy a12better copy.13MR. GLEISNER: Thanks, Counsel, I14appreciate that.Wetlands15Q15And you just acknowledged that it reads16Characteristics of Wetlands Adjacent to17Non-Traditional Navigable Waters that Flow Directly18or Indirectly into Traditional Navigable Waters?19A19A d subsection (b) specifically deals with General10Flow Relationship with Non-Traditional Navigable20Q21And subsection (b) specifically deals with General22Yaters?23A24Q24Q24Do you understand that statement to mean that the
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac 93	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES WI (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 95
1 MS. KAVANAUGH: He showed you. 2 MR. GLEISNER: No, no, you show 3 I'm not 4 MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. She's loo 5 at let's see (inaudible). 6 MS. CORRELL: I can show you if 7 MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Counse 8 you very much. I'm just not clear wh 9 are. 10 MS. CORRELL: Oh, you're not on 11 page. That would help. I thought we 12 through that. Okay. Wait a minute h 13 of these copies are wrong. 14 MR. GLEISNER: Sorry about this. 15 MS. CORRELL: No, don't apologiz 16 copy is not correct. 17 ALJ BOLDT: Everybody can come u 18 approach Dr. O'Reilly. We've found i 19 MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Judge. 20 ALJ BOLDT: we've got our fi 21 on it. 22 MS. CORRELL: Does his copy cont 23 portions I'm referring to? It seems 24 MR. GLEISNER: If we're allowed 25 approach, Judge, that cures the probl <td><pre>king you want. 1. Thank reviewing? 4 A Yes. 5 Q And they identify again that the flow is intermittent, is that correct? 7 A Correct. 8 Q And in the second sentence of sub (b) under 9 intermittent flow the report indicates, "The presence 10 of a shallow subsurface hydrologic gradient that 11 slopes from Wetland 2 to North Lake", is that 12 correct? 13 A That is correct. 14 Q And further down it identifies the surface flow is 15 overland sheet flow, is that correct? 16 A That is correct. 17 Q And it says the characteristics of that water 18 connection is that the North Lake Management District 19 provided photographs that indicate surface water 10 occasionally fills and eventually overflows Wetland 2 11 and flows overland into North Lake following heavy 12 precipitation events, is that correct? 13 A That is correct, depending on the level of water that 15 has ponded on the site. 16 m for now. 17 Q Is that what is stated in this document? 17 y Is that what is stated in this document? 18 A That is correct, depending on the level of water that 19 A That is correct, depending on the level of water that 10 A That is stated in this document? 11 A That is correct, depending on the level of water that 12 A That is correct, depending on the level of water that 14 A provided photographs that in this document? 15 A That is correct, depending on the level of water that 16 A That is correct, depending on the level of water that 17 A That is correct, depending on the level of water that 18 A ponded on the site. 19 A That is correct of the presence of the the the second of the site. 19 A That is correct of the the second of the site. 20 A A that is stated in this document? 21 A That is correct of the second of the site. 22 A That is correct of the second of the site. 23 A That is correct of the second of the site. 24 A that is stated in this document? 25 A That is correct of the second of the sec</pre></td>	<pre>king you want. 1. Thank reviewing? 4 A Yes. 5 Q And they identify again that the flow is intermittent, is that correct? 7 A Correct. 8 Q And in the second sentence of sub (b) under 9 intermittent flow the report indicates, "The presence 10 of a shallow subsurface hydrologic gradient that 11 slopes from Wetland 2 to North Lake", is that 12 correct? 13 A That is correct. 14 Q And further down it identifies the surface flow is 15 overland sheet flow, is that correct? 16 A That is correct. 17 Q And it says the characteristics of that water 18 connection is that the North Lake Management District 19 provided photographs that indicate surface water 10 occasionally fills and eventually overflows Wetland 2 11 and flows overland into North Lake following heavy 12 precipitation events, is that correct? 13 A That is correct, depending on the level of water that 15 has ponded on the site. 16 m for now. 17 Q Is that what is stated in this document? 17 y Is that what is stated in this document? 18 A That is correct, depending on the level of water that 19 A That is correct, depending on the level of water that 10 A That is stated in this document? 11 A That is correct, depending on the level of water that 12 A That is correct, depending on the level of water that 14 A provided photographs that in this document? 15 A That is correct, depending on the level of water that 16 A That is correct, depending on the level of water that 17 A That is correct, depending on the level of water that 18 A ponded on the site. 19 A That is correct of the presence of the the the second of the site. 19 A That is correct of the the second of the site. 20 A A that is stated in this document? 21 A That is correct of the second of the site. 22 A That is correct of the second of the site. 23 A That is correct of the second of the site. 24 A that is stated in this document? 25 A That is correct of the second of the sec</pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac 94	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES WI (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 96

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 25	
1 A That's what is stated in this document. 2 And is it your understanding that surface water is the same thing as a stream? 4 A Yes, that surface water is the same thing as a stream. My answer is yes. 6 Q Okay. 7 MS. CORRELL: I guess I have no further questions. 8 ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Redirect? Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Meyer? 10 Sorry, Mr. Meyer? 11 CROSS-EXAMINATION 12 BY MR. MEYER: 3 Q I'm just trying to make sure I understand your testimony then, Dr. O'Reilly, and I do not want to put words in your mouth so if I'm misstating 16 something please let me know. Is it your testimony that overland sheet flow, if it is sufficient depth to float a canoe with a person in it, is either a stream or a lake navigable lake or a stream? 20 A Yes. 20 Would that be true if it were MR. MEYER: Strike that. 20 Is that not the situation at times of the year, at least some years 25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hang on a second,	<pre>1 question, is miles from any lake or stream, on an 2 annual basis because of snow melt or rain can float 3 my more than normal size body in a canoe, that would 4 make my backyard a lake or stream under your 5 definition? 6 A It possibly could based on not my definition, but the 7 definitions that's come out of Wisconsin case law. 8 Q At least what you understand that law to be? 9 A Right, my understanding of Wisconsin case law, yes. 10 Q Let me and I'm not going to belabor the point 11 because I understand we've covered this, but let me 12 go to a different point. 13 MR. MEYER: May I approach Exhibit 14 Q Dr. O'Reilly, I'm up looking at Exhibit 15 MR. GLEISNER: 10. 10 Q 10 and if I heard your testimony correct, the 17 green hatched area, and let's take the outer line of 18 that green hatched area and the area generally has 19 been referred to as the grove of trees. You've 10 indicated the green line that circumscribes it is a 11 change of vegetation? 12 A Correct. 13 Q What I didn't hear you say that it's an ordinary high 14 water mark, is that true? 15 A No one asked me a question about ordinary high water</pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 97	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 99
1she's covering the microphone.2MS. CORRELL: Oh, I'm sorry.3MR. MEYER: You could just object, Counsel.4MS. CORRELL: I forgot we were sharing.5Q9Getting back to your immediate testimony that6overland sheet flow if it's of a sufficient depth to7float a canoe with a person in it would be either a8navigable lake or a stream, would that not apply to9Redland Road many years? Doesn't that occur on10Redland Road many years?11A As I stated a month ago in this hearing, I don't12know. I have done no navigability evaluation of13Redland Road.14Q15that in fact there has been a canoe floated over16Redland Road?17MS. CORRELL: No, I think she said could.18MS. CORRELL: No, I think she testified19MS. KAVANAUGH: Page Hanson testified10MS. KAVANAUGH: No, I think she testified11that when the water is high enough12MR. MEYER: Strike the question. I just13want to make sure the record is accurate.14So if my backyard which, for the sake of this	1 mark. 2 So you have not defined that as an ordinary high water mark? 4 A No. 5 Q When you're dealing with navigable waters and the jurisdiction under 30.12 and there's a reference to a body of water needing a bed and bank, does that water to be subject to the jurisdiction, 30.12, also need an ordinary high water mark somewhere on that bank? 10 A There is likely there is an ordinary high water mark. I have not determined exactly where it is. 12 Q So you're not testifying there's an ordinary high water mark? 14 A No, I'm I will state there is an ordinary high water mark, but I have not drawn it on a map or delineated it in the field. 17 Q So there is no defined, for purposes of this proceeding, ordinary high water mark defined for the area known as the grove of trees? 20 A Correct. 21 MR. MEYER: No further questions. 22 ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Now redirect? 23 MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor, despite the lengthy cross I have a blessedly short one question.
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 98	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 100

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 2	26	
1 2 BY M 3 Q All 4 to a	REDIRECT EXAMINATION R. GLEISNER: of the opinions that you've given today, are they reasonable degree of professional and scientific ainty? MR. MEYER: Objection, and if there are scientific components I would agree that it's an appropriate question, but I believe there's been some legal statements testified to which I would strongly disagree that this witness has can testify to as an expert witness. MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor, let it be understood that my question only relates to scientific issues. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. With that, go ahead and answer it.	1the only one we've referenced of the subparts is2108B, but we'll receive 108A, B, C and D.3MS. CORRELL: And just make sure when you4do that, that there's two 108's. So it's a5little6ALJ BOLDT: Correct.7MS. CORRELL: I think it's the first one.8MS. KAVANAUGH: When we get the transcript9could we get a list of everything that's10been the exhibit list too just to make sure11we're covered because I'm not sure12everything13ALJ BOLDT: Well, we can do it before we're14done. We'll tell you what's15MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. That would be really16helpful.17ALJ BOLDT: I'm receiving all the 108's.18MR. GALLO: It's 108 and, you're right, A,19B, C and D.20ALJ BOLDT: Correct.21MR. GALLO: Yeah.22MR. GALLO: Yeah.23housekeeping I'm going to very briefly state,24I've asked Tim a couple of times if we can get25color copies of the exhibits and I don't expect
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 101	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 103
$ \begin{array}{c} 1\\ 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ 25\\ \end{array} $	<pre>MR. GALLO: Your Honor, I need to move some exhibits. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Yes, we do have a few outstanding exhibits. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You don't have to wait for me. MR. GALLO: Okay. Exhibit 106 and 107. Are there any others that have not been admitted? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Those are the only two you used. ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, 105 was previously received and then 106 and 107 are received. And then just so it's clear, with this Exhibit 108 there's all these different subparts. Does anybody object to any of those subparts? MR. GLEISNER: What exhibit, Your Honor. ALJ BOLDT: 108. We've been talking a lot about 108B and the second B of 108. MS. CORRELL: Yeah, public comments to an EA. Yeah, no, we have no objection. I haven't looked through all of them, but I'm sure we have no objection. MR. GLEISNER: No objection, Your Honor. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. We'll receive I think</pre>	1that to be answered now, but at some point we're2going to have to resolve how we're going to get3our hands on the ones that were annotated.4UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We don't have5equipment for that.6ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, sure, I mean we can7certainly as an officer of the court we trust8you all to take them out and copy them if copies9are made for everyone.10MR. GLEISNER: That would be very11satisfactory. In fact, Counsel and I have12talked about13ALJ BOLDT: Well, you can all go together.14MR. GLEISNER: Exactly what I15MS. CORRELL: Yeah, we actually have16discussed this. I think it only takes two17attorneys to do that, but I could be wrong. It18might take a few.19MR. HARBECK: I don't know if there's a20light bulb involved in that too, then forget it.21MS. KAVANAUGH: First you have to argue22about whether it's a light bulb.23ALJ BOLDT: All right. Let's go off the24record.25(Recess taken)
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 102	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 104

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

	SHEET 27		
1 2	ALJ BOLDT: On the record. Okay. We're just probably five or ten minutes later than we		Transportation or other municipalities in a similar capacity. I've also done work with the Division of
3	said we were going to be and we're going to	3 5	State Facilities for parking lots adjacent to
4	convene. Mr. Meyer is not present, but we won't		existing facilities, bike trails and ski trails so
5	get into the substance until he does arrive.		some bike and pedestrian facilities as well.
6	Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole	6 Q A	And I think I forgot to clarify, are you a
7	truth and nothing but the truth, so help you		professional engineer?
8	God?		Yes, I'm a registered professional engineer.
9	MR. FARRENKOPF: I do.		And how long have you been
10 11	MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor, we have an objection before we get started.		In the State of Wisconsin.
12	ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Go ahead.	-	Oh, excuse me. And how long have you been practicing?
13	MR. GLEISNER: We do not object to the	-	As a professional engineer?
14	resume, we stipulate to the resume. That can be		Uh-huh.
15	admitted. We just want to reassert our	15 Ã 1	I've been practicing 20 years.
16	objection that we didn't know this witness was		You already stated that you're employed by Kapur and
17	going to testify today and that we didn't have a		Associates?
18	chance to depose him and that's just for the		Correct.
19 20	record, Your Honor.		What's your current position with Kapur and Associates?
20 21	ALJ BOLDT: Sure. Okay. Yeah, and I think what may have been confusing was that the word		Associates: I am a project manager in the we call it the
22	rebuttal was used. I think really the technical		Transportation Department of Kapur and Associates.
23	term is responsive testimony so I was		And I think you alluded to this, but what sector are
24	anticipating that the witness would be called	24 n	most of your clients from?
25	and the ruling yesterday stands so go ahead,	25 A Y	Yeah, the majority of my clients are, you know,
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES		LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES
	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI		(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI
	105		107
1	Counsel.		public agencies, the Wisconsin Department of
2	DIRECT EXAMINATION	2 1	Transportation, Division of State Facilities, also do
	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL:	2 1 3 V	
2 3	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Q Could you state your name and work address for the record?	2 1 3 v 4 a 5 Q V	Transportation, Division of State Facilities, also do work for counties and municipalities as well in the area of civil engineering. With respect to your State projects, could you
2 3 4 5 6	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Q Could you state your name and work address for the record? A My name is Kurt Farrenkopf and my work address is	2 1 3 v 4 a 5 Q v	Transportation, Division of State Facilities, also do work for counties and municipalities as well in the area of civil engineering. With respect to your State projects, could you explain the public bidding process for the record?
2 3 4 5 6 7	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Q Could you state your name and work address for the record? A My name is Kurt Farrenkopf and my work address is 7711 North Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin	2 7 3 v 4 a 5 Q V 6 e 7 A 1	Transportation, Division of State Facilities, also do work for counties and municipalities as well in the area of civil engineering. With respect to your State projects, could you explain the public bidding process for the record? I guess could you clarify? The bidding on how Kapur
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Q Could you state your name and work address for the record? A My name is Kurt Farrenkopf and my work address is 7711 North Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin and Kapur and Associates is the company.	2 7 3 v 4 a 5 Q V 6 e 7 A 7 8 k	Transportation, Division of State Facilities, also do work for counties and municipalities as well in the area of civil engineering. With respect to your State projects, could you explain the public bidding process for the record? I guess could you clarify? The bidding on how Kapur bids for the project or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Q Could you state your name and work address for the record? A My name is Kurt Farrenkopf and my work address is 7711 North Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin and Kapur and Associates is the company. Q What's your educational background?	2 7 3 w 4 a 5 Q w 6 e 7 A 1 8 k 9 Q F	Transportation, Division of State Facilities, also do work for counties and municipalities as well in the area of civil engineering. With respect to your State projects, could you explain the public bidding process for the record? I guess could you clarify? The bidding on how Kapur bids for the project or How Kapur would respond to a request for a proposal.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Q Could you state your name and work address for the record? A My name is Kurt Farrenkopf and my work address is 7711 North Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin and Kapur and Associates is the company. Q What's your educational background? A I have a BS degree in civil engineering from the	2 7 3 w 4 a 5 Q w 6 a 7 A 1 8 k 9 Q H 10 A 0	Transportation, Division of State Facilities, also do work for counties and municipalities as well in the area of civil engineering. With respect to your State projects, could you explain the public bidding process for the record? I guess could you clarify? The bidding on how Kapur bids for the project or How Kapur would respond to a request for a proposal. Okay. In the case of, say, Department of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Q Could you state your name and work address for the record? A My name is Kurt Farrenkopf and my work address is 7711 North Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin and Kapur and Associates is the company. Q What's your educational background? A I have a BS degree in civil engineering from the University of Wisconsin-Platteville. Q And have you received any training or education	2 7 3 w 4 a 5 Q w 6 a 7 A 1 8 k 9 Q H 10 A 0 11 7 12 f	Transportation, Division of State Facilities, also do work for counties and municipalities as well in the area of civil engineering. With respect to your State projects, could you explain the public bidding process for the record? I guess could you clarify? The bidding on how Kapur bids for the project or How Kapur would respond to a request for a proposal. Okay. In the case of, say, Department of Transportation or Division of Facilities Development or State Facilities, I'm sorry, they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Q Could you state your name and work address for the record? A My name is Kurt Farrenkopf and my work address is 7711 North Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin and Kapur and Associates is the company. Q What's your educational background? A I have a BS degree in civil engineering from the University of Wisconsin-Platteville. Q And have you received any training or education during your practice as an engineer?	2 7 3 w 4 a 5 Q w 6 e 7 A 1 8 k 9 Q H 10 A 0 11 7 12 1 13 s	Transportation, Division of State Facilities, also do work for counties and municipalities as well in the area of civil engineering. With respect to your State projects, could you explain the public bidding process for the record? I guess could you clarify? The bidding on how Kapur bids for the project or How Kapur would respond to a request for a proposal. Okay. In the case of, say, Department of Transportation or Division of Facilities Development or State Facilities, I'm sorry, they send out a request for a proposal. It's a no cost
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Q Could you state your name and work address for the record? A My name is Kurt Farrenkopf and my work address is 7711 North Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin and Kapur and Associates is the company. Q What's your educational background? A I have a BS degree in civil engineering from the University of Wisconsin-Platteville. Q And have you received any training or education during your practice as an engineer? A Yeah, I've been practicing as an engineer for 24	2 7 3 w 4 a 5 Q w 6 e 7 A 5 8 k 9 Q H 10 A 6 11 7 12 1 13 s 14 m	Transportation, Division of State Facilities, also do work for counties and municipalities as well in the area of civil engineering. With respect to your State projects, could you explain the public bidding process for the record? I guess could you clarify? The bidding on how Kapur bids for the project or How Kapur would respond to a request for a proposal. Okay. In the case of, say, Department of Transportation or Division of Facilities Development or State Facilities, I'm sorry, they send out a request for a proposal. It's a no cost request. It's called a quality base selection
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Q Could you state your name and work address for the record? A My name is Kurt Farrenkopf and my work address is 7711 North Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin and Kapur and Associates is the company. Q What's your educational background? A I have a BS degree in civil engineering from the University of Wisconsin-Platteville. Q And have you received any training or education during your practice as an engineer? A Yeah, I've been practicing as an engineer for 24 years and during that time I've taken numerous	2 7 3 w 4 a 5 Q w 6 e 7 A 1 8 k 9 Q H 10 A 0 11 7 12 1 13 s 14 m 15 k	Transportation, Division of State Facilities, also do work for counties and municipalities as well in the area of civil engineering. With respect to your State projects, could you explain the public bidding process for the record? I guess could you clarify? The bidding on how Kapur bids for the project or How Kapur would respond to a request for a proposal. Okay. In the case of, say, Department of Transportation or Division of Facilities Development or State Facilities, I'm sorry, they send out a request for a proposal. It's a no cost request. It's called a quality base selection basically. We submit our project team and our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Q Could you state your name and work address for the record? A My name is Kurt Farrenkopf and my work address is 7711 North Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin and Kapur and Associates is the company. Q What's your educational background? A I have a BS degree in civil engineering from the University of Wisconsin-Platteville. Q And have you received any training or education during your practice as an engineer? A Yeah, I've been practicing as an engineer for 24 years and during that time I've taken numerous continuing education credit courses in various areas	2 7 3 w 4 a 5 Q w 6 e 7 A 5 8 k 9 Q H 10 A 6 11 7 12 1 13 s 14 m 15 k 16 m	Transportation, Division of State Facilities, also do work for counties and municipalities as well in the area of civil engineering. With respect to your State projects, could you explain the public bidding process for the record? I guess could you clarify? The bidding on how Kapur bids for the project or How Kapur would respond to a request for a proposal. Okay. In the case of, say, Department of Transportation or Division of Facilities Development or State Facilities, I'm sorry, they send out a request for a proposal. It's a no cost request. It's called a quality base selection basically. We submit our project team and our resumes and project experience and, you know,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Q Could you state your name and work address for the record? A My name is Kurt Farrenkopf and my work address is 7711 North Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin and Kapur and Associates is the company. Q What's your educational background? A I have a BS degree in civil engineering from the University of Wisconsin-Platteville. Q And have you received any training or education during your practice as an engineer? A Yeah, I've been practicing as an engineer for 24 years and during that time I've taken numerous	2 7 3 w 4 a 5 Q w 6 e 7 A 5 8 k 9 Q H 10 A 6 11 7 12 1 13 s 14 m 15 k 16 m 17 c	Transportation, Division of State Facilities, also do work for counties and municipalities as well in the area of civil engineering. With respect to your State projects, could you explain the public bidding process for the record? I guess could you clarify? The bidding on how Kapur bids for the project or How Kapur would respond to a request for a proposal. Okay. In the case of, say, Department of Transportation or Division of Facilities Development or State Facilities, I'm sorry, they send out a request for a proposal. It's a no cost request. It's called a quality base selection basically. We submit our project team and our resumes and project experience and, you know, different details of our knowledge of the project,
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Q Could you state your name and work address for the record? A My name is Kurt Farrenkopf and my work address is 7711 North Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin and Kapur and Associates is the company. Q What's your educational background? A I have a BS degree in civil engineering from the University of Wisconsin-Platteville. Q And have you received any training or education during your practice as an engineer? A Yeah, I've been practicing as an engineer for 24 years and during that time I've taken numerous continuing education credit courses in various areas of engineering, areas of project management and project development, you know, attended numerous conferences and seminars in my area of professional	2 7 3 w 4 a 5 Q W 6 e 7 A D 8 k 9 Q H 10 A C 11 D 12 I 13 s 14 H 15 k 16 n 17 c 18 c 19 c	Transportation, Division of State Facilities, also do work for counties and municipalities as well in the area of civil engineering. With respect to your State projects, could you explain the public bidding process for the record? I guess could you clarify? The bidding on how Kapur bids for the project or How Kapur would respond to a request for a proposal. Okay. In the case of, say, Department of Transportation or Division of Facilities Development or State Facilities, I'm sorry, they send out a request for a proposal. It's a no cost request. It's called a quality base selection basically. We submit our project team and our resumes and project experience and, you know, different details of our knowledge of the project, depending on the type of project, and typically, depending on usually what the estimated construction
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Q Could you state your name and work address for the record? A My name is Kurt Farrenkopf and my work address is 7711 North Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin and Kapur and Associates is the company. Q What's your educational background? A I have a BS degree in civil engineering from the University of Wisconsin-Platteville. Q And have you received any training or education during your practice as an engineer? A Yeah, I've been practicing as an engineer for 24 years and during that time I've taken numerous continuing education credit courses in various areas of engineering, areas of project management and project development, you know, attended numerous conferences and seminars in my area of professional practice.	2 7 3 7 4 8 5 0 7 6 6 7 A 7 8 8 9 0 F 10 A 6 11 7 12 11 13 5 14 11 15 18 16 17 18 6 19 6 20 6	Transportation, Division of State Facilities, also do work for counties and municipalities as well in the area of civil engineering. With respect to your State projects, could you explain the public bidding process for the record? I guess could you clarify? The bidding on how Kapur bids for the project or How Kapur would respond to a request for a proposal. Okay. In the case of, say, Department of Transportation or Division of Facilities Development or State Facilities, I'm sorry, they send out a request for a proposal. It's a no cost request. It's called a quality base selection basically. We submit our project team and our resumes and project experience and, you know, different details of our knowledge of the project, depending on the type of project, and typically, depending on usually what the estimated construction cost of that project is, they either make a direct
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Q Could you state your name and work address for the record? A My name is Kurt Farrenkopf and my work address is 7711 North Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin and Kapur and Associates is the company. Q What's your educational background? A I have a BS degree in civil engineering from the University of Wisconsin-Platteville. Q And have you received any training or education during your practice as an engineer? A Yeah, I've been practicing as an engineer for 24 years and during that time I've taken numerous continuing education credit courses in various areas of engineering, areas of project management and project development, you know, attended numerous conferences and seminars in my area of professional practice. Q And what's the focus of your professional engineering	2 7 3 w 4 a 5 Q 6 a 7 A 9 Q 10 A 11 T 12 T 13 s 14 T 15 K 16 T 17 c 18 c 19 c 20 c 21 s	Transportation, Division of State Facilities, also do work for counties and municipalities as well in the area of civil engineering. With respect to your State projects, could you explain the public bidding process for the record? I guess could you clarify? The bidding on how Kapur bids for the project or How Kapur would respond to a request for a proposal. Okay. In the case of, say, Department of Transportation or Division of Facilities Development or State Facilities, I'm sorry, they send out a request for a proposal. It's a no cost request. It's called a quality base selection basically. We submit our project team and our resumes and project experience and, you know, different details of our knowledge of the project, depending on the type of project, and typically, depending on usually what the estimated construction cost of that project is, they either make a direct selection of a consulting firm or if the project
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Q Could you state your name and work address for the record? A My name is Kurt Farrenkopf and my work address is 7711 North Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin and Kapur and Associates is the company. Q What's your educational background? A I have a BS degree in civil engineering from the University of Wisconsin-Platteville. Q And have you received any training or education during your practice as an engineer? A Yeah, I've been practicing as an engineer for 24 years and during that time I've taken numerous continuing education credit courses in various areas of engineering, areas of project management and project development, you know, attended numerous conferences and seminars in my area of professional practice. Q And what's the focus of your professional engineering work?	2 7 3 w 4 3 5 Q 6 e 7 A 9 Q 10 A 12 T 13 s 14 T 15 k 16 T 17 c 18 c 20 c 21 c 22 c	Transportation, Division of State Facilities, also do work for counties and municipalities as well in the area of civil engineering. With respect to your State projects, could you explain the public bidding process for the record? I guess could you clarify? The bidding on how Kapur bids for the project or How Kapur would respond to a request for a proposal. Okay. In the case of, say, Department of Transportation or Division of Facilities Development or State Facilities, I'm sorry, they send out a request for a proposal. It's a no cost request. It's called a quality base selection basically. We submit our project team and our resumes and project experience and, you know, different details of our knowledge of the project, depending on the type of project, and typically, depending on usually what the estimated construction cost of that project is, they either make a direct selection of a consulting firm or if the project construction dollar amount is over a certain amount
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Q Could you state your name and work address for the record? A My name is Kurt Farrenkopf and my work address is 7711 North Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin and Kapur and Associates is the company. Q What's your educational background? A I have a BS degree in civil engineering from the University of Wisconsin-Platteville. Q And have you received any training or education during your practice as an engineer? A Yeah, I've been practicing as an engineer for 24 years and during that time I've taken numerous continuing education credit courses in various areas of engineering, areas of project management and project development, you know, attended numerous conferences and seminars in my area of professional practice. Q And what's the focus of your professional engineering work? A Probably 75 percent of my experience is in	2 7 3 w 4 3 5 Q 6 e 7 A 9 Q 10 A 12 I 13 s 14 I 15 k 16 I 17 c 20 c 21 c 22 c 23 t	Transportation, Division of State Facilities, also do work for counties and municipalities as well in the area of civil engineering. With respect to your State projects, could you explain the public bidding process for the record? I guess could you clarify? The bidding on how Kapur bids for the project or How Kapur would respond to a request for a proposal. Okay. In the case of, say, Department of Transportation or Division of Facilities Development or State Facilities, I'm sorry, they send out a request for a proposal. It's a no cost request. It's called a quality base selection basically. We submit our project team and our resumes and project experience and, you know, different details of our knowledge of the project, depending on the type of project, and typically, depending on usually what the estimated construction cost of that project is, they either make a direct selection of a consulting firm or if the project construction dollar amount is over a certain amount they may go to what's called what they call a
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Q Could you state your name and work address for the record? A My name is Kurt Farrenkopf and my work address is 7711 North Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin and Kapur and Associates is the company. Q What's your educational background? A I have a BS degree in civil engineering from the University of Wisconsin-Platteville. Q And have you received any training or education during your practice as an engineer? A Yeah, I've been practicing as an engineer for 24 years and during that time I've taken numerous continuing education credit courses in various areas of engineering, areas of project management and project development, you know, attended numerous conferences and seminars in my area of professional practice. Q And what's the focus of your professional engineering work?	2 7 3 w 4 3 5 Q 6 e 7 A 9 Q 10 A 12 I 13 s 14 I 15 k 16 I 17 c 20 c 21 c 22 c 23 ct 24 c	Transportation, Division of State Facilities, also do work for counties and municipalities as well in the area of civil engineering. With respect to your State projects, could you explain the public bidding process for the record? I guess could you clarify? The bidding on how Kapur bids for the project or How Kapur would respond to a request for a proposal. Okay. In the case of, say, Department of Transportation or Division of Facilities Development or State Facilities, I'm sorry, they send out a request for a proposal. It's a no cost request. It's called a quality base selection basically. We submit our project team and our resumes and project experience and, you know, different details of our knowledge of the project, depending on the type of project, and typically, depending on usually what the estimated construction cost of that project is, they either make a direct selection of a consulting firm or if the project construction dollar amount is over a certain amount
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Q Could you state your name and work address for the record? A My name is Kurt Farrenkopf and my work address is 7711 North Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin and Kapur and Associates is the company. Q What's your educational background? A I have a BS degree in civil engineering from the University of Wisconsin-Platteville. Q And have you received any training or education during your practice as an engineer? A Yeah, I've been practicing as an engineer for 24 years and during that time I've taken numerous continuing education credit courses in various areas of engineering, areas of project management and project development, you know, attended numerous conferences and seminars in my area of professional practice. Q And what's the focus of your professional engineering work? A Probably 75 percent of my experience is in transportation engineering, highway design, road	2 7 3 w 4 3 5 Q 6 e 7 A 9 Q 10 A 12 I 13 s 14 I 15 k 16 I 17 c 20 c 21 c 22 c 23 ct 24 c	Transportation, Division of State Facilities, also do work for counties and municipalities as well in the area of civil engineering. With respect to your State projects, could you explain the public bidding process for the record? I guess could you clarify? The bidding on how Kapur bids for the project or How Kapur would respond to a request for a proposal. Okay. In the case of, say, Department of Transportation or Division of Facilities Development or State Facilities, I'm sorry, they send out a request for a proposal. It's a no cost request. It's called a quality base selection basically. We submit our project team and our resumes and project experience and, you know, different details of our knowledge of the project, depending on the type of project, and typically, depending on usually what the estimated construction cost of that project is, they either make a direct selection of a consulting firm or if the project construction dollar amount is over a certain amount they may go to what's called what they call a short list of four or five individual consulting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Q Could you state your name and work address for the record? A My name is Kurt Farrenkopf and my work address is 7711 North Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin and Kapur and Associates is the company. Q What's your educational background? A I have a BS degree in civil engineering from the University of Wisconsin-Platteville. Q And have you received any training or education during your practice as an engineer? A Yeah, I've been practicing as an engineer for 24 years and during that time I've taken numerous continuing education credit courses in various areas of engineering, areas of project management and project development, you know, attended numerous conferences and seminars in my area of professional practice. Q And what's the focus of your professional engineering work? A Probably 75 percent of my experience is in transportation engineering, highway design, road	2 7 3 w 4 3 5 Q 6 e 7 A 9 Q 10 A 12 I 13 s 14 I 15 k 16 I 17 c 20 c 21 c 22 c 23 ct 24 c	Transportation, Division of State Facilities, also do work for counties and municipalities as well in the area of civil engineering. With respect to your State projects, could you explain the public bidding process for the record? I guess could you clarify? The bidding on how Kapur bids for the project or How Kapur would respond to a request for a proposal. Okay. In the case of, say, Department of Transportation or Division of Facilities Development or State Facilities, I'm sorry, they send out a request for a proposal. It's a no cost request. It's called a quality base selection basically. We submit our project team and our resumes and project experience and, you know, different details of our knowledge of the project, depending on the type of project, and typically, depending on usually what the estimated construction cost of that project is, they either make a direct selection of a consulting firm or if the project construction dollar amount is over a certain amount they may go to what's called what they call a short list of four or five individual consulting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Q Could you state your name and work address for the record? A My name is Kurt Farrenkopf and my work address is 7711 North Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin and Kapur and Associates is the company. Q What's your educational background? A I have a BS degree in civil engineering from the University of Wisconsin-Platteville. Q And have you received any training or education during your practice as an engineer? A Yeah, I've been practicing as an engineer for 24 years and during that time I've taken numerous continuing education credit courses in various areas of engineering, areas of project management and project development, you know, attended numerous conferences and seminars in my area of professional practice. Q And what's the focus of your professional engineering work? A Probably 75 percent of my experience is in transportation engineering, highway design, road	2 7 3 w 4 3 5 Q 6 e 7 A 9 Q 10 A 12 I 13 s 14 I 15 k 16 I 17 c 20 c 21 c 22 c 23 ct 24 c	Transportation, Division of State Facilities, also do work for counties and municipalities as well in the area of civil engineering. With respect to your State projects, could you explain the public bidding process for the record? I guess could you clarify? The bidding on how Kapur bids for the project or How Kapur would respond to a request for a proposal. Okay. In the case of, say, Department of Transportation or Division of Facilities Development or State Facilities, I'm sorry, they send out a request for a proposal. It's a no cost request. It's called a quality base selection basically. We submit our project team and our resumes and project experience and, you know, different details of our knowledge of the project, depending on the type of project, and typically, depending on usually what the estimated construction cost of that project is, they either make a direct selection of a consulting firm or if the project construction dollar amount is over a certain amount they may go to what's called what they call a short list of four or five individual consulting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Q Could you state your name and work address for the record? A My name is Kurt Farrenkopf and my work address is 7711 North Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin and Kapur and Associates is the company. Q What's your educational background? A I have a BS degree in civil engineering from the University of Wisconsin-Platteville. Q And have you received any training or education during your practice as an engineer? A Yeah, I've been practicing as an engineer for 24 years and during that time I've taken numerous continuing education credit courses in various areas of engineering, areas of project management and project development, you know, attended numerous conferences and seminars in my area of professional practice. Q And what's the focus of your professional engineering work? A Probably 75 percent of my experience is in transportation engineering, highway design, road design, working for the Wisconsin Department of 	2 7 3 w 4 3 5 Q 6 e 7 A 9 Q 10 A 12 I 13 s 14 I 15 k 16 I 17 c 20 c 21 c 22 c 23 ct 24 c	Transportation, Division of State Facilities, also do work for counties and municipalities as well in the area of civil engineering. With respect to your State projects, could you explain the public bidding process for the record? I guess could you clarify? The bidding on how Kapur bids for the project or How Kapur would respond to a request for a proposal. Okay. In the case of, say, Department of Transportation or Division of Facilities Development or State Facilities, I'm sorry, they send out a request for a proposal. It's a no cost request. It's called a quality base selection basically. We submit our project team and our resumes and project experience and, you know, different details of our knowledge of the project, depending on the type of project, and typically, depending on usually what the estimated construction cost of that project is, they either make a direct selection of a consulting firm or if the project construction dollar amount is over a certain amount they may go to what's called what they call a short list of four or five individual consulting firms or teams and then go through an interview LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Could you state your name and work address for the record? My name is Kurt Farrenkopf and my work address is 7711 North Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin and Kapur and Associates is the company. What's your educational background? I have a BS degree in civil engineering from the University of Wisconsin-Platteville. And have you received any training or education during your practice as an engineer? Yeah, I've been practicing as an engineer for 24 years and during that time I've taken numerous continuing education credit courses in various areas of engineering, areas of project management and project development, you know, attended numerous conferences and seminars in my area of professional practice. And what's the focus of your professional engineering work? Probably 75 percent of my experience is in transportation engineering, highway design, road design, working for the Wisconsin Department of 	2 7 3 w 4 3 5 Q 6 e 7 A 9 Q 10 A 12 I 13 s 14 I 15 k 16 I 17 c 20 c 21 c 22 c 23 ct 24 c	Transportation, Division of State Facilities, also do work for counties and municipalities as well in the area of civil engineering. With respect to your State projects, could you explain the public bidding process for the record? I guess could you clarify? The bidding on how Kapur bids for the project or How Kapur would respond to a request for a proposal. Okay. In the case of, say, Department of Transportation or Division of Facilities Development or State Facilities, I'm sorry, they send out a request for a proposal. It's a no cost request. It's called a quality base selection basically. We submit our project team and our resumes and project experience and, you know, different details of our knowledge of the project, depending on the type of project, and typically, depending on usually what the estimated construction cost of that project is, they either make a direct selection of a consulting firm or if the project construction dollar amount is over a certain amount they may go to what's called what they call a short list of four or five individual consulting firms or teams and then go through an interview LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Q Could you state your name and work address for the record? A My name is Kurt Farrenkopf and my work address is 7711 North Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin and Kapur and Associates is the company. Q What's your educational background? A I have a BS degree in civil engineering from the University of Wisconsin-Platteville. Q And have you received any training or education during your practice as an engineer? A Yeah, I've been practicing as an engineer for 24 years and during that time I've taken numerous continuing education credit courses in various areas of engineering, areas of project management and project development, you know, attended numerous conferences and seminars in my area of professional practice. Q And what's the focus of your professional engineering work? A Probably 75 percent of my experience is in transportation engineering, highway design, road design, working for the Wisconsin Department of 	2 7 3 w 4 3 5 Q 6 e 7 A 9 Q 10 A 12 I 13 s 14 I 15 k 16 I 17 c 20 c 21 c 22 c 23 ct 24 c	Transportation, Division of State Facilities, also do work for counties and municipalities as well in the area of civil engineering. With respect to your State projects, could you explain the public bidding process for the record? I guess could you clarify? The bidding on how Kapur bids for the project or How Kapur would respond to a request for a proposal. Okay. In the case of, say, Department of Transportation or Division of Facilities Development or State Facilities, I'm sorry, they send out a request for a proposal. It's a no cost request. It's called a quality base selection basically. We submit our project team and our resumes and project experience and, you know, different details of our knowledge of the project, depending on the type of project, and typically, depending on usually what the estimated construction cost of that project is, they either make a direct selection of a consulting firm or if the project construction dollar amount is over a certain amount they may go to what's called what they call a short list of four or five individual consulting firms or teams and then go through an interview LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 28 Process and select a firm based on after that interview process is completed. And then I guess to carry forward, once a firm if our firm is selected for a project we then sit down with the client and begin discussing the scope of the project. If it hasn't already been clearly identified, we clearly lay out what the scope is going to be for the for our project team, as well as what the owner will be doing as part of the project. And then after that scope is clarified we go we put together a contract in hours and dollars and negotiate the final contract amount for each project that we're awarded. Q Okay. So after you do that type of refinement of the initial bid for a particular project, is that sort of the final bid that governs the project going forward? A Well, usually the scope of the contract is pretty clear but, you know, many times during the design process of a project or the design development process of a different alignment alternative or a different width of the road called a typical section of the roadway, things like that. If they're not, you know, spelled out in the original contract then we discuss about possible scope changes and	project manager from the owner's side and, you know, come to them and say we think we're going to require or we need extra reimbursement here, we think this is above and beyond the scope, the original scope, of the project and, you know, most times we're pretty good at identifying that kind of thing early on and it's not an issue, but sometimes you know, sometimes there's a problem where they think, and rightfully so, that no, we think that's part of the alternative analysis as part of the original contract so 2 Q So there's a dialogue then 3 A Yeah. Q if I'm understanding you correctly in terms of whether or not the increased costs would be born by, for example, like DOT in a DOT project or born by Kapur and Associates? A Right. Q Okay. So what does that mean in terms of Kapur in submitting its bid? How important is it to accurately foresee any work that might need to be done in terms of Kapur's profitability on a project? A Well, I guess from the Kapur standpoint obviously, you know, we're not a non-profit organization so it's important for us to scope the project and coordinate
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES
(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI
109	111
amendments to that contract. There's a reasonable amount of alternative analysis that is done though that is considered, you know, common practice as part of the original contract, but there are oftentimes scope changes. So I guess I'm familiar with the term sometimes in construction change order, but you're saying Yeah, I'm saying You're saying that the term would typically be a scope change in terms of Yeah, as far as the I guess I'm speaking through the design and the things, not the construction end, but as far as a design contract goes there can be scope changes as well during the design development process. And what if the scope of the project was defined somewhat narrowly and at a later point there was need to amend that scope. What how does that process work? A Yeah, sometimes there's obviously gray areas as far as what's part of the original scope and what we would consider extra work, I guess, above and beyond what the contract spells out. So you try to identify that as early as possible during the design process. And if, you know, you come to an agreement with the	with the client as far as what the scope of the project is going to be and make sure that if there is extra services and extra work on our part required that wasn't part of the original contract, we would you know, it behooves us to be compensated for that type of extra work. But, on the other hand, we want to make sure going into the original negotiation, we don't want to you know, we're not trying to purposefully miss you know, we're not something out and come back later because if in the client's eyes we're a consulting firm that continually comes back and asks for amendments and, you know, (inaudible) catch on to something like that fairly quickly. So, you know, it's in the best interest of us to be open and honest up front in the original design contract so we try to minimize what we call amendments to our contract as much as possible. So you sort of alluded to the question I had about you said it would be in your in Kapur's best interest to anticipate those issues. What are the implications of, you know, inaccurately bidding low and then seeking additional compensation later? A Well, bidding low, you know, obviously you don't want to lose money on the project. We need to make profit
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES
(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI
110	112

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 29	
 as a company to continue growing and continuing our work, but if we're low bidder all the time and we come back and we're continually asking for extras and amendments, you know, the clients obviously know that. They remember that and that's not something you want to have you know, a label put on you as. Q basically as a repeat customer you don't want DOT to A Right. Q draw that type of conclusion, is that a correct understanding? A Yeah. Well, I think, like I said, you know, we've been doing this for a number of years and the people at the DOT that we work with have been doing this a number of years so I think we're pretty good working together and putting a pretty good scope together upfront. Sometimes things happen, but we try to avoid that. Q What are your job responsibilities as a project manager in the municipal design department and I think you said in particular in terms of transportation projects? A I guess my responsibility as a project manager on any individual project is first of all I'm the contact person. I would be the first person of contact 	A At this point in my career I'm primarily in what's called the southeast and northeast regions. The northeast region is kind of the Green Bay area. The southeast region is out of the Waukesha office. So I've got some projects in the northeast region as well as projects in the southeast region, but the bulk of it right now is in the southeast region. Over my career, earlier in my career, I was doing projects all around the State, in the La Crosse area, up near Hayward and Superior, up in those areas too. So based on your experience in the southeastern portion of the State, how would you say generally the soils are in this area of the State? Well, in general as far as you know, they're mainly clay, silty clay, soils. I mean as we've heard earlier, there's a lot of poor soils in this part of the State. I've also worked on numerous projects I've actually had where we've had some good gravelly-type silty gravel soils in like the Kettle Moraine areas, southern and northern units of the Kettle Moraine. But I've done a lot of projects where we've had poor soils, clays soils, where we've had to do taking extra measures other than your normal roadway, pavement core, to build a proper
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 113	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 115
 between myself and the client. And then it's my job to make sure that I have the staff and resources available to meet the requirements of what the project entails as well as to make sure I can meet the schedule of the project. I'm also as project manager I do the majority of the coordination with the agency coordination, the utility coordination, public involvement with the owner. We spearhead the public involvement process, you know, depending on what that scope might be on any particular roadway project. We put together the final plans and estimates and I would do the specifications typically to go along with the plans. I would also be responsible for any reports that are required and, again, I've being doing a lot of DOT work so I'm talking about DOT projects. There's typically an environmental document, a design study report which talks about the geometric features and the safety and accident history of the project, pavement type selection reports. I would be basically spearheading that with help, you know, from others within staff or with the sub-consultants on our team. Q What areas of the State do you primarily work in? 	<pre>1 roadway to handle the loading. 2 Q Are you familiar with the site that's the subject of 3 this appeal? 4 A Yes, I am. 5 Q And have you attended the majority of the proceedings 6 in this matter? 7 A I missed yesterday and I think most of the first day, 8 but I think the majority of it otherwise. 9 Q Were you present for the testimony of I believe it's 10 Mr. Giese, if I'm pronouncing that correctly, from 11 Giles? 12 A Yes. 13 Q And also for the testimony of Mr. Don Reinbold? 14 A Yes, I was here for that. 15 Q DOT. What's your opinion regarding the soils present 16 on the site? 17 ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Let me just stop. I'll 18 note it's one o'clock. We were planning to 19 reconvene at 12:30. I think it's appropriate to 20 just continue in the absence of Mr. Meyer into 21 the substance. So this is right where we're 22 starting to get into it so I'll just note that 23 he hasn't returned, but we can't obviously, 24 everybody is well, a number of people are 25 paying their counsel and we can't wait so 26 LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES</pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 114	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 116

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 30	
1 MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Judge. 2 MS. CORRELL: So noted. 3 Q My pending question was what was your what is your opinion regarding the soils present on the DNR access site? 6 A I guess in general there's some poor soils out here. 7 We've got a little bit of variety. I'm comparing, you know, with the other projects I've had in the past. The north/south section of the access road is in fairly good shape from a soils standpoint according to my soils investigation report done 10 mR. GLEISNER: Pardon me, Your Honor, just so we've got a good record here, could we have him referencing some maps or something so we've got some idea 17 MR. GLEISNER: Either that or 2-002. Is 19 that all right, Counsel? 10 MS. CORRELL: Yeah. 11 MR. GLEISNER: Just so the record is clear, Your Honor. 12 MS. CORRELL: Yeah. 13 MR. GLEISNER: Just so the record is clear, Your Honor. 14 MR. GLEISNER: Just so the record is clear, Your Honor. 15 ALJ BOLDT: Sure. No, thank you. 14 Well, I'm referring to Exhibit 2-002. The soils along the existing north/south roadway are I'd say	1 Q Right. So I just wanted to clarify for the record the DNR application which is located at Exhibit 200 contains plans from 2008 and I don't know if you need to take a look at them in order to answer this question, but we'll see. These is it your understanding that these plans have been altered in terms of the road alignment subsequent to the 2008 plans? I can also give you some time to locate those documents. Unfortunately, Exhibit 200 is not tabbed. A Okay. I'm looking at I don't know what exhibit this is. MS. KAVANAUGH: It might have a Bates number, but they don't all. ALJ BOLDT: It's a part of 200 and it's got a Bates stamp of 032 on the side. MS. CORRELL: Okay. MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Your Honor. ALJ BOLDT: It's a Kapur drawing. A C104 is our page number, I guess the Kapur page number, in the border. Q Yeah, the plan number. Okay. A Yeah, the plan number, and it appears that that is the alignment that we were working with and it looks like it hasn't been altered. Q Yeah, hold on a second. I guess maybe if you could
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 117	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 119
1average soils. I can't specifically remember what's2in the report there, but as you had east through the3wetland obviously those are some poor deep wetland4soils and then as you enter onto the area where the5proposed parking lot is going to be adjacent to the6lake, again, those are some poor clay soils and7there's some wetlands in there as well.8MR. GLEISNER: There's some wetlands in9there as well?10THE WITNESS: Well, there's been wetlands11identified within the area of I guess this12region marked in brown or orange. There's a13pocket of wetlands that's been identified in14there as well.15MR. GLEISNER: Thank you very much.16THE WITNESS: Ub-huh.17Q18When J say yeah, when I say wetlands I mean wet20 correct, when you refer to21A20 wetlands in the area of because your expertise21is not in identifying wetlands?25A26A	<pre>1 refer to Bates stamp 040 C100-2 because this one 2 actually has some of the property boundaries I think. 3 A Okay. 4 MR. HARBECK: What page was that? 5 MS. KAVANAUGH: The Bates stamp is 040 6 MS. CORRELL: Exhibit 200 and it's just a 7 few pages past what we were looking at. 8 MR. GLEISNER: Thanks, Counsel. 9 MS. CORRELL: Okay. C100-2, Bates stamp 10 040. 11 Q And I think you can see two lines after the road 12 turns east/west that are DNR's recorded easement, is 13 that right? 14 A That's my understanding is that's the location of the easement, correct. 16 Q Okay. And so this existing road as it has been 17 sitting there since 1950 is a bit off of that 18 recorded easement, is that right? 19 A Yeah, as you head off this page actually the existing 10 road 11 Q Yeah, it does go off the page, but at the corner 12 there? 13 A Uh-huh, yes. 14 Q So I'll have you turn to another exhibit which 25 contains a more recent it's in Don's set of plans</pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 118	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 120

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 31	
1from December of 2010, I believe, which are where.2Bear with me.3MS. CORRELL: Sorry I didn't locate this in4advance. I thought I knew where they were.5Don, can you help me locating your exhibits6or there's three binders. It's taking me a7long time.8MR. GALLO: Are you referring to 2010?9MS. CORRELL: Yeah, probably the1012/23/2010. Somehow I've lost it in all the11paper here. I apologize for the delay. Oh,12here they are. No, that's not it. I thought13they were in Don's, but maybe they're in Redland14Road's.15MR. GALLO: You know, they were I had a16roll of the full size, but I didn't bring them.17MS. CORRELL: Yeah, we have a roll too.18Oh, this is what I was talking about.19ALJ BOLDT: How about the full set?20MS. CORRELL: I guess it fell out, yeah.21Yeah, that full set is basically what I'm22talking about. I believe those are the same as23the exhibit you provided which is Exhibit24Number 105, North Lake Management District? Is25that the same?	 4 requested that change in terms of you know, why 5 they didn't initially request that? 6 A I guess it's my understanding that the interpretation 7 was the easement covered the existing roadway 8 apparently and then it was later found out that that 9 wasn't the case and we were asked to move the roadway 10 into the current mapped easement the DNR easement. 11 Q Do you have any general knowledge about litigation 12 involving whether DNR could use the access road?
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 121	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 123
1 MR. GALLO: Yes. 2 MS. CORRELL: It should be oh, no, this 3 is '08 also. 4 ALJ BOLDT: These are December 2010 plans. 5 MS. CORRELL: Yeah, no, that's what 6 I'm I think these, at least part of them, is 7 '08. Yeah, they look like all '08. Sorry. 8 Q So do you have the 2010 plans? 9 A Yes, uh-huh. 10 MR. GLEISNER: It's all Tim's fault. 11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Step into my office, 12 the windows are open. 13 MS. CORRELL: I think we're let's see 14 here. Let me just ask the question, how about 15 that? 16 Q 11 UNDENT request at some point for the road to be 17 realigned to avoid impacting another adjacent 18 property owner? 19 A 19 A 19 A 10 property owner? 19 A 10 property owner? 19 A 10	23 MS. CORRELL: I stand corrected. 24 ALJ BOLDT: No, that's the term that the 25 statute uses for
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 122	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 124

	SHEET 32	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 MS. CORRELL: Yes, you're correct. ALJ BOLDT: administrative law judges. MS. CORRELL: Yes, under 227. Okay. You threw me off my balance here. MS. KAVANAUGH: What's the right term? MS. CORRELL: Official notice. MS. KAVANAUGH: Official notice. MS. CORRELL: That's what 227 requires and I think NR2 too. Q Okay. Could you identify what has been marked okay, so portions of these plans are from December 22nd, 2010. So I guess what I wanted to clarify is the testimony of Mr. Hudak was that he made his determination based off two sets of plans, one for an earlier portion of 2009 and one from I believe September of 2009. Would those have included the proper road alignment? A I believe so. I believe the 2009 also incorporated the same roadway alignment that's currently being shown in the 2010 plans. Q Okay. So just for practical purposes, the 2010 or 2009 road alignments for the impacts that have been discussed in this proceeding would be the same? A I believe so, yes. 	1decision was made on?2MS. CORRELL: Right, because he wouldn't3have had the December 23rd, 2010 so I was asking4whether or not there's been any realignment or5change in that roadway such that we could use6the same documents you've already been using.7MR. GALLO: Yeah, so for8MS. CORRELL: That's all I'm trying to9establish.10MR. GALLO: For our purposes11ALJ BOLDT: Does everybody stipulate to12that? I know Mr. Gallo does. Do you guys13stipulate to it?14MR. GLEISNER: Well, first of all, Your15Honor, what exhibit number is in front of the16witness right now? I'm assuming that's marked?17ALJ BOLDT: I don't think it's marked at18this particular time.19MR. GLEISNER: Maybe that would be a good20idea, Judge, I don't know.21MS. CORRELL: A large exhibit was provided22by you guys. We didn't actually have that.23MR. GALLO: We provided it I think.24MS. CORRELL: Okay. So I didn't get a25number with it. I don't know what it is. We
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 125	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 127
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	<pre>MR. HARBECK: Can I just ask one question because before I thought you said 2008. Did you mean MS. CORRELL: Oh, that was a mistake if I did say that. MR. HARBECK: Okay. When you identified Exhibit 200 I thought you said 2008 and maybe I got it wrong. Was that MS. KAVANAUGH: Exhibit 200 was 2008 because that was MS. CORRELL: Yes, that was 2008. It was prior to the realignment. MR. HARBECK: Right. MS. CORRELL: And that's why I'm just trying to clarify is the decision document references and I can go back and refer to that if you'd like to. I'm just trying to move along. MR. HARBECK: No, I just want to make sure that I understood what you were talking about when you were talking about which plans. MR. GALLO: Let me see if I can clarify. You're saying that there's a 2009 version that's not in the record that was with the new alignment the same as 2010 and that was what the</pre>	1just got a big roll MR. GLEISNER: Just so the record is clear, Judge.4ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, I mean we can mark it. MS. CORRELL: Yeah. MR. HARBECK: Is it let me ask, is it the same as Exhibit 3? MR. GALLO: Yes. It was in the earlier deposition.10MS. CORRELL: That's what I was searching for, I think. MR. GALLO: It is Exhibit 3. MR. GLEISNER: Oh, okay. MR. GLEISNER: Maybe we could just put 3 on that?16that? ALJ BOLDT: It's a smaller version of I mean this is a larger version of Exhibit 3? MS. CORRELL: Yes, exactly. That's what I was trying to find in all these binders and ALJ BOLDT: Let's have the witness confirm that and then we're golden. MR. GALLO: Your Honor, I can provide it. MS. CORRELL: I think it's in his it was in the RNA. I didn't find it.
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 126	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 128

33			
ALJ BOLDT: Are those the same plans as far as you can tell? THE WITNESS: Exhibit 3? ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, Exhibit 3, yes. THE WITNESS: And, again, these are 2010 for the date. ALJ BOLDT: Right. And that's what this large one was too, right? THE WITNESS: Yep, yep, it looks like yeah, the date is the same, the alignment is the same as the full size. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. MR. GLEISNER: The witness is testifying just so we have a basis for a stipulation. The witness is testifying that prior to the manual code approval there were 2009 plans available to Mr. Hudak that were the same as the 2010, Your Honor? ALJ BOLDT: Is that what you're saying, Mr. Farrenkopf? MR. HARBECK: Or doesn't he I don't know if he knows. MR. MEYER: In terms of the alignment. MS. CORRELL: With respect to the alignment is all I was asking him. I'm sure there was a	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A Q A Q	<pre>look at, some vertical profile of the road that wound its way through the east/west section and, you know, we had to adjust our quantities to reflect that. I'm going to have you turn to what's been marked Exhibit 700.</pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 129			LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 131
<pre>reason for a new plan, some minor adjustment, but that's</pre>	2 3 4 5 5 6 7 7 8 9 9 0 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A Q A Q A Q A	<pre>Are you have you previously worked with other projects involving these type of soils? Yeah, I've been on other projects with I don't know if they're the exact same, the Houghton, but as far as from a roadway design standpoint they were similar I guess in their design parameters and conditions. Have you also consulted with Mr. Doug Bath from GESTRA Geotechnical regarding issues raised during these proceedings? Yes, I have. Do you know why only one sample was taken along the stretch that included the muck soils? Well MR. GLEISNER: I hate to keep interrupting, but I want to make sure the record is clear here. Could you identify what soil boring you're referring to, Counsel? MS. CORRELL: Certainly. I'll refer you specifically to the soil boring map at Appendix 1 which is marked Exhibit 7-009, boring location map, and 7-010 that depicts the actual map. Okay. I'm there. And there's a boring Number 4 identified on that map? Yes.</pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 130			LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 132
	as you can tell? THE WIINESS: Exhibit 3? ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, Exhibit 3, yes. THE WIINESS: And, again, these are 2010 for the date. ALJ BOLDT: Right. And that's what this large one was too, right? THE WIINESS: Yep, yep, it looks like yeah, the date is the same, the alignment is the same as the full size. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. MR. GLEISNER: The witness is testifying just so we have a basis for a stipulation. The witness is testifying that prior to the manual code approval there were 2009 plans available to Mr. Hudak that were the same as the 2010, Your Honor? ALJ BOLDT: Is that what you're saying, MR. HARBECK: Or doesn't he I don't know if he knows. MR. MEYER: In terms of the alignment. MS. CORRELL: With respect to the alignment is all I was asking him. I'm sure there was a LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 129 reason for a new plan, some minor adjustment, but that's MR. GLEISNER: No, no, I understand that. I understand you're limiting your question to the alignment of the road MS. CORRELL: Right. MR. GLEISNER: No, no, I understanding, that that is the same alignment, same MR. GLEISNER: We'll stipulate to that, Your Honor. MS. CORRELL: Okay. Thank you. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. And we'll take these back. We'll have them if you need them. at did the switch in access road alignment mean for bur in terms of design engineering that was ressary? 11, it means, you know, we had to introduce more rizontal curves for a roadway alignment. We had to ok it also obviously meant more wetland impacts part of the footprint of the roadway compared to eping it on the existing roadbed that goes through re. Some profile adjustments I suppose we had to LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI	ALJ BOLDT: Are those the same plans as far as you can tell? THE WITNESS: Exhibit 3? ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, Exhibit 3, yes. THE WITNESS: And, again, these are 2010 for the date. ALJ BOLDT: Right. And that's what this large one was too, right? THE WITNESS: Yep, yep, it looks like yeah, the date is the same, the alignment is the same as the full size. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. MR. GLEISNER: The witness is testifying just so we have a basis for a stipulation. The witness is testifying that prior to the manual code approval there were 2009 plans available to Mr. Hudak that were the same as the 2010, Your Honor? ALJ BOLDT: Is that what you're saying, MR. Farrenkopf? MR. HARBECK: Or doesn't he I don't know if he knows. MS. CORRELL: With respect to the alignment. MS. CORRELL: With respect to the alignment is all I was asking him. I'm sure there was a LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 129 Teason for a new plan, some minor adjustment, but that's MR. GLEISNER: No, no, I understand that. I understand you're limiting your question to the alignment of the road MS. CORRELL: Right. MR. GLEISNER: No, no, I understand that. I understand you're limiting your question to the alignment, of the road MS. CORRELL: Night. MR. GLEISNER: No, no, I understand that. I understand you're limiting your question to the alignment, Sight. MR. GLEISNER: We'll stipulate to that, Your HONOR. MS. CORRELL: Okay. Thank you. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. And we'll take these back. We'll have them if you need them. AL JOLDT: Okay. And we'll take these back. We'll have them if you need them. 4 td id the switch in access road alignment. We had to ck it also obviously meant more wetland impacts part of the footprint of the roadway compared to 20 21 22 24 25 25 26(08) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 25 26 27 28 29 29 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 21 22 23 24 25 25 25 26 26 27 27 28 29 29 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	ALJ BOLDT: Are those the same plans as far as you can tell? THE WITNESS: Exhibit 3? ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, Exhibit 3, yes. THE WITNESS: And, again, these are 2010 for the date. ALJ BOLDT: Right. And that's what this large one was too, right? THE WITNESS: Yep, yep, it looks like yeah, the date is the same, the alignment is the same as the full size. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. MR. GLEISNER: The witness is testifying just so we have a basis for a stipulation. The witness is testifying that prior to the manual code approval there were 2009 plans available to Mr. Hudak that were the same as the 2010, Your Honor? ALJ BOLDT: Is that what you're saying, MR. Farrenkopf? MR. HARBECK: Or doesn't he I don't know if he knows. MR. MEYER: In terms of the alignment. MS. CORRELL: With respect to the alignment is all I was asking him. I'm sure there was a LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 129 reason for a new plan, some minor adjustment, but that's MR. GLEISNER: No, no, I understand that. I understand you're limiting your question to the alignment of the road MS. CORRELL: Will stipulate to that, Your Honor. MS. CORRELL: Okay. Thank you. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. And we'll take these back. We'll have them if you need them. at did the switch in access road alignment mean for ur in terms of design engineering that was tessary? I, LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (609) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI A A A LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI A A A LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (609) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI

SHEET 34 1 Q Could you explain what your understanding of what the 2 map provides in terms of what the soil types are 3 adjacent to the B4 boring? 4 Well, they have what they call the boring log which 5 describes the soils they encounter during their test 6 boring and that's specifically for B4. That is on 7 Exhibit 7-016. 8 Q 9 A 10 Q 11 A Yes. 12 Q 9 A I'm sorry, is that B4? 10 Q 11 A Yes. 12 Q 14 A It looks like the Houghton on that 15 Q 14 It looks like the Houghton on that 15 Q 14 It looking for the definitions here. Well, the 17 general soils map in Exhibit 7-010 is in the areas of 18 A 17 looking for the definitions here. Well, the 19 general soils map in Exhibit 7-004 there's the 16 Right. And then on Exhibit 7-004 there's the <th><pre>soils out in this area. And then trying to get more detailed borings out beyond the existing roadway core and out into the wetland would be difficult because to get the proper piece of equipment out there it might be the soil might be unable to hold it and they'd have trouble operating a piece of equipment out there. So he did take what we call hand probes where a person can walk out into that material and push a if you can push a hand probe down without refusal, you know, you'd be able to determine that that too is also wet soils or soft soils I guess. What's a standard non-manual way of taking a soil boring? What's a standard non-manual way of taking a soil boring? What a drill a vehicle a drill mounted on a vehicle typically. Q Okay. And would it be practical to try and take a drill rig vehicle into the wetland? A I guess in discussions with my with GESTRA Engineering, they felt, again, they're pretty confident what the material was, you know, what the design issues are related to that soil and they thought it would be difficult to get a piece of a larger piece of equipment out there. Q Could you refer to Section 3.3 of Exhibit 7-001? I'm sorry, that must be wrong. It's actually </pre></th>	<pre>soils out in this area. And then trying to get more detailed borings out beyond the existing roadway core and out into the wetland would be difficult because to get the proper piece of equipment out there it might be the soil might be unable to hold it and they'd have trouble operating a piece of equipment out there. So he did take what we call hand probes where a person can walk out into that material and push a if you can push a hand probe down without refusal, you know, you'd be able to determine that that too is also wet soils or soft soils I guess. What's a standard non-manual way of taking a soil boring? What's a standard non-manual way of taking a soil boring? What a drill a vehicle a drill mounted on a vehicle typically. Q Okay. And would it be practical to try and take a drill rig vehicle into the wetland? A I guess in discussions with my with GESTRA Engineering, they felt, again, they're pretty confident what the material was, you know, what the design issues are related to that soil and they thought it would be difficult to get a piece of a larger piece of equipment out there. Q Could you refer to Section 3.3 of Exhibit 7-001? I'm sorry, that must be wrong. It's actually </pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES
(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI
133	135
1 Q And also looking at Exhibit 7-004 there are assigned	<pre>1 Exhibit 7-006 where Section 3.3 is located.</pre>
soil values for the Wisconsin Department of	2 A Okay.
Transportation. Both of those soils are indicated as	3 Q And could you explain what the subgrade improvement
poor support value, is that correct?	4 section and particularly 3.3(1) identifies and also
5 A Correct.	5 located on Exhibit 2-002 for the record, but what
6 Q So assuming that you have poor soils in the area is	6 that area generally is?
7 there a necessity to do a plethora of soil borings to	7 MR. GLEISNER: I believe I guess I'm
8 identify that the soils are poor in that stretch?	8 going to object because is that two questions?
9 A I guess based on the discussions with my geotechnical	9 MS. CORRELL: It is compound. I can break
9 engineer, he felt that there were consistent soils in	10 them out.
11 that corridor and he felt comfortable with the boring	11 MR. GLEISNER: Thank you.
12 that he took, that it would be representative of that	12 Q Could you identify the east the portion of the
13 stretch of roadway.	13 access road that is east of Station 20 on
14 Q And there was also some testimony regarding the	14 A On which exhibit?
15 method that he had used in terms of trying to access	15 Q Yeah, Exhibit 2-002 is fine since that's up here.
16 the wetland itself and I believe I don't know what	16 A I guess Station 20 (inaudible)
17 the proper term is, but hand-holding a rod and trying	17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hang on, take a
18 to drive that rod down	18 microphone please.
19 A Right.	19 THE WITNESS: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay. Sorry.
20 Q in the soils. There was critique of that method.	20 A Station 20 is in the area basically where the roadway
21 Do you have an understanding of why some other boring	21 turns to the east the access roadway turns to the
22 methods might not have been used in that area?	22 east.
23 A Well, I guess part of it is, again, based on what he	32 Q And then extending east so
24 found with his soil boring in B4. He was fairly	34 A On then it extends east approximately 500 feet.
25 confident I guess that it's consistent as far as the	35 Q Okay. And so you're pointing to Exhibit 2-002
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES
(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI
134	136

SHEET 35 identifying Station 20 more or less at the turn from the north/south road to the east/west road and extending east towards the lake? A Correct. MS. KAVANAUGH: (Inaudible)? MS. CORRELL: Oh, okay. You can refer NR. GLEISNER: 143, Counsel. MR. GLEISNER: 143, Counsel. MS. CORRELL: Thank you. Q So extending east to Station 24.75? A All right. That's about the limits of the east/west portion of the road. Q So it extends not quite as far as to the parking lot,	1our what we call usable excavated material, either2good granular fill or good excavated material and3then on top of that we would place our gravel base4for the new roadway. And then, finally, after5observing any settlement we would put the asphalt or6pavement on top of that. That's kind of a general7(inaudible) in that area.8MR. GLEISNER: Counsel, clarification. Did9the witness say snowshoe?10MS. KAVANAUGH: Like a snowshoe, yes.11MS. CORRELL: Yes.12THE WITNESS: Yeah, it kind of it's13a they called it a snowshoe effect in the14report. It spreads the load of the fill
 but a fair distance down the access road the east/west access road? A Are we talking with the wetland area or the area of I mean the east/west road basically runs from Station 20 plus 00 to 25 plus 00, about 500 feet. Q Okay. A And then at that point it opens up into where the proposed parking lot would be located east of that. Q Okay. So that identifies the location and then I'm going to have you refer back to the GESTRA report. A Okay. 	<pre>11 Interview of the spreads the fold of the fill 15 material. 16 MR. GLEISNER: Thank you. 17 Q And a guess another clarification, you said good 18 material so if you could just explain. I think as a 19 professional engineer you have a better understanding 20 of what that means in this context. 21 A I guess it's material suitable for compaction of our 22 roadway embankment to minimize settlement and 23 movement of the roadway once it's completed and once 24 it starts carrying the load of the traffic. So 25 some you know, on a larger road project sometimes</pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 137	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 139
1 Q Thank you. Could you describe your understanding of the recommendations included in 3.3.1 of the GESTRA report? 4 A Uh-huh. Basically, in this area that we're talking about, this 500-foot stretch, what they're 6 recommending is that we excavate down below the 7 existing ground to the north of the existing roadway core about three to four feet. There's a thin layer 9 of what's called peat material that they have the most concern with from a settlement standpoint and that is at about three to four feet deep according to the boring they took, to excavate down to remove that portion of the wetland area, the marsh, the poor marsh soils, to place a grid a filter fabric down or a geotextile fabric down to separate the remaining existing marsh soils from our new roadway bed so that we don't have contamination of any marsh soils into our new roadway bed. Then placing a granular fill layer varying from three feet to one foot on top of that grid and then or, I'm sorry, and adding the (inaudible) grid on top of that which will help to it kind of acts as a snowshoe basically for the road and to spread the load and control the settlement of the roadway the vertical settlement. And then on top of that grid we would place	 you can take that material from other areas of the roadway that you're excavating and in some cases, and maybe in this case, you have to obtain that material from another location, what we call a borrow site, to get proper material for compaction. Q Okay. Thank you. And I think you just a moment. I think you referred to some recommendations that are beyond those specifically mentioned in 3.3.1. I was also going to refer you to Exhibit 7-007. I'll give you a moment to look over the additional comments in 3.4, specifically the final paragraph on that page. A Okay. Okay. Q Did you are some of the recommendations here repeating the recommendations of 3.3.1 or are they more specific than what's identified in both sections together? A Well, I guess it gives a little more detail as far as what they're expecting as far as settlement issues go, depending on how you know, what treatments are used for excavation and (inaudible) and it talks about length of time that the settlement could be expected. Q And could you provide more specificity in terms of the amount of time in which Mr. Bath opined settlement would be completed?
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 138	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 140

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

1 As far as length of time, he talks about 2 consideration to be qiruen to allow for estilement 3 much of the compressible soil vould experience 4 much of the compressible soil vould experience 5 ms plotty of the settlement over a few months and then 6 he talks about as opposed to a clay-type soil which 7 consideration to be asymption to a set talk 8 how long. But that's depending he's looking at 9 assuming a two-foot r l'm sorry, if he's 10 And he's assuming a two-foot raise to the roadway, what is the 11 or any dark or traise two-foot raise so the roadway, what is the 12 asserial is proceed elevation? 14 The proposed elevation? 15 you have a set where you idn't 16 T would asy in general it's probably in the range of 17 A mean process at the traise so the coadway, what is the 18 T would asy in general it's probably in the range of 19 Haw we're running grade? It's 10 Nath we're traise as as the asset that two, some 11 places a little more ton two. 12 yout	SHEET 36	
(608) 279-5295Prairie du Sac WI(608) 279-5295Prairie du Sac WI1141143	1 A As far as length of time, he talks about consideration to be given to allow for settlement prior to the asphalt being placed and his opinion is much of the compressible soil would experience a majority of the settlement over a few months and then he talks about as opposed to a clay-type soil which could take longer, but he doesn't say specifically how long. But that's depending he's looking at assuming an approximate two-foot fill on top of that soil. 10 And he's assuming a two-foot I'm sorry, if he's assuming a two-foot raise to the roadway, what is the roadway elevation plan to be for this project site? 14 A The proposed elevation? 15 Q Yes, thank you. 16 A I would say in general it's probably in the range of two to three feet, some places less than two, some places a little more than two. 19 Q How does that compare to the existing grade? It's just 1 A Well, basically, I think what we're trying to do is match the existing grade of the existing roadway and then keep it to that pretty much the same elevation, but just widening it out into the wetland	proof roll the grade once the gravel is placed, sometimes prior to gravel but usually when the gravel is placed on, to see if there's any and the proof rolling consists of taking a loaded dump truck and rolling it over the newly-graded area and seeing if there's any settlement or soft spots, areas that would need new excavation, undercutting, and then some sort of reinforcement, whether it be adding some more fabric or if you have an area where you didn't do any undercutting perhaps along a roadway core and you encounter a soft spot, you can cut down and you could maybe cut down two feet or, you know, some depth and introduce some granular backfill or some like brick or rock stone which is just bare rock, to help carry that load. You remove those soft soils and bring in some better material and then put your new gravel and asphalt on top of that. So that's the purpose of the proof roll. MR. GLEISNER: Judge, without interrupting, may I just confer quietly with Mr. Gallo for one minute? ALJ BOLDT: Sure. MR. GLEISNER: Go ahead, Counsel. Thank
 fill material is on the existing roadway. Am I understanding correctly then the existing roadway isn't exactly even? As far as fill height? As far as road elevation? Well, it's pretty flat but yeah, there's some changes in grade on it, but it's fairly flat. Qokay. And what if there's some vertical settlement? What type of maintenance could be provided prior to placement of the asphalt the final layer? A well, yeah, then that's what he's recommending here is to wait some amount of time period, a few months, to see what kind of settlement takes place and he's showing it to be two to four inches. So we can place In the the tare source of the tare place and he's source of the tare sou	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI
17 check the grade and if there has been settlement they 18 could bring in gravel and raise that those areas 19 that settled up to the plan elevations and then bring 20 in the pavement after that. 21 Q Okay. And backing up a little bit, after placement 22 of the fill what's recommended in terms of a proof 23 roll test? I'm referring again back to 7-006 in the 24 3.3.1 recommendations in the GESTRA report exhibit. 25 A Yeah, we would proof roll like we do most of our road 17 take some measures to improve those areas that are soft. 19 Q So it doesn't mean you have to tear up the entire access road? 21 A No. No, you would probably have to excavate back down a certain depth and, you know, we would work with the geotechnical expert on that, depending how bad the situation is, and you could do several different things. There's different alternatives to	fill material is on the existing roadway. Am I understanding correctly then the existing roadway isn't exactly even? As far as fill height? As far as road elevation? Well, it's pretty flat but yeah, there's some changes in grade on it, but it's fairly flat. Okay. And what if there's some vertical settlement? What type of maintenance could be provided prior to placement of the asphalt the final layer? Well, yeah, then that's what he's recommending here is to wait some amount of time period, a few months, to see what kind of settlement takes place and he's showing it to be two to four inches. So we can place the gravel down, not pave it, wait a few months, check the grade and if there has been settlement they could bring in gravel and raise that those areas that settled up to the plan elevations and then bring in the pavement after that. Qokay. And backing up a little bit, after placement of the fill what's recommended in terms of a proof roll test? I'm referring again back to 7-006 in the	 roll is to ferret out whether or not the various layers of material work for all areas of the access road? A Right, we would do the entire roadway, access roadway, and the parking lot area. We would require a proof roll. Q So depending on soil suitability and the various load layers that are placed, you could make adjustments in specific areas that didn't pass, basically pass, the proof roll test? A Right, because oftentimes you don't know if an area is soft until you do this proof roll. You know, normal construction equipment may or may not show you that there's some bad spots in there so that's why you have to conduct a proof roll and then you can take some measures to improve those areas that are soft. Q So it doesn't mean you have to tear up the entire access road? A No. No, you would probably have to excavate back down a certain depth and, you know, we would work with the geotechnical expert on that, depending how bad the situation is, and you could do several
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 142 (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 144	25 A Yeah, we would proof roll like we do most of our road	25 different things. There's different alternatives to

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

1	. SHE	EET 37		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25		<pre>fix the settlement or the poor soil issue. And what would happen if you didn't pass the proof roll test and is there going to be huge chunks of roadway that will fall laterally into adjacent areas? Well, in this specific instance we're going to utilize the recommendations of the of my geotechnical engineer and by the use of the geotextile grid I'm confident with his expertise that that won't be an issue. Have you consulted with him further in preparation for this litigation regarding whether or not there would be any failure associated with the access road designed with his recommendations incorporated? MR. GLEISNER: Objection, we think that Mr. Bath should be here to testify to that. MS. KAVANAUGH: An expert is allowed to consult with other experts in forming his opinion. MS. CORRELL: Yes, and he's allowed to testify to that consultation. ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, that's the law so go ahead and answer it if you can. Okay. I have consulted with Mr. Bath. He's seen the plans, he knows what type of facilities we built, he knows what soils are out there and he feels that the</pre>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 Q 12 13 14 A 15 Q 16 17 18 A 19 20 Q 21 A 22 Q 23 24 25 Q	<pre>projects usually on a DOT project I am not out there, there's a construction manager that's out there, but they do do proof rolls so I don't necessarily witness those proof rolls, but on my projects with the Division of State Facilities, whether it be a parking lot or access road, I've been out there or a representative from our company has been out there to, you know, observe the proof roll that's being and we do do a proof roll on our projects. For those projects and then for the DOT projects you presume that the design would require and someone would conduct a proof roll? Yes. But if I'm understanding your clarification correctly, that would be a DOT project manager that would conduct that proof roll? Yeah, typically it's the DOT or another consultant project manager. But it's a pretty standard practice? Yes. And you've referred to partial MS. CORRELL: Pardon me, I've got another question to ask him along these lines. Could you indicate for the record how Kapur's final</pre>
		LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 145		LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 147
1		treatment that hale recommended that we intend in	1	nlang will incomposed these recommondations?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q A	treatment that he's recommended that we intend in following, that there should not be an issue with lateral movement of the roadway. And are some of the recommendations of Mr. Bath and some of the other steps that you plan to incorporate the best practices that you have utilized in the past?	1 2 A 3 4 5 6 7	plans will incorporate these recommendations? Well, we'll have construction details, additional construction details, and specifications addressing all aspects of the project from the drainage structures to the embankment techniques being utilized to the specifications that also require the proof rolling as well. I hope I'm getting too
9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A Q A	Yeah, I guess pertaining to what I call a partial depth excavation instead of a full depth excavation, we have used this in other projects in the past. MR. GLEISNER: I'm sorry, Your Honor, I didn't understand the words. What was that? As far as this type of, I guess, technique of roadway embankment, placing of a roadway on these types of soils, we have used this approach or I have been recommended this approach by other geotechnical experts on past projects. MR. GLEISNER: Sorry, Your Honor, I didn't understand. Thank you. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry it wasn't clear. MR. GLEISNER: I just bad hearing. I think you also testified, but I just wanted to clarify, is the proof roll something out of the ordinary to conduct on a roadway? No, we normally always do a proof roll. On my	8 9 Q 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	<pre>general for you or No, that's fine. Would you say how far along in the design are you? Is this getting close to a final design or, again, going back to the bidding process, I don't I'm not aware of what's the timeline for submitting final projects and meeting those qualifications. If you could explain that for the record? Well, I guess at this point we're in the preliminary design process which is typical I guess. Once we get into we'll start once I get the go ahead, I guess, to begin the final design then we'll start preparing the final design plans which will have all the details and, again, the specifications relating to that and those will be submitted to Division of State Facility and to the owner in this case, the Department of Natural Resources, for their review as well.</pre>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q	<pre>depth excavation instead of a full depth excavation, we have used this in other projects in the past.</pre>	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<pre>general for you or No, that's fine. Would you say how far along in the design are you? Is this getting close to a final design or, again, going back to the bidding process, I don't I'm not aware of what's the timeline for submitting final projects and meeting those qualifications. If you could explain that for the record? Well, I guess at this point we're in the preliminary design process which is typical I guess. Once we get into we'll start once I get the go ahead, I guess, to begin the final design then we'll start preparing the final design plans which will have all the details and, again, the specifications relating to that and those will be submitted to Division of State Facility and to the owner in this case, the Department of Natural Resources, for their review as</pre>

SHEET 38	
2this point yet?2it's a visual inspectio3ATo produce final plans no, we have not.3or how much that gravel4QAnd within all the measures that you identified, are3or how much that gravel4QAnd within all the measures that you identified, are3or how much that gravel5there grades or various materials that could be6withized for, for example, the geotechnical grid or67the geotechnical fabric?7the basic limits of tho8AAre there grades? I guess I'm not9done. So, basically, y9QLet me rephrase the question. It wasn't very good.9done. So, basically, y10When you get to final design phase will there be a10in the soil, if it's bo11particular grade in terms of quality or strength of11rolls over it, or somet12geotechnical fabric separation qualities or grid in13through there.14utilized as well as, you know, the granular material,14Q15etcetera?14QOkay. And I think you16Yeah, we'll have to call that out specifically in our15you alluded to earlier16A re 're putting in geotextile fabric, GESTRA19A19at. If we're putting in geotextile fabric, GESTRA19A20Way. So, again, there was a lot of testimony about24math to move the road24massive failures of roadways or significant24we had	see how much basically, n of how much that soil moves moves. Depths of the ruts n into consideration. You r that truck sinks in, you spot. The area is marked off, se areas that need to be f, and then the remedies are ou're looking for sponginess uncing a lot when the truck imes I've seen where, you ruts from that truck going alluded to yeah, I think other projects that have vation in areas of poor soils describe your experience with ion project? projects I guess where we've re the wetland area or the airly deep, you know, over 20 this was a State highway ss it's Sawyer County, where over to a marshy area because s in proximity to a sensitive
(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI (608) 279-5295	EO SERVICES Prairie du Sac WI 51
2QWhat types of factors do you look at to determine whether a road will experience settlement, either vertically or laterally?area actually. It was3whether a road will experience settlement, either vertically or laterally?3was.4QOh, boy.55AWell, we typically on any project we work with our geotechnical expert to determine what the existing remedies need to be taken, whether the soils are adequate for the loading, you know, the amount of using to be expected to be on that facility and then they'll also make recommendations as they have here adequate and what type of techniques we need to they'll also make recommendations as they have here ta as to whether those soils are not proper or not those soils below and in our roadway bed. So we look at, you know, the types of soils, the amount of the se adway access didn't experience sort of a massive failure or any slumpage, what types of minor 21area actually. It was was.2area actually.It was3was.4Q4QOh, boy.5AAnd in that case we did a and this came agai of Transportation and t to be adapted for the loading, you know, the amount of the roadway cocess didn't experience sort of a massive failure or any slumpage, what types of minor 2110And if the roadway access didn't experience sort of a massive failure or any slumpage, what types of minor 23Indications of movement would you be looking for at 24No, it was probably in maybe maximum that they 2424QOkay.	he next stion? So you said they basically the vegetation recollection or idea how deep the way the 20 feet of depth of the ity or was it the order of two to three feet
(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI (608) 279-5295	EO SERVICES Prairie du Sac WI 52

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 39			
2 geote: 3 reinfd 4 Q And th 5 corred 6 A Yeah, 7 there 8 8 west of 9 9 of that 10 10 Q And we 11 the DI 12 12 that at 13 13 A Yes. 14 highwa 15 15 Q Okay. 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 Q And ye 23 Q And ye 24 recent 14	<pre>we had to move there was an existing road and we had to move the new road over to the of the existing road and build the road on top at wetland. e don't want to hear about that because we're NR, but sorry, no, I'm just kidding. But is a State highway that's still in existence today? I believe so, yeah. I'm sure. It's the main ay coming out of the north side of Hayward. MR. HARBECK: You only want to hear about it when it's your own site, right? MR. MEYER: Would that be Highway 63? THE WITNESS: Highway 27 it was. MR. MEYER: 27. MS. CORRELL: Highway 27. Okay. THE WITNESS: This was a long time ago. pu alluded to another project, perhaps more</pre>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 20 21 22 23 24 A 25	just described indicating a wetland depth of approximately 20 feet, were there less steps in terms of layers of various replacement materials provided than what is going to be provided for the DNR access site design?
((LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES 508) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 153		LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 155
2 rememil 3 soil, 4 excava 5 went of 6 feet of 7 know feet of 8 geotes 9 backfi 10 widen: 11 out in 12 road. 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 out 21 22 23 24 Q If I to	al depth excavation where we again, I can't beer the depth of the marshy soil or the softer but it was too deep for us to do a full ation and too cost prohibitive so, again, we down I'm thinking we might have gone down six on that. There was a range. Again, I don't the specifics, but four to six feet, put some stile fabric back down in that and some granular ill. And it was similar to this where we were ing on the existing roadway core and widening the wetlands which were on both sides of the MR. GLEISNER: For the record can you identify that somewhere? THE WITNESS: Oh, the name of the road? MR. GLEISNER: Yeah. THE WITNESS: It's County Highway ES in Waukesha County and I would say it's MR. GLEISNER: That's enough. I just wanted to get an idea. THE WITNESS: Yeah, it's west of I'm sorry, east of Mukwonago. MR. GLEISNER: Thank you. understand your testimony correctly, is it fair y that those two partial excavations that you've	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 9 10 2 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 A 21 22 23 24 25 Q	which is you do a lot of jobs where the DOT standards are the guiding standards. I would assume you don't do a huge quantity of public boat access projects, but you do do some other projects that are less impacting than a transportation a State transportation highway. What are some of the factors that would be different in terms of speeds, weight and number of cars that you would expect to pass the area in terms of your engineering expertise? Well, certainly in all of my highway, whether it be State highway or county highway or even municipal roadway projects, the loadings and the number of traffic would be much greater than what I would anticipate for a boat launch-type facility.
({	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES 508) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 154		LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 156

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 40	
<pre>1 traveling? Is that a factor in terms of engineering? 2 A I guess speed isn't necessarily a factor other than 3 maybe at intersections where you're looking at 4 potential rutting of vehicles as they're approaching 5 a stop or something like that. But we're typically 1 looking at what I call in our pavement analysis, 7 pavement design, the loading of trucks and a number 8 of vehicles per day and a percent of vehicles that 9 are trucks or classified as trucks. 10 Q Okay. And what kind of loading capacity is utilized 11 for, for example, a typical pick-up truck with an 12 average size boat trailer and boat versus, I don't 13 know, all the other trucks that travel on State 14 highway? 15 A You mean as far as what their weight is combined? 16 Q I'm not saying exact weights, but if you could 17 describe what the loading might be in terms of 18 differential between those two types of vehicles? 19 A Oh, boy, I can't I could only speculate, but 10 obviously a semi trailer truck has a much heavier 11 loading than a pick-up truck hauling a trailer. That 12 would be considered a car, you know, basically a car, 13 in our pavement design analysis for highway projects 14 versus a truck which has a much heavier loading. 15 Q And when you do a loading analysis for a State</pre>	1MR. MEYER: No questions, Your Honor.2ALJ BOLDT: Okay.3MR. GLEISNER: If I could take a break,4Your Honor, so we can discuss this with our5experts before we cross-examine?6MS. CORRELL: How about a five-minute7bathroom break?8MR. GLEISNER: We didn't have a chance to9do any discovery. Bathroom break.10MS. CORRELL: I mean I'd say five minutes11is plenty?12MR. GLEISNER: Yeah, sure.13ALJ BOLDT: Okay. That's fine.14(Recess taken)15ALJ BOLDT: Now we're back on the record.16CROSS-EXAMINATION17BY MR. GLEISNER:18Q19getting in mind what the limitations are of your10responsibilities. You have no opinion about the11extent or the delineation of the wetlands on this18Property, is that correct?19A Correct, those are delineated by experts24Q25A and then we did the survey.
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 157	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 159
1highway do you take into account how many car and2traffic studies that would identify how many cars3would be passing along4AYeah.Q6ABasically, we design a roadway on a State highway7project or any county highway we design our8projects for the 20-year design life of a roadway.9And typically the DOT, the Wisconsin Department of10Transportation, will provide us with traffic11projections as far as what that facility is going to12be carrying, what percent trucks are going to be13carried and those are the numbers we use as part of14our pavement design report, along with the15engineering properties given to us in the soils by16the geotechnical engineer.17Q18I mean compared to a highway no, obviously not.10There will be much less traffic, much less truck10loading, if any.20Okay.23MS. CORRELL: I have no further questions24for you. Thank you, Mr. Farrenkopf.25ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Mr. Meyer?	<pre>1 Q I'm just trying to understand. 2 A Uh-huh, right. 3 Q And you have no opinion or any expertise with regard 4 to the delineation of or the identification of 5 navigable waters, is that correct? 6 A No, you know, we rely upon others to delineate those. 7 Q And you yourself are not a geotechnical engineer, is 8 that correct? 9 A No, I'm not. 10 Q And so you may have consulted with Mr. Bath, but 9 you're not in a position to provide any information 11 from your own knowledge or expertise concerning 12 geotechnical matters, is that correct? 14 A Right, we rely upon the geotechnical's 15 recommendations for all of our roadway projects. 16 Q Thank you. Now, let me begin by some preliminary 17 matters here that and I apologize, but I haven't 18 had a chance to depose you or meet you before so I 19 need to get a little background on how Kapur works 20 and what Kapur is about, if you don't mind. You 21 testified to a contract selection process, is that 22 correct? 23 A That's one way, yeah. 24 Q Now, was this contract that you have you have a 25 contract with DNR, is that correct?</pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 158	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 160

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 41	
 1 A Correct. 2 Q The contract that you have, was that the result of a bidding process or the result of a contract negotiation process? A It was the two-step process I guess I was talking about where it's called quality base selection where they the Division of State Facilities sent out a request for a proposal and then we submitted the proposal for this project as well as a number of other firms and then once they selected us we sat down and negotiated a contract with the Division of State Facilities, and the DNR was involved in that as well. Q Thank you very much. Now, let me understand, if you know, most of what you do for DNR is public, is that correct? I mean it's of public record? A Yeah, I guess the end result, you know, the plans and specifications and everything that we produce are a matter of public record and the contract that we have as well. Q So if one wanted to get your file one could access it by an open records request, for example, would that be correct? MS. KAVANAUGH: He's calling for a legal opinion. 	<pre>1 was an amendment. I know that it covered more 2 geotechnical investigation, but from a design 3 standpoint I can't be certain if that was part of an 4 amendment on that specific 5 Q The reason I'm going there is I recall from your 6 testimony, I believe I recall from your testimony, 7 that because of the alteration of the roadway or the 8 realignment of the roadway near the Hanson property 9 more wetland impact and profile changes and other 10 changes occurred, am I correct on that? 11 A Compared to the alignment that was on the existing 12 roadway? 13 Q Right. 14 A Correct, there were more obviously more wetland 15 impacts took place because of the new alignment. 16 Q Now, when that alignment took place did it take the 17 roadway off from the existing roadway? 18 A The alignment shift? 19 Q Yes. 20 A A short portion is off the existing roadway, correct, 21 to match to fit into DNR's mapped easement. 22 Okay. I'd like to direct your attention to 23 Exhibit 7-003 and I am specifically addressing the 24 second paragraph and the second-to-last sentence. It 25 says, "The roadway will generally follow an existing</pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 161	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 163
1MS. CORRELL: Objection2MR. GLEISNER: Well, no, I'm not, I'm3trying to avoid, Your Honor, saying produce your4file.5ALJ BOLDT: What's the point? We're not in6discovery now7MR. GLEISNER: No, no8ALJ BOLDT: and discovery is9limited let's just get to the point today,10okay?11MR. GLEISNER: I'm trying, Your Honor.12Q13A design budget?14Q15A Yeah, we negotiated a design contract.16Q17And with regard to the amendments, you mentioned that17there are amendments from time to time. Were there18any amendments made in the contract that you have19with DNR?20A21Q22A33I guess I can't say for certain if it specifically34addressed the alignment change or if that was part of35our, you know, original alternative analysis. There	<pre>1 access trail that is cleared but not paved." Was the 2 GESTRA report actually done before the 2009 report 3 that we've stipulated to was completed? 4 A I guess I'm not sure of the timing of when their 5 field work was done versus the current project 1 location. 7 MR. GLEISNER: That would be relevant, Your 8 Honor, because we are concerned that the GESTRA 9 report 10 MS. CORRELL: Are you 11 testifying objection. 12 MR. GLEISNER: No, I'm not testifying at 13 all. 14 ALJ BOLDT: No, just keep asking questions. 15 Let's go. 16 MR. GLEISNER: Okay. 17 ALJ BOLDT: There wasn't an objection. 18 MR. GLEISNER: All right. 19 Q I'm going to direct your attention to Exhibit 7-004. 19 Now, there are two types of soils referenced in the 11 second graph, correct, Houghton muck and I think it's 12 Roland muck, is that correct? 13 A Correct. 14 Q There are a number of variables that relate to those 15 soils, including design group, frost index, soil</pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 162	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 164

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHE	ET 42	
1 2 3 4 5 0 6 7 8 A 9 10 11 12 13 0 14 15 16 17 A 18 0 19 A 20 21 22 0 23 24 A 25 0	<pre>support value, drainage factor. All of those have none written into them except for one. Why is that? My guess is that they didn't conduct the testing on the soil samples in those areas. Well, I apologize, but isn't that simply an expression of what the soils are able to support in that graph? They're right there, they're these are what they call the petrological (phonetic) method and these are different soil carrying capacity values I guess you'd call them and what their soil parameters are. So, in other words, if I'm reading this graph correctly, the soil support value for Houghton soil and the Roland soil, or muck as they call it, is none, is that correct? Correct, that's what they have here, uh-huh. And do you attach any significance to that? Well, I guess I recognize it from from a roadway building standpoint, those are poor soils that a roadway would be built on. I'm going to direct your attention to 7-010 and I'm specifically referring to B4 boring 4? Uh-huh. That appears to be located on the border between the</pre>	1 A Uh-huh. 2 Usn't that boring actually in the existing access trail or road? 4 A In the existing road? 5 Q If you look at the map itself? 6 A Yeah. I guess I'm not specifically sure where they put the boring with respect to the roadway core. We gave them basically this symbol here or a map saying you know, let's take a boring at this location. I'm not sure if he took it in the center of the road. 11 Usually what they try to do is get as close to the edge of the road as they can in this location so he went probably the first couple feet are through the existing roadway core or the fill embankment and then he continued on down, down below that. 16 Q Now, is the existing roadway, trail, whatever it is is that already compacted? 18 A I guess I don't know how long it's been out there, but my guess would be it has settled to a signification point, I don't know. 21 Q And I understand. Thank you. 22 A O'kay. Fair enough. On the north and south portion the portion to the north of the access road and the
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 165	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 167
1 2 4 3 4 5 6 A 7 Q 8 9 10 A 11 12 Q 13 14 15 A 16 Q 17 18 19 A 20 21 22 23 24 Q 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	 Houghton muck and the Roland muck, is that correct? Correct. But there were no borings done anywhere along the any other place along the east/west access road, is that correct? No drill rig borings, correct. And how many I mean I'm assuming that this is a complete rendition of the borings that were done. Were there other borings done along the access road? Yeah, we did two on the north/south portion of the roadway and we did two in the parking lot area. Thank you. So then my the answer to my question is B4 is the only soil boring that was done on the access road going east and west, is that correct? Correct. How can you be certain that the rest of the east/west access road is capable of or what the soil is like in the rest of the east/west access road? Sorry. Again, I base that on the recommendations from my geotechnical engineer and if he was uncomfortable with his recommendations I would imagine he would, you know, recommend more borings be taken, more information be taken, in that stretch of roadway. I would direct your attention again to the map on B4 on 7-010. 	<pre>1 portion to the south of the access road, would you 2 agree that's wetland? 3 A Oh, north and west? The east/west portion of the 4 access road? 5 Q Yeah, I apologize 6 A Yeah. 7 Q the east/west portion of the road. 8 A Yeah, based on, you know, the delineations the DNR 9 did and what the geotechnical reports tell me yeah, 10 those they're wetlands, soft soils, poor soils. 11 Q And was it your testimony did I understand your 12 testimony correctly that you couldn't get a truck of 13 there, a boring truck out there, into those wetland 14 areas? 15 A I don't know if they have a piece of equipment that 16 could do it, but I would imagine the standard drill 17 rig could not get out there to conduct those boring 18 Q Now, how much familiarity do you have personally wi 19 wetlands? 20 A I guess from a design standpoint, you know, in this 21 part of the State we encounter them on most of our 22 roadway projects. We work with the DNR on the 23 delineation of wetlands, vegetation types, things 24 like that and we look at ways to avoid or minimize 25 our impacts on those wetlands and, if we can't avoid 26 our impacts on those wetlands and, if we can't avoid 27 and the state wetlands and, if we can't avoid 28 and 29 and 20 and 20</pre>
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 166	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 168

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 43	
 it, we look at, you know, mitigation measures or other things on all of our DOT projects. Now, there's a bio-filter contemplated for this project, is there not? Yes. If you could just remove if you wouldn't mind removing Exhibit 143 for a moment. Put it down on the ground. It's just fine. Can you, with reference to Exhibit 2-002, describe for the Judge approximately where the bio-filter will be located? A The bio-filter will be located to the north of the proposed new parking lot and then south of the area marked in dark blue between the parking lot and that swale So it'd be safe would it be fair to say that on 2-002 I'm sorry. On 2-002 the bio-filter would be on the borderline between the north orange line and the south portion of the blue line approximately? Approximately, in general, it would be in that region, correct. Why is the bio-filter below the elevation of the lake? MS. CORRELL: Objection I don't know that it is I guess. MS. KAVANAUGH: Assumes facts not in 	1alternate analysis. It has to do with the2MS. KAVANAUGH: I don't think the3bio-filter4ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Alternatives analysis is5not part of this hearing.6MS. CORRELL: Another thing is, your7engineer only testified as to impacts to the8access road and we're providing responsive9testimony with respect to the engineering.10We're not going to go over every inch of this11property again and every issue.12MR. GLEISNER: And I'm not trying to,13Counsel. I'm not trying to.14ALJ BOLDT: The objection is sustained.15MR. GLEISNER: Okay.16You are going to be putting eight-inch culverts into17this area, is that correct?18MR. MEYER: (Inaudible).19MS. CORRELL: Objection20Are there culverts intended for any location where21Yes, there are.22And where would those be located? And you can use
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 169	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 171
1 evidence. 2 MS. CORRELL: There's no foundation laid 3 for that question. 4 ALJ BOLDT: The answer came in. He said I 5 don't know that it is so 6 Q Do you have any knowledge yourself personally as to 7 the elevation of the bio-filter? 8 A Yes, we put those elevations in our plans. 9 Q 9 And you have the plans in front of you I believe at 10 Exhibit 3 in the white book in front of you. 11 A Yes. 12 Q 13 myou tell me the elevation of the bio-filter? 14 This has to do with storm water and not as to 15 navigability which, again, is the subject of the 16 proceeding. 17 MR. GLEISNER: It is the subject of the 18 proceeding. Your Honor. We want to understand 19 the relationship of the parking lot and the 20 parking lot location to North Lake and we're 21 confused by where they put the bio-filter and 22 why they put the bio-filter where they did. 23 M	 Exhibit 2-002 if you wish. A Well, they're not shown on that. MS. CORRELL: That's not a good exhibit if you're trying to show where culverts are located. MR. GLEISNER: Fair enough. Okay. Sure. You're bringing up Exhibit 143 at this point? A 143. Okay. Well, we have several different types of pipe out here. So you're referring specifically to cross-culverts or Q Okay. First of all, what type of culverts are there going to be on this project? A Well, there's going to be cross-culverts under the roadway. I guess specifically along the east/west portion between Station 20 and 25 there's going to be I believe and it's hard to see on this exhibit, but I believe there's going to be four eight-inch cross-culvert pipes. Q And the cross-culverts will connect what has been you've been here for most of the testimony? A Yes. Q What has been described on Exhibit 2-002, behind that EXANDEL UNDED CEDURCE
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 170	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 172

	SHI	EET 44		
1	A	Correct.	1	you're there.
	Q	The other culverts on the site will be where? Or	2 A	I'm there.
3 4	A	what are they, first of all? Well, I quess they're storm sewer pipe	3	MS. CORRELL: I'm just a little behind
	Q	I don't care about the storm water sewer pipe.	4	here. MR. GALLO: That's okay.
	Ă	There's some pipes in the bio-filter that we talked	6	MS. CORRELL: Okay. And you're on
7		about.	7	Boring 4, right?
8	Q	I don't care about those either. So there's only	8	MR. GALLO: Boring 4, Page 16 and 17.
9		four culverts that are responsible for connecting the	9	We'll start on 16.
10 11		north and south navigable wetlands as it's been testified to, is that correct?	10 11 0	MS. CORRELL: Got it. Thank you. 16. There's a drill date under the drilling
12	А	Between here and here, correct, four culvert pipes.	11 Q 12	information. Can you see that date?
13		And you're referring to between Station 20 and	13 A	I see that.
14		Station 25	14 Q	What is the date?
15		Yes.	15 A	Well, on 7-016 it's October 3rd of 2007.
16 17	-	on the east/west access road, is that correct? Correct.	16 Q 17	Okay. And the depth of the boring is ten feet, is that correct?
18		You testified earlier with regard to two areas that	17 18 A	Correct.
19	×	you had done work on, Highway 27 and County ES and	10 n 19 Q	Okay. On 17, Page 17, this is again Test Boring 4?
20		with regard to County ES you said that, if I recall	20 A	Uh-huh.
21		correctly, the partial depth excavation was too cost	21 Q	And the drilling date?
22 23		prohibitive and that you put the geotech right over the vegetation, am I correct on that?	22 A 23 Q	It's October 3rd, 2007 and September 16th, 2008. Okay. And the depth of this boring is 20 feet?
23 24		MS. CORRELL: Objection, I don't think	23 Q 24 A	Correct.
25		that I think the record speaks for itself and	25 Q	So the drilling date for the 20-foot depth is
		-		
		LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES		LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES
		(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI		(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI
		173		1.7
		1 / V		175
1				
1 2		I don't think he said that.	1 2 A	September 16th, is that correct, 2008? Yes.
2 3		I don't think he said that. MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'm just trying to I'm trying to cross and I'm trying to make	1 2 A 3 Q	September 16th, is that correct, 2008? Yes. Okay. Back to Mr. Gleisner's question on Page 3,
2 3 4		I don't think he said that. MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'm just trying to I'm trying to cross and I'm trying to make sure that I have the right foundation.	3 Q 4	September 16th, is that correct, 2008? Yes. Okay. Back to Mr. Gleisner's question on Page 3, it's actually Page 2 of the report, it's
2 3 4 5		I don't think he said that. MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'm just trying to I'm trying to cross and I'm trying to make sure that I have the right foundation. ALJ BOLDT: Is that what you testified to?	3 Q	September 16th, is that correct, 2008? Yes. Okay. Back to Mr. Gleisner's question on Page 3, it's actually Page 2 of the report, it's Exhibit 7-003, the date of this report is at the top
2 3 4 5 6		I don't think he said that. MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'm just trying to I'm trying to cross and I'm trying to make sure that I have the right foundation. ALJ BOLDT: Is that what you testified to? MS. KAVANAUGH: Don't you think maybe you	3 Q 4 5 6	September 16th, is that correct, 2008? Yes. Okay. Back to Mr. Gleisner's question on Page 3, it's actually Page 2 of the report, it's Exhibit 7-003, the date of this report is at the top of the page. Can you cite that date?
2 3 4 5		I don't think he said that. MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'm just trying to I'm trying to cross and I'm trying to make sure that I have the right foundation. ALJ BOLDT: Is that what you testified to?	3 Q 4	September 16th, is that correct, 2008? Yes. Okay. Back to Mr. Gleisner's question on Page 3, it's actually Page 2 of the report, it's Exhibit 7-003, the date of this report is at the top of the page. Can you cite that date? January 29th, 2009.
2 3 5 6 7 8 9		I don't think he said that. MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'm just trying to I'm trying to cross and I'm trying to make sure that I have the right foundation. ALJ BOLDT: Is that what you testified to? MS. KAVANAUGH: Don't you think maybe you should ask him what he testified to? ALJ BOLDT: Wait. THE WITNESS: I think what I said was that	3 Q 4 5 6 7 A 8 Q 9	September 16th, is that correct, 2008? Yes. Okay. Back to Mr. Gleisner's question on Page 3, it's actually Page 2 of the report, it's Exhibit 7-003, the date of this report is at the top of the page. Can you cite that date?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		I don't think he said that. MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'm just trying to I'm trying to cross and I'm trying to make sure that I have the right foundation. ALJ BOLDT: Is that what you testified to? MS. KAVANAUGH: Don't you think maybe you should ask him what he testified to? ALJ BOLDT: Wait. THE WITNESS: I think what I said was that the full depth excavation would have been too	3 Q 4 5 6 7 A 8 Q 9 10	September 16th, is that correct, 2008? Yes. Okay. Back to Mr. Gleisner's question on Page 3, it's actually Page 2 of the report, it's Exhibit 7-003, the date of this report is at the top of the page. Can you cite that date? January 29th, 2009. Okay. With these dates in mind and the second paragraph down in Section 1.0, Introduction, second paragraph down, the second sentence from the bottom.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11		I don't think he said that. MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'm just trying to I'm trying to cross and I'm trying to make sure that I have the right foundation. ALJ BOLDT: Is that what you testified to? MS. KAVANAUGH: Don't you think maybe you should ask him what he testified to? ALJ BOLDT: Wait. THE WITNESS: I think what I said was that the full depth excavation would have been too cost prohibitive and also would impact wetlands	3 Q 4 5 6 7 A 8 Q 9 10 11	September 16th, is that correct, 2008? Yes. Okay. Back to Mr. Gleisner's question on Page 3, it's actually Page 2 of the report, it's Exhibit 7-003, the date of this report is at the top of the page. Can you cite that date? January 29th, 2009. Okay. With these dates in mind and the second paragraph down in Section 1.0, Introduction, second paragraph down, the second sentence from the bottom. I'm just going to read this again. "The roadway will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12		I don't think he said that. MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'm just trying to I'm trying to cross and I'm trying to make sure that I have the right foundation. ALJ BOLDT: Is that what you testified to? MS. KAVANAUGH: Don't you think maybe you should ask him what he testified to? ALJ BOLDT: Wait. THE WITNESS: I think what I said was that the full depth excavation would have been too cost prohibitive and also would impact wetlands obviously more greatly and that we did and	3 Q 4 5 6 7 A 8 Q 9 10 11 12	September 16th, is that correct, 2008? Yes. Okay. Back to Mr. Gleisner's question on Page 3, it's actually Page 2 of the report, it's Exhibit 7-003, the date of this report is at the top of the page. Can you cite that date? January 29th, 2009. Okay. With these dates in mind and the second paragraph down in Section 1.0, Introduction, second paragraph down, the second sentence from the bottom. I'm just going to read this again. "The roadway will generally follow an existing access trail that is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		I don't think he said that. MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'm just trying to I'm trying to cross and I'm trying to make sure that I have the right foundation. ALJ BOLDT: Is that what you testified to? MS. KAVANAUGH: Don't you think maybe you should ask him what he testified to? ALJ BOLDT: Wait. THE WITNESS: I think what I said was that the full depth excavation would have been too cost prohibitive and also would impact wetlands obviously more greatly and that we did and that's one of the reasons we went to the partial	3 Q 4 5 6 7 A 8 Q 9 10 11	September 16th, is that correct, 2008? Yes. Okay. Back to Mr. Gleisner's question on Page 3, it's actually Page 2 of the report, it's Exhibit 7-003, the date of this report is at the top of the page. Can you cite that date? January 29th, 2009. Okay. With these dates in mind and the second paragraph down in Section 1.0, Introduction, second paragraph down, the second sentence from the bottom. I'm just going to read this again. "The roadway will generally follow an existing access trail that is cleared but not paved." This report, if I'm not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15		I don't think he said that. MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'm just trying to I'm trying to cross and I'm trying to make sure that I have the right foundation. ALJ BOLDT: Is that what you testified to? MS. KAVANAUGH: Don't you think maybe you should ask him what he testified to? ALJ BOLDT: Wait. THE WITNESS: I think what I said was that the full depth excavation would have been too cost prohibitive and also would impact wetlands obviously more greatly and that we did and that's one of the reasons we went to the partial depth excavation on those. MR. GLEISNER: I'll defer to Mr. Meyer.	3 Q 4 5 6 7 A 8 Q 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	September 16th, is that correct, 2008? Yes. Okay. Back to Mr. Gleisner's question on Page 3, it's actually Page 2 of the report, it's Exhibit 7-003, the date of this report is at the top of the page. Can you cite that date? January 29th, 2009. Okay. With these dates in mind and the second paragraph down in Section 1.0, Introduction, second paragraph down, the second sentence from the bottom. I'm just going to read this again. "The roadway will generally follow an existing access trail that is cleared but not paved." This report, if I'm not mistaken, was prepared under the old alignment, is that correct, or do you know?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16		I don't think he said that. MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'm just trying to I'm trying to cross and I'm trying to make sure that I have the right foundation. ALJ BOLDT: Is that what you testified to? MS. KAVANAUGH: Don't you think maybe you should ask him what he testified to? ALJ BOLDT: Wait. THE WITNESS: I think what I said was that the full depth excavation would have been too cost prohibitive and also would impact wetlands obviously more greatly and that we did and that's one of the reasons we went to the partial depth excavation on those. MR. GLEISNER: I'll defer to Mr. Meyer. MR. HARBECK: No, Mr. Gallo.	3 Q 4 5 6 7 A 8 Q 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A	September 16th, is that correct, 2008? Yes. Okay. Back to Mr. Gleisner's question on Page 3, it's actually Page 2 of the report, it's Exhibit 7-003, the date of this report is at the top of the page. Can you cite that date? January 29th, 2009. Okay. With these dates in mind and the second paragraph down in Section 1.0, Introduction, second paragraph down, the second sentence from the bottom. I'm just going to read this again. "The roadway will generally follow an existing access trail that is cleared but not paved." This report, if I'm not mistaken, was prepared under the old alignment, is that correct, or do you know? I guess I'm not certain.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17		I don't think he said that. MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'm just trying to I'm trying to cross and I'm trying to make sure that I have the right foundation. ALJ BOLDT: Is that what you testified to? MS. KAVANAUGH: Don't you think maybe you should ask him what he testified to? ALJ BOLDT: Wait. THE WITNESS: I think what I said was that the full depth excavation would have been too cost prohibitive and also would impact wetlands obviously more greatly and that we did and that's one of the reasons we went to the partial depth excavation on those. MR. GLEISNER: I'll defer to Mr. Meyer. MR. HARBECK: No, Mr. Gallo. MR. GLEISNER: Mr. Gallo.	3 Q 4 5 6 7 A 8 Q 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A 17 Q	September 16th, is that correct, 2008? Yes. Okay. Back to Mr. Gleisner's question on Page 3, it's actually Page 2 of the report, it's Exhibit 7-003, the date of this report is at the top of the page. Can you cite that date? January 29th, 2009. Okay. With these dates in mind and the second paragraph down in Section 1.0, Introduction, second paragraph down, the second sentence from the bottom. I'm just going to read this again. "The roadway will generally follow an existing access trail that is cleared but not paved." This report, if I'm not mistaken, was prepared under the old alignment, is that correct, or do you know? I guess I'm not certain. Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18		I don't think he said that. MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'm just trying to I'm trying to cross and I'm trying to make sure that I have the right foundation. ALJ BOLDT: Is that what you testified to? MS. KAVANAUGH: Don't you think maybe you should ask him what he testified to? ALJ BOLDT: Wait. THE WITNESS: I think what I said was that the full depth excavation would have been too cost prohibitive and also would impact wetlands obviously more greatly and that we did and that's one of the reasons we went to the partial depth excavation on those. MR. GLEISNER: I'll defer to Mr. Meyer. MR. HARBECK: No, Mr. Gallo. MR. GLEISNER: Mr. Gallo. MS. CORRELL: Mr. Gallo gets a turn.	3 Q 4 5 6 7 A 8 Q 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A 17 Q 18 A	September 16th, is that correct, 2008? Yes. Okay. Back to Mr. Gleisner's question on Page 3, it's actually Page 2 of the report, it's Exhibit 7-003, the date of this report is at the top of the page. Can you cite that date? January 29th, 2009. Okay. With these dates in mind and the second paragraph down in Section 1.0, Introduction, second paragraph down, the second sentence from the bottom. I'm just going to read this again. "The roadway will generally follow an existing access trail that is cleared but not paved." This report, if I'm not mistaken, was prepared under the old alignment, is that correct, or do you know? I guess I'm not certain. Okay. It might have started that way, but then when we knew
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17		I don't think he said that. MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'm just trying to I'm trying to cross and I'm trying to make sure that I have the right foundation. ALJ BOLDT: Is that what you testified to? MS. KAVANAUGH: Don't you think maybe you should ask him what he testified to? ALJ BOLDT: Wait. THE WITNESS: I think what I said was that the full depth excavation would have been too cost prohibitive and also would impact wetlands obviously more greatly and that we did and that's one of the reasons we went to the partial depth excavation on those. MR. GLEISNER: I'll defer to Mr. Meyer. MR. HARBECK: No, Mr. Gallo. MR. GLEISNER: Mr. Gallo.	3 Q 4 5 6 7 A 8 Q 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A 17 Q	September 16th, is that correct, 2008? Yes. Okay. Back to Mr. Gleisner's question on Page 3, it's actually Page 2 of the report, it's Exhibit 7-003, the date of this report is at the top of the page. Can you cite that date? January 29th, 2009. Okay. With these dates in mind and the second paragraph down in Section 1.0, Introduction, second paragraph down, the second sentence from the bottom. I'm just going to read this again. "The roadway will generally follow an existing access trail that is cleared but not paved." This report, if I'm not mistaken, was prepared under the old alignment, is that correct, or do you know? I guess I'm not certain. Okay. It might have started that way, but then when we knew the alignment was going to be shifted, you know,
2 3 4 5 6 6 7 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21		I don't think he said that. MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'm just trying to I'm trying to cross and I'm trying to make sure that I have the right foundation. ALJ BOLDT: Is that what you testified to? MS. KAVANAUGH: Don't you think maybe you should ask him what he testified to? ALJ BOLDT: Wait. THE WITNESS: I think what I said was that the full depth excavation would have been too cost prohibitive and also would impact wetlands obviously more greatly and that we did and that's one of the reasons we went to the partial depth excavation on those. MR. GLEISNER: I'll defer to Mr. Meyer. MR. HARBECK: No, Mr. Gallo. MR. GLEISNER: Mr. Gallo. MS. CORRELL: Mr. Gallo gets a turn. MR. GALLO: Okay. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GALLO:	3 Q 4 5 6 7 A 8 Q 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A 17 Q 18 A 19 20 21	September 16th, is that correct, 2008? Yes. Okay. Back to Mr. Gleisner's question on Page 3, it's actually Page 2 of the report, it's Exhibit 7-003, the date of this report is at the top of the page. Can you cite that date? January 29th, 2009. Okay. With these dates in mind and the second paragraph down in Section 1.0, Introduction, second paragraph down, the second sentence from the bottom. I'm just going to read this again. "The roadway will generally follow an existing access trail that is cleared but not paved." This report, if I'm not mistaken, was prepared under the old alignment, is that correct, or do you know? I guess I'm not certain. Okay. It might have started that way, but then when we knew the alignment was going to be shifted, you know, obviously they went out and extended their boring deeper at a later date.
2 3 4 5 6 6 7 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 6 17 7 8 9 9 20 21 22	Q	I don't think he said that. MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'm just trying to I'm trying to cross and I'm trying to make sure that I have the right foundation. ALJ BOLDT: Is that what you testified to? MS. KAVANAUGH: Don't you think maybe you should ask him what he testified to? ALJ BOLDT: Wait. THE WITNESS: I think what I said was that the full depth excavation would have been too cost prohibitive and also would impact wetlands obviously more greatly and that we did and that's one of the reasons we went to the partial depth excavation on those. MR. GLEISNER: I'll defer to Mr. Meyer. MR. HARBECK: No, Mr. Gallo. MR. GLEISNER: Mr. Gallo. MS. CORRELL: Mr. Gallo gets a turn. MR. GALLO: Okay. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GALLO: Back to the GESTRA report which was Exhibit 7, I'm	3 Q 4 5 6 7 A 8 Q 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A 17 Q 18 A 19 20 21 22 Q	September 16th, is that correct, 2008? Yes. Okay. Back to Mr. Gleisner's question on Page 3, it's actually Page 2 of the report, it's Exhibit 7-003, the date of this report is at the top of the page. Can you cite that date? January 29th, 2009. Okay. With these dates in mind and the second paragraph down in Section 1.0, Introduction, second paragraph down, the second sentence from the bottom. I'm just going to read this again. "The roadway will generally follow an existing access trail that is cleared but not paved." This report, if I'm not mistaken, was prepared under the old alignment, is that correct, or do you know? I guess I'm not certain. Okay. It might have started that way, but then when we knew the alignment was going to be shifted, you know, obviously they went out and extended their boring deeper at a later date. Let's go to 7-017 again. You're familiar with
2 3 4 5 6 6 7 7 8 9 9 0 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 6 17 7 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q	I don't think he said that. MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'm just trying to I'm trying to cross and I'm trying to make sure that I have the right foundation. ALJ BOLDT: Is that what you testified to? MS. KAVANAUGH: Don't you think maybe you should ask him what he testified to? ALJ BOLDT: Wait. THE WITNESS: I think what I said was that the full depth excavation would have been too cost prohibitive and also would impact wetlands obviously more greatly and that we did and that's one of the reasons we went to the partial depth excavation on those. MR. GLEISNER: I'll defer to Mr. Meyer. MR. HARBECK: No, Mr. Gallo. MR. GLEISNER: Mr. Gallo. MS. CORRELL: Mr. Gallo gets a turn. MR. GALLO: Okay. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GALLO: Back to the GESTRA report which was Exhibit 7, I'm referring you to Soil Boring 4 and that's on Page 16	3 Q 4 5 6 7 A 8 Q 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A 17 Q 18 A 19 20 21 20 21 22 Q 23	September 16th, is that correct, 2008? Yes. Okay. Back to Mr. Gleisner's question on Page 3, it's actually Page 2 of the report, it's Exhibit 7-003, the date of this report is at the top of the page. Can you cite that date? January 29th, 2009. Okay. With these dates in mind and the second paragraph down in Section 1.0, Introduction, second paragraph down, the second sentence from the bottom. I'm just going to read this again. "The roadway will generally follow an existing access trail that is cleared but not paved." This report, if I'm not mistaken, was prepared under the old alignment, is that correct, or do you know? I guess I'm not certain. Okay. It might have started that way, but then when we knew the alignment was going to be shifted, you know, obviously they went out and extended their boring deeper at a later date. Let's go to 7-017 again. You're familiar with reading boring logs?
2 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q	<pre>I don't think he said that. MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'm just trying to I'm trying to cross and I'm trying to make sure that I have the right foundation. ALJ BOLDT: Is that what you testified to? MS. KAVANAUGH: Don't you think maybe you should ask him what he testified to? ALJ BOLDT: Wait. THE WITNESS: I think what I said was that the full depth excavation would have been too cost prohibitive and also would impact wetlands obviously more greatly and that we did and that's one of the reasons we went to the partial depth excavation on those. MR. GLEISNER: I'll defer to Mr. Meyer. MR. HARBECK: No, Mr. Gallo. MR. GLEISNER: Mr. Gallo. MS. CORRELL: Mr. Gallo gets a turn. MR. GALLO: Okay. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GALLO: Back to the GESTRA report which was Exhibit 7, I'm referring you to Soil Boring 4 and that's on Page 16 and 17 7-016 and 7-017. At the bottom of the page</pre>	3 Q 4 5 6 7 A 8 Q 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A 17 Q 18 A 19 20 21 20 21 22 Q 23 24 A	September 16th, is that correct, 2008? Yes. Okay. Back to Mr. Gleisner's question on Page 3, it's actually Page 2 of the report, it's Exhibit 7-003, the date of this report is at the top of the page. Can you cite that date? January 29th, 2009. Okay. With these dates in mind and the second paragraph down in Section 1.0, Introduction, second paragraph down, the second sentence from the bottom. I'm just going to read this again. "The roadway will generally follow an existing access trail that is cleared but not paved." This report, if I'm not mistaken, was prepared under the old alignment, is that correct, or do you know? I guess I'm not certain. Okay. It might have started that way, but then when we knew the alignment was going to be shifted, you know, obviously they went out and extended their boring deeper at a later date. Let's go to 7-017 again. You're familiar with reading boring logs? I know enough to be dangerous, I guess.
2 3 4 5 6 6 7 7 8 9 9 0 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 6 177 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q	I don't think he said that. MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'm just trying to I'm trying to cross and I'm trying to make sure that I have the right foundation. ALJ BOLDT: Is that what you testified to? MS. KAVANAUGH: Don't you think maybe you should ask him what he testified to? ALJ BOLDT: Wait. THE WITNESS: I think what I said was that the full depth excavation would have been too cost prohibitive and also would impact wetlands obviously more greatly and that we did and that's one of the reasons we went to the partial depth excavation on those. MR. GLEISNER: I'll defer to Mr. Meyer. MR. HARBECK: No, Mr. Gallo. MR. GLEISNER: Mr. Gallo. MS. CORRELL: Mr. Gallo gets a turn. MR. GALLO: Okay. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GALLO: Back to the GESTRA report which was Exhibit 7, I'm referring you to Soil Boring 4 and that's on Page 16	3 Q 4 5 6 7 A 8 Q 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A 17 Q 18 A 19 20 21 20 21 22 Q 23	September 16th, is that correct, 2008? Yes. Okay. Back to Mr. Gleisner's question on Page 3, it's actually Page 2 of the report, it's Exhibit 7-003, the date of this report is at the top of the page. Can you cite that date? January 29th, 2009. Okay. With these dates in mind and the second paragraph down in Section 1.0, Introduction, second paragraph down, the second sentence from the bottom. I'm just going to read this again. "The roadway will generally follow an existing access trail that is cleared but not paved." This report, if I'm not mistaken, was prepared under the old alignment, is that correct, or do you know? I guess I'm not certain. Okay. It might have started that way, but then when we knew the alignment was going to be shifted, you know, obviously they went out and extended their boring deeper at a later date. Let's go to 7-017 again. You're familiar with reading boring logs?
2 3 3 4 5 6 6 7 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 7 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q	<pre>I don't think he said that. MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'm just trying to I'm trying to cross and I'm trying to make sure that I have the right foundation. ALJ BOLDT: Is that what you testified to? MS. KAVANAUGH: Don't you think maybe you should ask him what he testified to? ALJ BOLDT: Wait. THE WITNESS: I think what I said was that the full depth excavation would have been too cost prohibitive and also would impact wetlands obviously more greatly and that we did and that's one of the reasons we went to the partial depth excavation on those. MR. GLEISNER: I'll defer to Mr. Meyer. MR. HARBECK: No, Mr. Gallo. MR. GLEISNER: Mr. Gallo. MS. CORRELL: Mr. Gallo gets a turn. MR. GALLO: Okay. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GALLO: Back to the GESTRA report which was Exhibit 7, I'm referring you to Soil Boring 4 and that's on Page 16 and 17 7-016 and 7-017. At the bottom of the page</pre>	3 Q 4 5 6 7 A 8 Q 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A 17 Q 18 A 19 20 21 20 21 22 Q 23 24 A	September 16th, is that correct, 2008? Yes. Okay. Back to Mr. Gleisner's question on Page 3, it's actually Page 2 of the report, it's Exhibit 7-003, the date of this report is at the top of the page. Can you cite that date? January 29th, 2009. Okay. With these dates in mind and the second paragraph down in Section 1.0, Introduction, second paragraph down, the second sentence from the bottom. I'm just going to read this again. "The roadway will generally follow an existing access trail that is cleared but not paved." This report, if I'm not mistaken, was prepared under the old alignment, is that correct, or do you know? I guess I'm not certain. Okay. It might have started that way, but then when we knew the alignment was going to be shifted, you know, obviously they went out and extended their boring deeper at a later date. Let's go to 7-017 again. You're familiar with reading boring logs? I know enough to be dangerous, I guess.
2 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q	<pre>I don't think he said that. MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'm just trying to I'm trying to cross and I'm trying to make sure that I have the right foundation. ALJ BOLDT: Is that what you testified to? MS. KAVANAUGH: Don't you think maybe you should ask him what he testified to? ALJ BOLDT: Wait. THE WITNESS: I think what I said was that the full depth excavation would have been too cost prohibitive and also would impact wetlands obviously more greatly and that we did and that's one of the reasons we went to the partial depth excavation on those. MR. GLEISNER: I'll defer to Mr. Meyer. MR. HARBECK: No, Mr. Gallo. MR. GLEISNER: Mr. Gallo. MS. CORRELL: Mr. Gallo gets a turn. MR. GALLO: Okay. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GALLO: Back to the GESTRA report which was Exhibit 7, I'm referring you to Soil Boring 4 and that's on Page 16 and 17 7-016 and 7-017. At the bottom of the page</pre>	3 Q 4 5 6 7 A 8 Q 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A 17 Q 18 A 19 20 21 20 21 22 Q 23 24 A	September 16th, is that correct, 2008? Yes. Okay. Back to Mr. Gleisner's question on Page 3, it's actually Page 2 of the report, it's Exhibit 7-003, the date of this report is at the top of the page. Can you cite that date? January 29th, 2009. Okay. With these dates in mind and the second paragraph down in Section 1.0, Introduction, second paragraph down, the second sentence from the bottom. I'm just going to read this again. "The roadway will generally follow an existing access trail that is cleared but not paved." This report, if I'm not mistaken, was prepared under the old alignment, is that correct, or do you know? I guess I'm not certain. Okay. It might have started that way, but then when we knew the alignment was going to be shifted, you know, obviously they went out and extended their boring deeper at a later date. Let's go to 7-017 again. You're familiar with reading boring logs? I know enough to be dangerous, I guess.
2 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q	<pre>I don't think he said that. MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'm just trying to I'm trying to cross and I'm trying to make sure that I have the right foundation. ALJ BOLDT: Is that what you testified to? MS. KAVANAUGH: Don't you think maybe you should ask him what he testified to? ALJ BOLDT: Wait. THE WITNESS: I think what I said was that the full depth excavation would have been too cost prohibitive and also would impact wetlands obviously more greatly and that we did and that's one of the reasons we went to the partial depth excavation on those. MR. GLEISNER: I'll defer to Mr. Meyer. MR. HARBECK: No, Mr. Gallo. MR. GLEISNER: Mr. Gallo. MS. CORRELL: Mr. Gallo gets a turn. MR. GALLO: Okay. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GALLO: Back to the GESTRA report which was Exhibit 7, I'm referring you to Soil Boring 4 and that's on Page 16 and 17 7-016 and 7-017. At the bottom of the page</pre>	3 Q 4 5 6 7 A 8 Q 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A 17 Q 18 A 19 20 21 20 21 22 Q 23 24 A	September 16th, is that correct, 2008? Yes. Okay. Back to Mr. Gleisner's question on Page 3, it's actually Page 2 of the report, it's Exhibit 7-003, the date of this report is at the top of the page. Can you cite that date? January 29th, 2009. Okay. With these dates in mind and the second paragraph down in Section 1.0, Introduction, second paragraph down, the second sentence from the bottom. I'm just going to read this again. "The roadway will generally follow an existing access trail that is cleared but not paved." This report, if I'm not mistaken, was prepared under the old alignment, is that correct, or do you know? I guess I'm not certain. Okay. It might have started that way, but then when we knew the alignment was going to be shifted, you know, obviously they went out and extended their boring deeper at a later date. Let's go to 7-017 again. You're familiar with reading boring logs? I know enough to be dangerous, I guess.
2 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q	I don't think he said that. MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'm just trying to I'm trying to cross and I'm trying to make sure that I have the right foundation. ALJ BOLDT: Is that what you testified to? MS. KAVANAUGH: Don't you think maybe you should ask him what he testified to? ALJ BOLDT: Wait. THE WITNESS: I think what I said was that the full depth excavation would have been too cost prohibitive and also would impact wetlands obviously more greatly and that we did and that's one of the reasons we went to the partial depth excavation on those. MR. GLEISNER: I'll defer to Mr. Meyer. MR. HARBECK: No, Mr. Gallo. MR. GLEISNER: Mr. Gallo. MR. GLEISNER: Mr. Gallo. MR. GALLO: Okay. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GALLO: Back to the GESTRA report which was Exhibit 7, I'm referring you to Soil Boring 4 and that's on Page 16 and 17 7-016 and 7-017. At the bottom of the page there's a drill date. I'm sorry, I'll wait until	3 Q 4 5 6 7 A 8 Q 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A 17 Q 18 A 19 20 21 20 21 22 Q 23 24 A	September 16th, is that correct, 2008? Yes. Okay. Back to Mr. Gleisner's question on Page 3, it's actually Page 2 of the report, it's Exhibit 7-003, the date of this report is at the top of the page. Can you cite that date? January 29th, 2009. Okay. With these dates in mind and the second paragraph down in Section 1.0, Introduction, second paragraph down, the second sentence from the bottom. I'm just going to read this again. "The roadway will generally follow an existing access trail that is cleared but not paved." This report, if I'm not mistaken, was prepared under the old alignment, is that correct, or do you know? I guess I'm not certain. Okay. It might have started that way, but then when we knew the alignment was going to be shifted, you know, obviously they went out and extended their boring deeper at a later date. Let's go to 7-017 again. You're familiar with reading boring logs? I know enough to be dangerous, I guess. Okay. Like the rest of us.

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SH	EET 45		
1 A 2 Q 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 A 11 12 Q 13 14 A 15 16 Q 17 18 19 20 A 21 Q 22 23 24 25 A	But I utilize these on all of our projects. If you look at the top three feet and I think you responded to Mr. Gleisner's comment his question was, was this boring located in the existing driveway. If you look at the zero to three foot in the description of soil, that's a description that would is it correct to say that that's a description that would reflect the existing driveway or do you have an opinion? I would believe it's in at least a portion of the roadway or the existing driveway, yeah. You're not aware of any borings that were conducted out in the wetland area? Just hand probes that were done, no nothing with large equipment. Okay. Are you aware and if you're not, that's okay. Are you aware of any compression test or triaxial tests that were run on soil samples taken from this Boring 4? I am not aware of any, no. Okay. And if you were designing a road into the wetland, as you most likely will be doing, would you want to do some additional borings in the wetland area? I guess I need to leave that up to my geotechnical	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 A 10 11 Q 12 A 13 14 15 16 17 18 Q 19 A 20 Q 21 A 22 23 24 Q 25	<pre>will eliminate settlement" and then about the center of the paragraph it says, "If the roadway is raised two feet it is likely to result in settlement that would be on the order of two to four inches." The concern that I have, and I'm asking if you have an opinion with regard to this, is this analysis based upon the alignment over the existing driveway as opposed to in the wetland? I guess I can't speak to the opinion of this paragraph. I understand. All I know is, you know, I've had discussions about what we're doing out there under this current scenario and he has addressed both the existing roadway and what we're doing with that versus the additional fill that we'll be incorporating over the wetland area. Do you have anything in writing to document that? I probably have some notes. There's no addendum though to this report? Well, there is an addendum, but I don't think it was for this area so, correct, there's no addendum for this specific Mr. Farrenkopf, were you present for the testimony of Don Reinbold and Paul Giese?</pre>
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 177		LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 179
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	<pre>expert. He knows what I'm building out there and Okay. That's fair. Thank you. You know, if it was a, you know, a heavier volume roadway, perhaps he would have said that we need to take or, you know, heavier loading. The concern I have is that in his conclusions in the GESTRA report on Page 6, Exhibit Number 7-007, if you can turn to that page Okay. at the the paragraph at the bottom, the second sentence, he says, "Neither approach shown will eliminate settlement." And then he estimates, "If the roadway is raised two feet the settlement will be on the order of two to four inches." MS. CORRELL: I'm sorry, What page? MR. GALLO: I'm sorry, Page 7-007. MS. CORRELL: Oh, not 6. Okay. MS. KAVANAUGH: Yeah, he said 6. Okay. Let me repeat that. MS. CORRELL: You said 6 I think 7-006. Okay. The bottom paragraph MS. CORRELL: Got it now. second sentence, there's some conclusions. These are additional comments. "Neither approach shown</pre>	1 A 2 Q 3 A 4 Q 5 A 6 Q 7 R 9 10 11 12 13 Q 14 15 16 177 18 A 19 Q 20 Q 21 A 22 Q 23 24 25 A	Yes. Okay. Do you have any dispute with their expertise? As far as their experience, no. Their expertise and qualifications? No, none at all. Thank you. When you're talking about the proof rolling test, what do you do if you have a significant failure with these geotextiles even in limited areas? MS. KAVANAUGH: Can you clarify significant failure? MR. GALLO: Okay. Can you describe for me you did mention that you would look at the degree of rutting. What happens when the dump truck gets stuck and it's really failing through more than rutting? Is that a failure? Would you consider that to be a failure? Correct. Yeah, as part of the proof rolling I'd consider that an area that we need to fix. And does that on occasion happen? Oh, sure. Okay. And when you're you know, with the geotextile, that certainly complicates the repair to some degree, is that correct? I would think say.
2 Q 3 A 4 5 6 Q 7 8 9 A 10 Q 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 Q 20 21 22 Q 23 24 Q	<pre>Okay. That's fair. Thank you. You know, if it was a, you know, a heavier volume roadway, perhaps he would have said that we need to take or, you know, heavier loading. The concern I have is that in his conclusions in the GESTRA report on Page 6, Exhibit Number 7-007, if you can turn to that page Okay. at the the paragraph at the bottom, the second sentence, he says, "Neither approach shown will eliminate settlement." And then he estimates, "If the roadway is raised two feet the settlement will be on the order of two to four inches." MS. CORRELL: I'm sorry, Page 7-007. MS. CORRELL: Oh, not 6. Okay. MS. KAVANAUGH: Yeah, he said 6. Okay. Let me repeat that. MS. CORRELL: You said 6 I think 7-006. Okay. The bottom paragraph MS. CORRELL: Got it now. second sentence, there's some conclusions. These</pre>	2 Q 3 A 4 Q 5 A 6 Q 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 Q 14 15 16 17 18 A 19 20 Q 21 A 22 Q 23 24	<pre>Okay. Do you have any dispute with their expertise? As far as their experience, no. Their expertise and qualifications? No, none at all. Thank you. When you're talking about the proof rolling test, what do you do if you have a significant failure with these geotextiles even in limited areas? MS. KAVANAUGH: Can you clarify significant failure? MR. GALLO: Okay. Can you describe for me you did mention that you would look at the degree of rutting. What happens when the dump truck gets stuck and it's really failing through more than rutting? Is that a failure? Would you consider that to be a failure? Correct. Yeah, as part of the proof rolling I'd consider that an area that we need to fix. And does that on occasion happen? Oh, sure. Okay. And when you're you know, with the geotextile, that certainly complicates the repair to some degree, is that correct?</pre>

SHEET 46	
1QYeah.Okay.2AI guess I've never had an area fail where they've3placed the geotextile fabric.The areas of failure4are prior to that.5Q5QAre you familiar with the difference between a truck6loading, which is my understanding is that would7drive the pavement design in the top courses and the8surcharge loading?9AI have limited experience in surcharge loading.10QSurcharge loading, as I'm referring to it, it would11be the depth of fill that they're talking about in12the GESTRA report that's two to three feet of13(inaudible) or suitable compactable materials, is14that your understanding as well?15AOkay.16MS. CORRELL:17of what some surcharge loading I don't recall18testimony from your expert regarding this.19MR. HARBECK:10MR. GALLO:11Yeah, GALLO:12MAR GALLO:13MAR it is.14MR. GALLO:15MAR GALLO:16MR. GALLO:17Assume that or asking him to agree that that's18MAR GALLO:19MR. GALLO:10MR. GALLO:10Assume that or asking him to agree that that's11MR. GALLO:12ALJ BOLDT:13No, the objection is overruled.	1 A Yes, I would imagine. MR. GALLO: No further questions. ALJ BOLDT: Thank you. Redirect? MS. CORRELL: Yes, just a couple questions. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Q I believe that we already covered this on direct, but since you were asked several questions on cross-examination regarding the soil boring B4 U h-huh. Q in your conversations with Doug Bath regarding the soil carrying capacity, was it your what was your understanding of why Mr. Bath did not recommend additional borings be done beyond that Boring B4? A Well, he indicated that he expects the soils through that portion of roadway between Station 20 and 25 to operate similarly as what he found in Boring B4. Our roadway fill heights and widening beyond the existing embankment would be consistent throughout that portion. He felt that the information he obtained in that boring was adequate considering the type of facility we're building and how that roadway is physically going to be placed out in that structure of the east/west section of the roadway. 25 Q And you discussed with Mr. Bath that some of the
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 181	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 183
1Is there a question pending?2MR. GALLO: Yeah, let me restate the3question. I want it to be clear.4QPart of the recommendation on how to construct this5roadway from the GESTRA report is to do a limited6excavation and backfill with suitable compacted7granular material. You know, I think your steps were8you do the limited excavation, do a geotextile so9that you wouldn't have contamination of the fill,10then you'd have two to three feet of suitable11granular compacted material, and that's what I'm12defining as the surcharge loading. Are you aware13that the surcharge loading drives the settlement14analysis?15A17massuming that GESTRA took the surcharge loading16into consideration for their settlement.17QQkay. But would it make a difference between the18surcharge loading in the wetlands of the new19alignment which does not have any timeframe of20compaction versus the existing driveway which I21believe is part of the GESTRA report that had many22yeas.23A24offerent or25QYes.	<pre>impacts would be located further into the wetland during your conversations?</pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 182	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 184

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 47	
<pre>one alternative that can be or one technique that can be used, but as far as ways, you know, recommended in his report, he hasn't altered that. And as you're MS. CORRELL: Strike that. Are your design plans identifying additional tools that will be implemented beyond the surcharge loading that Mr. Gallo just asked you about? A Well Well Which he defined as simply the excavation and the placement of the geotextile fabric? We'll also be incorporating the structural grid or the uni-axial and biaxial grid as part of to help carry the load of the roadway through that stretch. MR. MEYER: I have a clarification question. Is that what you referred to as the snowshoes? HE WITNESS: Yeah, the biaxial membrane or grid would create that snowshoe effect to help spread the load to control the settlement. MR. MEYER: Thank you for that clarification. ALJ BOLDT: Can I ask you a question? When we were looking at the soil boring and analysis of the soil types, there's not a category of</pre>	1MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. Let me just ask one2question then if it's okay, Judge. The one soil3boring showed no (inaudible) zero or none,4right, so and the Judge asked if there's5anything worse or lower than none, correct?6THE WITNESS: Not that I'm7MS. KAVANAUGH: So if he's assuming that8all the other soil is as bad as that soil would9there be a purpose to doing any more borings10just to establish that that soil was as bad as11all the rest of the soil?12MR. HARBECK: I object both on leading and13foundation. She's asking what someone else may14or may not be assuming so15MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. Well16MS. CORRELL: However17ALJ BOLDT: I think he already answered the18question.19MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay.20ALJ BOLDT: Any other questions? We do21have a number of other witnesses.22MR. MEYER: I don't want to muck this up23anymore.
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 185	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 187
1 1	
1less than none in terms of carrying capacity, is2there?3THE WITNESS: Not that I'm aware of.4ALJ BOLDT: So if he was operating on the5assumption that that same soil type of no6carrying capacity continued on, would that be a7reasonable judgment to make from an engineering8standpoint?9THE WITNESS: You know, again, I'm10deferring to his expertise and he has the11mapping available as well as the boring he took12so I'm assuming that's a safe judgment.13ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Any other questions of14this witness?15MS. CORRELL: Yeah.16Q17conversations with Mr. Bath18MS. CORRELL: Strike that.19Q19In your conversations with Mr. Bath in preparation20for hearing today that he assumed worst case scenario21in terms of not conducting additional soil22MR. HARBECK: Objection, leading.23MS. CORRELL: Sure.	1MR. HARBECK: Pun intended? CROSS-EXAMINATION3BY MR. MEYER: Q4Q9There was in the east/west stretch there are going to be four culverts placed and they're eight-inch culverts?7A7A8Q9To your knowledge, how many culverts are there now and what is their diameter?10A11the east/west stretch to my knowledge there is one and I believe it's about an 18-inch culvert, but it's partially buried too. So it may not be acting as an 18-inch culvert but I believe it's an 18-inch culvert.15Q16MR. MEYER: That's all. ALJ BOLDT: Does anybody else have any questions?19MR. GALLO: One quick one. ALJ BOLDT: Mr. Gallo. RECROSS-EXAMINATION20I'm going to ask MR. HARBECK: Before you ask that, can we just have 30 seconds?
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 186	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 188

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

_	SHEET 48	
1	ALJ BOLDT: Sure.	1 ALJ BOLDT: Overruled. If you can answer
	Q Two quick questions.	2 it, answer it.
3	<pre>A Okay. Q Do you have any experience and were you on the drill</pre>	3 A Well, I thought we talked about this, but I might be 4 mixing it up.
4 5	rig when they did the drilling and sampling and do	5 ALJ BOLDT: Maybe Mr. Gallo does repeat
6	you have any personal experience with the analysis of	6 himself.
7	soils?	7 A I think what we talked about is I quess settlement on
8		8 the existing roadway versus settlement of a new
9	out there. It's not it's not in my area of	9 roadway further into the wetland and those there
10	expertise, absolutely.	10 would be differences in the settlement, but with my
11	Q You're relying entirely upon the expertise of the	11 discussions with Mr. Bath, that's why we're
12	geotechnical engineer?	12 introducing the geo-grid, the reinforcement grid, for
13	MS. CORRELL: Objection.	13 the area that's filled into the wetland or the
14		14 portion of the roadway that's filled in the wetland.
15	ALJ BOLDT: She didn't state an objection	15 MR. MEYER: And can I clarify? That's the 16 difference
16 17	other than saying objection so go ahead and answer it.	<pre>16 difference 17 ALJ BOLDT: So whatever the soil type, it</pre>
18		18 would have the same engineering solution in
19	parameters and what type of roadway section is built,	19 terms of building a roadway, is that a fair
20	I base my soils-related functions on the geotechnical	20 understanding of what you just said? I mean the
21	report that's submitted to me. I mean, obviously,	21 potential difference between the existing
22	I've done this for 24 years and I'm familiar with the	22 roadway and the wetland area?
23	soil reports and the variety of soils that are out	23 THE WITNESS: As far as adding the
24	there, but when it comes to designing the roadway and	24 reinforcing grid, we would we're going to be
25	what I use to design it, I rely on what's given to me	25 excavating that existing roadway base or the
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES
	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI
	189	191
1	in the geotechnical report.	1 existing core down to at least our subgrade
	Q Okay. From your knowledge and experience as a civil	2 because we have to introduce the new gravel and
3	Q Okay. From your knowledge and experience as a civil engineer, there's been discussion and questions	2 because we have to introduce the new gravel and 3 asphalt and then so we would most likely be
3 4	Q Okay. From your knowledge and experience as a civil engineer, there's been discussion and questions regarding this Boring B4 and one of the DNR attorneys	 because we have to introduce the new gravel and asphalt and then so we would most likely be running that geotextile reinforcing grid right
3	Q Okay. From your knowledge and experience as a civil engineer, there's been discussion and questions regarding this Boring B4 and one of the DNR attorneys asked whether or not if Boring 4 would be essentially	 because we have to introduce the new gravel and asphalt and then so we would most likely be running that geotextile reinforcing grid right across that existing roadway core as well.
3 4 5	Q Okay. From your knowledge and experience as a civil engineer, there's been discussion and questions regarding this Boring B4 and one of the DNR attorneys asked whether or not if Boring 4 would be essentially the same as a boring out in the wetlands. She was	 because we have to introduce the new gravel and asphalt and then so we would most likely be running that geotextile reinforcing grid right
3 4 5 6	Q Okay. From your knowledge and experience as a civil engineer, there's been discussion and questions regarding this Boring B4 and one of the DNR attorneys asked whether or not if Boring 4 would be essentially	 because we have to introduce the new gravel and asphalt and then so we would most likely be running that geotextile reinforcing grid right across that existing roadway core as well. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Was there another
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q Okay. From your knowledge and experience as a civil engineer, there's been discussion and questions regarding this Boring B4 and one of the DNR attorneys asked whether or not if Boring 4 would be essentially the same as a boring out in the wetlands. She was making a point that there would be no need to do additional borings. My question to you is that Boring 4, with the surcharge loading for a number of	 because we have to introduce the new gravel and asphalt and then so we would most likely be running that geotextile reinforcing grid right across that existing roadway core as well. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Was there another question? MR. MEYER: I just want to clarify. This geotechnical cloth (inaudible) geotechnical
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q Okay. From your knowledge and experience as a civil engineer, there's been discussion and questions regarding this Boring B4 and one of the DNR attorneys asked whether or not if Boring 4 would be essentially the same as a boring out in the wetlands. She was making a point that there would be no need to do additional borings. My question to you is that Boring 4, with the surcharge loading for a number of years, is that significantly different than a boring	2 because we have to introduce the new gravel and 3 asphalt and then so we would most likely be 4 running that geotextile reinforcing grid right 5 across that existing roadway core as well. 6 ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Was there another 7 question? 8 MR. MEYER: I just want to clarify. This 9 geotechnical cloth (inaudible) geotechnical 10 grid, those are two different steps and two
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q Okay. From your knowledge and experience as a civil engineer, there's been discussion and questions regarding this Boring B4 and one of the DNR attorneys asked whether or not if Boring 4 would be essentially the same as a boring out in the wetlands. She was making a point that there would be no need to do additional borings. My question to you is that Boring 4, with the surcharge loading for a number of years, is that significantly different than a boring that would be located in the wetland without any	2 because we have to introduce the new gravel and 3 asphalt and then so we would most likely be 4 running that geotextile reinforcing grid right 5 across that existing roadway core as well. 6 ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Was there another 7 question? 8 MR. MEYER: I just want to clarify. This 9 geotechnical cloth (inaudible) geotechnical 10 grid, those are two different steps and two 11 different components, is that correct?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q Okay. From your knowledge and experience as a civil engineer, there's been discussion and questions regarding this Boring B4 and one of the DNR attorneys asked whether or not if Boring 4 would be essentially the same as a boring out in the wetlands. She was making a point that there would be no need to do additional borings. My question to you is that Boring 4, with the surcharge loading for a number of years, is that significantly different than a boring that would be located in the wetland without any surcharge?	2 because we have to introduce the new gravel and 3 asphalt and then so we would most likely be 4 running that geotextile reinforcing grid right 5 across that existing roadway core as well. 6 ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Was there another 7 question? 8 MR. MEYER: I just want to clarify. This 9 geotechnical cloth (inaudible) geotechnical 10 grid, those are two different steps and two 11 different components, is that correct? 12 THE WITNESS: Yeah yes.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q Okay. From your knowledge and experience as a civil engineer, there's been discussion and questions regarding this Boring B4 and one of the DNR attorneys asked whether or not if Boring 4 would be essentially the same as a boring out in the wetlands. She was making a point that there would be no need to do additional borings. My question to you is that Boring 4, with the surcharge loading for a number of years, is that significantly different than a boring that would be located in the wetland without any surcharge? MS. KAVANAUGH: It's sort of vague. I	2 because we have to introduce the new gravel and asphalt and then so we would most likely be running that geotextile reinforcing grid right across that existing roadway core as well. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Was there another question? MR. MEYER: I just want to clarify. This geotechnical cloth (inaudible) geotechnical grid, those are two different steps and two different components, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yeah yes. MR. MEYER: Thank you.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q Okay. From your knowledge and experience as a civil engineer, there's been discussion and questions regarding this Boring B4 and one of the DNR attorneys asked whether or not if Boring 4 would be essentially the same as a boring out in the wetlands. She was making a point that there would be no need to do additional borings. My question to you is that Boring 4, with the surcharge loading for a number of years, is that significantly different than a boring that would be located in the wetland without any surcharge? MS. KAVANAUGH: It's sort of vague. I guess I'd object. You know, different in what	because we have to introduce the new gravel and asphalt and then so we would most likely be running that geotextile reinforcing grid right across that existing roadway core as well. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Was there another question? MR. MEYER: I just want to clarify. This geotechnical cloth (inaudible) geotechnical grid, those are two different steps and two different components, is that correct? HE WITNESS: Yeah yes. MR. MEYER: Thank you. MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q Okay. From your knowledge and experience as a civil engineer, there's been discussion and questions regarding this Boring B4 and one of the DNR attorneys asked whether or not if Boring 4 would be essentially the same as a boring out in the wetlands. She was making a point that there would be no need to do additional borings. My question to you is that Boring 4, with the surcharge loading for a number of years, is that significantly different than a boring that would be located in the wetland without any surcharge? MS. KAVANAUGH: It's sort of vague. I	2 because we have to introduce the new gravel and 3 asphalt and then so we would most likely be 4 running that geotextile reinforcing grid right 5 across that existing roadway core as well. 6 ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Was there another 7 question? 8 MR. MEYER: I just want to clarify. This 9 geotechnical cloth (inaudible) geotechnical 10 grid, those are two different steps and two 11 different components, is that correct? 12 THE WITNESS: Yeah yes. 13 MR. MEYER: Thank you. 14 MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q Okay. From your knowledge and experience as a civil engineer, there's been discussion and questions regarding this Boring B4 and one of the DNR attorneys asked whether or not if Boring 4 would be essentially the same as a boring out in the wetlands. She was making a point that there would be no need to do additional borings. My question to you is that Boring 4, with the surcharge loading for a number of years, is that significantly different than a boring that would be located in the wetland without any surcharge? MS. KAVANAUGH: It's sort of vague. I guess I'd object. You know, different in what way and I don't think I think the question	 because we have to introduce the new gravel and asphalt and then so we would most likely be running that geotextile reinforcing grid right across that existing roadway core as well. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Was there another question? MR. MEYER: I just want to clarify. This geotechnical cloth (inaudible) geotechnical grid, those are two different steps and two different components, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yeah yes. MR. MEYER: Thank you. MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor? ALJ BOLDT: Yes. MR. GLEISNER: I just have a couple questions based on what has just been testified
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q Okay. From your knowledge and experience as a civil engineer, there's been discussion and questions regarding this Boring B4 and one of the DNR attorneys asked whether or not if Boring 4 would be essentially the same as a boring out in the wetlands. She was making a point that there would be no need to do additional borings. My question to you is that Boring 4, with the surcharge loading for a number of years, is that significantly different than a boring that would be located in the wetland without any surcharge? MS. KAVANAUGH: It's sort of vague. I guess I'd object. You know, different in what way and I don't think I think the question was, you know, if the soil was as bad or something and it wasn't answered because it was objected to.	because we have to introduce the new gravel and asphalt and then so we would most likely be running that geotextile reinforcing grid right across that existing roadway core as well. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Was there another question? MR. MEYER: I just want to clarify. This geotechnical cloth (inaudible) geotechnical grid, those are two different steps and two different components, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yeah yes. MR. MEYER: Thank you. MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor? ALJ BOLDT: Yes. MR. GLEISNER: I just have a couple questions based on what has just been testified to.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q Okay. From your knowledge and experience as a civil engineer, there's been discussion and questions regarding this Boring B4 and one of the DNR attorneys asked whether or not if Boring 4 would be essentially the same as a boring out in the wetlands. She was making a point that there would be no need to do additional borings. My question to you is that Boring 4, with the surcharge loading for a number of years, is that significantly different than a boring that would be located in the wetland without any surcharge? MS. KAVANAUGH: It's sort of vague. I guess I'd object. You know, different in what way and I don't think I think the question was, you know, if the soil was as bad or something and it wasn't answered because it was objected to.	 because we have to introduce the new gravel and asphalt and then so we would most likely be running that geotextile reinforcing grid right across that existing roadway core as well. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Was there another question? MR. MEYER: I just want to clarify. This geotechnical cloth (inaudible) geotechnical grid, those are two different steps and two different components, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yeah yes. MR. MEYER: Thank you. MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor? ALJ BOLDT: Yes. MR. GLEISNER: I just have a couple questions based on what has just been testified to. RECROSS-EXAMINATION
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q Okay. From your knowledge and experience as a civil engineer, there's been discussion and questions regarding this Boring B4 and one of the DNR attorneys asked whether or not if Boring 4 would be essentially the same as a boring out in the wetlands. She was making a point that there would be no need to do additional borings. My question to you is that Boring 4, with the surcharge loading for a number of years, is that significantly different than a boring that would be located in the wetland without any surcharge? MS. KAVANAUGH: It's sort of vague. I guess I'd object. You know, different in what way and I don't think I think the question was, you know, if the soil was as bad or something and it wasn't answered because it was objected to.	2because we have to introduce the new gravel and asphalt and then so we would most likely be running that geotextile reinforcing grid right across that existing roadway core as well.6ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Was there another question?7question?8MR. MEYER: I just want to clarify. This geotechnical cloth (inaudible) geotechnical lo grid, those are two different steps and two different components, is that correct?10grid, those are two different steps and two different components, is that correct?12THE WITNESS: Yeah yes.13MR. MEYER: Thank you.14MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor?15ALJ BOLDT: Yes.16MR. GLEISNER: I just have a couple17questions based on what has just been testified to.18to.20BY MR. GLEISNER:
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q Okay. From your knowledge and experience as a civil engineer, there's been discussion and questions regarding this Boring B4 and one of the DNR attorneys asked whether or not if Boring 4 would be essentially the same as a boring out in the wetlands. She was making a point that there would be no need to do additional borings. My question to you is that Boring 4, with the surcharge loading for a number of years, is that significantly different than a boring that would be located in the wetland without any surcharge? MS. KAVANAUGH: It's sort of vague. I guess I'd object. You know, different in what way and I don't think I think the question was, you know, if the soil was as bad or something and it wasn't answered because it was objected to. Q With the surcharge in Boring 4, the lower soils, the muck, would experience compression over time. Would the soil characteristics be different in a boring	because we have to introduce the new gravel and asphalt and then so we would most likely be running that geotextile reinforcing grid right across that existing roadway core as well. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Was there another question? MR. MEYER: I just want to clarify. This geotechnical cloth (inaudible) geotechnical grid, those are two different steps and two different components, is that correct? HE WITNESS: Yeah yes. MR. MEYER: Thank you. MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor? ALJ BOLDT: Yes. MR. GLEISNER: I just have a couple questions based on what has just been testified to. MR. GLEISNER: Q What's a land bridge, sir?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q Okay. From your knowledge and experience as a civil engineer, there's been discussion and questions regarding this Boring B4 and one of the DNR attorneys asked whether or not if Boring 4 would be essentially the same as a boring out in the wetlands. She was making a point that there would be no need to do additional borings. My question to you is that Boring 4, with the surcharge loading for a number of years, is that significantly different than a boring that would be located in the wetland without any surcharge? MS. KAVANAUGH: It's sort of vague. I guess I'd object. You know, different in what way and I don't think I think the question was, you know, if the soil was as bad or something and it wasn't answered because it was objected to. Q With the surcharge in Boring 4, the lower soils, the muck, would experience compression over time. Would the soil characteristics be different in a boring located within the wetlands that did not experience	2because we have to introduce the new gravel and asphalt and then so we would most likely be running that geotextile reinforcing grid right across that existing roadway core as well.6ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Was there another question?7question?8MR. MEYER: I just want to clarify. This geotechnical cloth (inaudible) geotechnical lo grid, those are two different steps and two different components, is that correct?10grid, those are two different steps and two different components, is that correct?12THE WITNESS: Yeah yes.13MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor?14MR. GLEISNER: I just have a couple questions based on what has just been testified to.19RECROSS-EXAMINATION20BY MR. GLEISNER:21Q22A land bridge, sir?23A land bridge?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q Okay. From your knowledge and experience as a civil engineer, there's been discussion and questions regarding this Boring B4 and one of the DNR attorneys asked whether or not if Boring 4 would be essentially the same as a boring out in the wetlands. She was making a point that there would be no need to do additional borings. My question to you is that Boring 4, with the surcharge loading for a number of years, is that significantly different than a boring that would be located in the wetland without any surcharge? MS. KAVANAUGH: It's sort of vague. I guess I'd object. You know, different in what way and I don't think I think the question was, you know, if the soil was as bad or something and it wasn't answered because it was objected to. Q With the surcharge in Boring 4, the lower soils, the muck, would experience compression over time. Would the soil characteristics be different in a boring located within the wetlands that did not experience any surcharge?	because we have to introduce the new gravel and asphalt and then so we would most likely be running that geotextile reinforcing grid right across that existing roadway core as well. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Was there another question? MR. MEYER: I just want to clarify. This geotechnical cloth (inaudible) geotechnical grid, those are two different steps and two different components, is that correct? HE WITNESS: Yeah yes. MR. MEYER: Thank you. MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor? ALJ BOLDT: Yes. MR. GLEISNER: I just have a couple questions based on what has just been testified to. MR. GLEISNER: Q What's a land bridge, sir? Q Yes.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q Okay. From your knowledge and experience as a civil engineer, there's been discussion and questions regarding this Boring B4 and one of the DNR attorneys asked whether or not if Boring 4 would be essentially the same as a boring out in the wetlands. She was making a point that there would be no need to do additional borings. My question to you is that Boring 4, with the surcharge loading for a number of years, is that significantly different than a boring that would be located in the wetland without any surcharge? MS. KAVANAUGH: It's sort of vague. I guess I'd object. You know, different in what way and I don't think I think the question was, you know, if the soil was as bad or something and it wasn't answered because it was objected to. Q With the surcharge in Boring 4, the lower soils, the muck, would experience compression over time. Would the soil characteristics be different in a boring located within the wetlands that did not experience	2because we have to introduce the new gravel and asphalt and then so we would most likely be running that geotextile reinforcing grid right across that existing roadway core as well.6ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Was there another question?7question?8MR. MEYER: I just want to clarify. This geotechnical cloth (inaudible) geotechnical lo grid, those are two different steps and two different components, is that correct?10grid, those are two different steps and two different components, is that correct?12THE WITNESS: Yeah yes.13MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor?14MR. GLEISNER: I just have a couple questions based on what has just been testified to.19RECROSS-EXAMINATION20BY MR. GLEISNER:21Q22A land bridge, sir?23A land bridge?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q Okay. From your knowledge and experience as a civil engineer, there's been discussion and questions regarding this Boring B4 and one of the DNR attorneys asked whether or not if Boring 4 would be essentially the same as a boring out in the wetlands. She was making a point that there would be no need to do additional borings. My question to you is that Boring 4, with the surcharge loading for a number of years, is that significantly different than a boring that would be located in the wetland without any surcharge? MS. KAVANAUGH: It's sort of vague. I guess I'd object. You know, different in what way and I don't think I think the question was, you know, if the soil was as bad or something and it wasn't answered because it was objected to. Q With the surcharge in Boring 4, the lower soils, the muck, would experience compression over time. Would the soil characteristics be different in a boring located within the wetlands that did not experience any surcharge?	2because we have to introduce the new gravel and asphalt and then so we would most likely be running that geotextile reinforcing grid right across that existing roadway core as well.6ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Was there another question?7guestion?8MR. MEYER: I just want to clarify. This geotechnical cloth (inaudible) geotechnical lo grid, those are two different steps and two different components, is that correct?10grid, those are two different steps and two different components, is that correct?12THE WITNESS: Yeah yes.13MR. MEYER: Thank you.14MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor?15ALJ BOLDT: Yes.16MR. GLEISNER: I just have a couple questions based on what has just been testified to.19RECROSS-EXAMINATION20BY MR. GLEISNER:21Q22A land bridge?23Q24MS. CORRELL: Objection, relevance.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q Okay. From your knowledge and experience as a civil engineer, there's been discussion and questions regarding this Boring B4 and one of the DNR attorneys asked whether or not if Boring 4 would be essentially the same as a boring out in the wetlands. She was making a point that there would be no need to do additional borings. My question to you is that Boring 4, with the surcharge loading for a number of years, is that significantly different than a boring that would be located in the wetland without any surcharge? MS. KAVANAUGH: It's sort of vague. I guess I'd object. You know, different in what way and I don't think I think the question was, you know, if the soil was as bad or something and it wasn't answered because it was objected to. Q With the surcharge in Boring 4, the lower soils, the muck, would experience compression over time. Would the soil characteristics be different in a boring located within the wetlands that did not experience any surcharge?	2because we have to introduce the new gravel and asphalt and then so we would most likely be running that geotextile reinforcing grid right across that existing roadway core as well.6ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Was there another question?7guestion?8MR. MEYER: I just want to clarify. This geotechnical cloth (inaudible) geotechnical lo grid, those are two different steps and two different components, is that correct?10grid, those are two different steps and two different components, is that correct?12THE WITNESS: Yeah yes.13MR. MEYER: Thank you.14MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor?15ALJ BOLDT: Yes.16MR. GLEISNER: I just have a couple questions based on what has just been testified to.19RECROSS-EXAMINATION20BY MR. GLEISNER:21Q22A land bridge?23Q24MS. CORRELL: Objection, relevance.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q Okay. From your knowledge and experience as a civil engineer, there's been discussion and questions regarding this Boring B4 and one of the DNR attorneys asked whether or not if Boring 4 would be essentially the same as a boring out in the wetlands. She was making a point that there would be no need to do additional borings. My question to you is that Boring 4, with the surcharge loading for a number of years, is that significantly different than a boring that would be located in the wetland without any surcharge? MS. KAVANAUGH: It's sort of vague. I guess I'd object. You know, different in what way and I don't think I think the question was, you know, if the soil was as bad or something and it wasn't answered because it was objected to. Q With the surcharge in Boring 4, the lower soils, the muck, would experience compression over time. Would the soil characteristics be different in a boring located within the wetlands that did not experience any surcharge?	2because we have to introduce the new gravel and asphalt and then so we would most likely be running that geotextile reinforcing grid right across that existing roadway core as well.6ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Was there another question?7guestion?8MR. MEYER: I just want to clarify. This geotechnical cloth (inaudible) geotechnical lo grid, those are two different steps and two different components, is that correct?10grid, those are two different steps and two different components, is that correct?12THE WITNESS: Yeah yes.13MR. MEYER: Thank you.14MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor?15ALJ BOLDT: Yes.16MR. GLEISNER: I just have a couple questions based on what has just been testified to.19RECROSS-EXAMINATION20BY MR. GLEISNER:21Q22A land bridge?23Q24MS. CORRELL: Objection, relevance.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q Okay. From your knowledge and experience as a civil engineer, there's been discussion and questions regarding this Boring B4 and one of the DNR attorneys asked whether or not if Boring 4 would be essentially the same as a boring out in the wetlands. She was making a point that there would be no need to do additional borings. My question to you is that Boring 4, with the surcharge loading for a number of years, is that significantly different than a boring that would be located in the wetland without any surcharge? MS. KAVANAUGH: It's sort of vague. I guess I'd object. You know, different in what way and I don't think I think the question was, you know, if the soil was as bad or something and it wasn't answered because it was objected to. Q With the surcharge in Boring 4, the lower soils, the muck, would experience compression over time. Would the soil characteristics be different in a boring located within the wetlands that did not experience any surcharge? MS. CORRELL: Objection, calls for speculation. 	2because we have to introduce the new gravel and asphalt and then so we would most likely be running that geotextile reinforcing grid right across that existing roadway core as well. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Was there another question? MR. MEYER: I just want to clarify. This geotechnical cloth (inaudible) geotechnical grid, those are two different steps and two different components, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yeah yes. MR. MEYER: Thank you. MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor? ALJ BOLDT: Yes. MR. GLEISNER: I just have a couple questions based on what has just been testified to. MR. GLEISNER: Q What's a land bridge, sir? A land bridge? Q Yes.2MS. CORRELL: Objection, relevance. MR. GLEISNER: Okay. Let's do a
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q Okay. From your knowledge and experience as a civil engineer, there's been discussion and questions regarding this Boring B4 and one of the DNR attorneys asked whether or not if Boring 4 would be essentially the same as a boring out in the wetlands. She was making a point that there would be no need to do additional borings. My question to you is that Boring 4, with the surcharge loading for a number of years, is that significantly different than a boring that would be located in the wetland without any surcharge? MS. KAVANAUGH: It's sort of vague. I guess I'd object. You know, different in what way and I don't think I think the question was, you know, if the soil was as bad or something and it wasn't answered because it was objected to. Q With the surcharge in Boring 4, the lower soils, the muck, would experience compression over time. Would the soil characteristics be different in a boring located within the wetlands that did not experience any surcharge? MS. CORRELL: Objection, calls for speculation. 	2because we have to introduce the new gravel and asphalt and then so we would most likely be running that geotextile reinforcing grid right across that existing roadway core as well.6ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Was there another question?7question?8MR. MEYER: I just want to clarify. This geotechnical cloth (inaudible) geotechnical grid, those are two different steps and two different components, is that correct?10grid, those are two different steps and two different components, is that correct?11different components, is that correct?12THE WITNESS: Yeah yes.13MR. MEYER: Thank you.14MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor?15ALJ BOLDT: Yes.16MR. GLEISNER: I just have a couple17questions based on what has just been testified to.19RECROSS-EXAMINATION20BY MR. GLEISNER:21Q Yes.22A land bridge?23Q Yes.24MS. CORRELL: Objection, relevance.25MR. GLEISNER: Okay. Let's do aLEGAL VIDEO SERVICES
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q Okay. From your knowledge and experience as a civil engineer, there's been discussion and questions regarding this Boring B4 and one of the DNR attorneys asked whether or not if Boring 4 would be essentially the same as a boring out in the wetlands. She was making a point that there would be no need to do additional borings. My question to you is that Boring 4, with the surcharge loading for a number of years, is that significantly different than a boring that would be located in the wetland without any surcharge? MS. KAVANAUGH: It's sort of vague. I guess I'd object. You know, different in what way and I don't think I think the question was, you know, if the soil was as bad or something and it wasn't answered because it was objected to. Q With the surcharge in Boring 4, the lower soils, the muck, would experience compression over time. Would the soil characteristics be different in a boring located within the wetlands that did not experience any surcharge? MS. CORRELL: Objection, calls for speculation. 	2because we have to introduce the new gravel and asphalt and then so we would most likely be running that geotextile reinforcing grid right across that existing roadway core as well. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Was there another question? MR. MEYER: I just want to clarify. This geotechnical cloth (inaudible) geotechnical grid, those are two different steps and two different components, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yeah yes. MR. MEYER: Thank you. MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor? ALJ BOLDT: Yes. MR. GLEISNER: I just have a couple questions based on what has just been testified to. MR. GLEISNER: Q What's a land bridge, sir? A land bridge? Q Yes.24MS. CORRELL: Objection, relevance. MR. GLEISNER: Okay. Let's do a

1	SHE	EET 49		
	0	foundation.	1	order for the road to not fail, did he?
2	Q	If the geotechnical	2 A	I don't recall seeing anything.
3 4	0	MR. GLEISNER: Strike that.	3 Q 4	And did you reach an opinion within a reasonable degree of professional certainty regarding the design
4 5	Q	Could the geotechnical fail if the soil was sufficiently lacking in support capabilities?	4 5	characteristics that will be incorporated in the
6		MR. MEYER: Well, we just clarified there's	6	final plans that you will be able to build a sound
7		two geotechnicals. Counsel, which one are you	7	road for the DNR public boating access site?
8		referring to?	8	HARBECK: Objection to the form of the
9		MR. GLEISNER: I guess I'm going to ask	9	question, it's leading and he hasn't ever said
10		with regard to both of them.	10	exactly the words that she just tried to put in
	Q	Is there a potential for either of them to fail if	11	his mouth.
12	~	the soil support is sufficiently lacking? Do you	12	MS. CORRELL: I asked a question, does he
13		understand the question?	13	have an opinion.
14	А	I suppose there is always that potential. You know,	14	ALJ BOLDT: No, no, she's asking if he had
15		it's happened. I don't know if there was geo-grid	15	a the objection is overruled. Does he have
16		involved or not, but I know there's been failures.	16	an opinion I think
17	Q	And if there were a failure would a land bridge	17 Q	And what is that opinion?
18	_	become an option?	18	ALJ BOLDT: Well, he didn't did you say
19		Are you talking something structural	19	you have an opinion?
20		Yes.	20	MS. CORRELL: Oh, sorry.
21 22	А	on piers? That's an option, you know, not from a cost standpoint, but obviously	21 22	ALJ BOLDT: Do you have an opinion on that
22 23		MR. GLEISNER: No other questions, Your	22	question that she just asked you? MS. CORRELL: I can restate the question.
24		Honor.	24	THE WITNESS: Could you restate the
25	A	there's still some wetland impacts associated	25	question? I'm sorry.
		····· · · ····· · ·····		1
		LECAL VIDEO CEDUICEO		I DONI WINDO ODDUTODO
		LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI		LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI
		193		(000) 275-5255 FFAILLE du Sac WI 195
1				
		with that if we were to build it in this same	1 Q	Have you formed an opinion within a reasonable degree
2		alignment.	2	of professional certainty whether the public access
3		alignment. MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Judge.	2 3	of professional certainty whether the public access road as designed in its final plans will meet sound
3 4		alignment. MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Judge. MS. CORRELL: I have two other questions	2 3 4	of professional certainty whether the public access road as designed in its final plans will meet sound engineering practices?
3 4 5		alignment. MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Judge. MS. CORRELL: I have two other questions elicited from these questions.	2 3 4 5 A	of professional certainty whether the public access road as designed in its final plans will meet sound engineering practices? I believe it will and also based on the
3 4 5 6		alignment. MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Judge. MS. CORRELL: I have two other questions elicited from these questions. REDIRECT EXAMINATION	2 3 4	of professional certainty whether the public access road as designed in its final plans will meet sound engineering practices? I believe it will and also based on the recommendations from the geotechnical expert.
3 4 5 6 7	0	alignment. MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Judge. MS. CORRELL: I have two other questions elicited from these questions. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL:	2 3 4 5 A	of professional certainty whether the public access road as designed in its final plans will meet sound engineering practices? I believe it will and also based on the recommendations from the geotechnical expert. ALJ BOLDT: I'm sorry, so you do have an
3 4 5 6 7 8	Q	alignment. MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Judge. MS. CORRELL: I have two other questions elicited from these questions. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Number one is have you reviewed or received any	2 3 4 5 A 6 7 8	of professional certainty whether the public access road as designed in its final plans will meet sound engineering practices? I believe it will and also based on the recommendations from the geotechnical expert. ALJ BOLDT: I'm sorry, so you do have an opinion and your opinion is that yes, you can?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q	alignment. MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Judge. MS. CORRELL: I have two other questions elicited from these questions. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Number one is have you reviewed or received any competing recommendations in terms of the soils	2 3 4 5 A 6 7 8 9	of professional certainty whether the public access road as designed in its final plans will meet sound engineering practices? I believe it will and also based on the recommendations from the geotechnical expert. ALJ BOLDT: I'm sorry, so you do have an opinion and your opinion is that yes, you can? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
3 4 5 6 7 8	Q	alignment. MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Judge. MS. CORRELL: I have two other questions elicited from these questions. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Number one is have you reviewed or received any competing recommendations in terms of the soils analysis and recommendations that should be followed	2 3 4 5 A 6 7 8	of professional certainty whether the public access road as designed in its final plans will meet sound engineering practices? I believe it will and also based on the recommendations from the geotechnical expert. ALJ BOLDT: I'm sorry, so you do have an opinion and your opinion is that yes, you can? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. ALJ BOLDT: Is that you said believe and
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q	alignment. MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Judge. MS. CORRELL: I have two other questions elicited from these questions. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Number one is have you reviewed or received any competing recommendations in terms of the soils	2 3 4 5 8 9 10 11 12	of professional certainty whether the public access road as designed in its final plans will meet sound engineering practices? I believe it will and also based on the recommendations from the geotechnical expert. ALJ BOLDT: I'm sorry, so you do have an opinion and your opinion is that yes, you can? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		alignment. MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Judge. MS. CORRELL: I have two other questions elicited from these questions. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Number one is have you reviewed or received any competing recommendations in terms of the soils analysis and recommendations that should be followed for this project site competing to the GESTRA report? I guess what I've heard during the hearing. So I guess just take that one step further. I	2 3 4 5 8 9 10 11 12 13	of professional certainty whether the public access road as designed in its final plans will meet sound engineering practices? I believe it will and also based on the recommendations from the geotechnical expert. ALJ BOLDT: I'm sorry, so you do have an opinion and your opinion is that yes, you can? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. ALJ BOLDT: Is that you said believe and that's not a standard for expert testimony. THE WITNESS: Okay. Yes, it is my opinion that we can build a reasonable roadway facility
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A	alignment. MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Judge. MS. CORRELL: I have two other questions elicited from these questions. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Number one is have you reviewed or received any competing recommendations in terms of the soils analysis and recommendations that should be followed for this project site competing to the GESTRA report? I guess what I've heard during the hearing. So I guess just take that one step further. I believe Don Reinbold testified that you need to tear	2 3 4 5 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of professional certainty whether the public access road as designed in its final plans will meet sound engineering practices? I believe it will and also based on the recommendations from the geotechnical expert. ALJ BOLDT: I'm sorry, so you do have an opinion and your opinion is that yes, you can? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. ALJ BOLDT: Is that you said believe and that's not a standard for expert testimony. THE WITNESS: Okay. Yes, it is my opinion that we can build a reasonable roadway facility safe for the public use in this instance.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A	alignment. MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Judge. MS. CORRELL: I have two other questions elicited from these questions. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Number one is have you reviewed or received any competing recommendations in terms of the soils analysis and recommendations that should be followed for this project site competing to the GESTRA report? I guess what I've heard during the hearing. So I guess just take that one step further. I believe Don Reinbold testified that you need to tear out the entire existing road and take various other	2 3 4 5 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 Q	of professional certainty whether the public access road as designed in its final plans will meet sound engineering practices? I believe it will and also based on the recommendations from the geotechnical expert. ALJ BOLDT: I'm sorry, so you do have an opinion and your opinion is that yes, you can? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. ALJ BOLDT: Is that you said believe and that's not a standard for expert testimony. THE WITNESS: Okay. Yes, it is my opinion that we can build a reasonable roadway facility safe for the public use in this instance. And in worse case scenario if there is any movement
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A	<pre>alignment.</pre>	2 3 4 5 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 Q 16	of professional certainty whether the public access road as designed in its final plans will meet sound engineering practices? I believe it will and also based on the recommendations from the geotechnical expert. ALJ BOLDT: I'm sorry, so you do have an opinion and your opinion is that yes, you can? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. ALJ BOLDT: Is that you said believe and that's not a standard for expert testimony. THE WITNESS: Okay. Yes, it is my opinion that we can build a reasonable roadway facility safe for the public use in this instance. And in worse case scenario if there is any movement subsequent to the as-built proof roll and prior to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A Q	<pre>alignment.</pre>	2 3 4 5 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 2 16 17	of professional certainty whether the public access road as designed in its final plans will meet sound engineering practices? I believe it will and also based on the recommendations from the geotechnical expert. ALJ BOLDT: I'm sorry, so you do have an opinion and your opinion is that yes, you can? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. ALJ BOLDT: Is that you said believe and that's not a standard for expert testimony. THE WITNESS: Okay. Yes, it is my opinion that we can build a reasonable roadway facility safe for the public use in this instance. And in worse case scenario if there is any movement subsequent to the as-built proof roll and prior to placement of asphalt, do you have engineering tools
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A	<pre>alignment.</pre>	2 3 4 5 A 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 Q 16 17 18	of professional certainty whether the public access road as designed in its final plans will meet sound engineering practices? I believe it will and also based on the recommendations from the geotechnical expert. ALJ BOLDT: I'm sorry, so you do have an opinion and your opinion is that yes, you can? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. ALJ BOLDT: Is that you said believe and that's not a standard for expert testimony. THE WITNESS: Okay. Yes, it is my opinion that we can build a reasonable roadway facility safe for the public use in this instance. And in worse case scenario if there is any movement subsequent to the as-built proof roll and prior to placement of asphalt, do you have engineering tools available to address those concerns?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A Q	alignment. MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Judge. MS. CORRELL: I have two other questions elicited from these questions. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Number one is have you reviewed or received any competing recommendations in terms of the soils analysis and recommendations that should be followed for this project site competing to the GESTRA report? I guess what I've heard during the hearing. So I guess just take that one step further. I believe Don Reinbold testified that you need to tear out the entire existing road and take various other measures. Do you believe that that's cost effective or necessary for this project? No, based on the type of facility we're building and, again, the recommendations from my geotechnical	2 3 4 5 A 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 Q 16 17 18 19 A	of professional certainty whether the public access road as designed in its final plans will meet sound engineering practices? I believe it will and also based on the recommendations from the geotechnical expert. ALJ BOLDT: I'm sorry, so you do have an opinion and your opinion is that yes, you can? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. ALJ BOLDT: Is that you said believe and that's not a standard for expert testimony. THE WITNESS: Okay. Yes, it is my opinion that we can build a reasonable roadway facility safe for the public use in this instance. And in worse case scenario if there is any movement subsequent to the as-built proof roll and prior to placement of asphalt, do you have engineering tools available to address those concerns? Yes, in conversations with my geotechnical expert
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A Q	alignment. MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Judge. MS. CORRELL: I have two other questions elicited from these questions. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Number one is have you reviewed or received any competing recommendations in terms of the soils analysis and recommendations that should be followed for this project site competing to the GESTRA report? I guess what I've heard during the hearing. So I guess just take that one step further. I believe Don Reinbold testified that you need to tear out the entire existing road and take various other measures. Do you believe that that's cost effective or necessary for this project? No, based on the type of facility we're building and, again, the recommendations from my geotechnical engineer, that would be, you know, best case scenario	2 3 4 5 A 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 Q 16 17 18 19 A 20	of professional certainty whether the public access road as designed in its final plans will meet sound engineering practices? I believe it will and also based on the recommendations from the geotechnical expert. ALJ BOLDT: I'm sorry, so you do have an opinion and your opinion is that yes, you can? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. ALJ BOLDT: Is that you said believe and that's not a standard for expert testimony. THE WITNESS: Okay. Yes, it is my opinion that we can build a reasonable roadway facility safe for the public use in this instance. And in worse case scenario if there is any movement subsequent to the as-built proof roll and prior to placement of asphalt, do you have engineering tools available to address those concerns? Yes, in conversations with my geotechnical expert there's other options that can be done.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A Q	alignment. MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Judge. MS. CORRELL: I have two other questions elicited from these questions. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Number one is have you reviewed or received any competing recommendations in terms of the soils analysis and recommendations that should be followed for this project site competing to the GESTRA report? I guess what I've heard during the hearing. So I guess just take that one step further. I believe Don Reinbold testified that you need to tear out the entire existing road and take various other measures. Do you believe that that's cost effective or necessary for this project? No, based on the type of facility we're building and, again, the recommendations from my geotechnical	2 3 4 5 A 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 Q 16 17 18 19 A 20	of professional certainty whether the public access road as designed in its final plans will meet sound engineering practices? I believe it will and also based on the recommendations from the geotechnical expert. ALJ BOLDT: I'm sorry, so you do have an opinion and your opinion is that yes, you can? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. ALJ BOLDT: Is that you said believe and that's not a standard for expert testimony. THE WITNESS: Okay. Yes, it is my opinion that we can build a reasonable roadway facility safe for the public use in this instance. And in worse case scenario if there is any movement subsequent to the as-built proof roll and prior to placement of asphalt, do you have engineering tools available to address those concerns? Yes, in conversations with my geotechnical expert
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A Q	<pre>alignment. MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Judge. MS. CORRELL: I have two other questions elicited from these questions. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Number one is have you reviewed or received any competing recommendations in terms of the soils analysis and recommendations that should be followed for this project site competing to the GESTRA report? I guess what I've heard during the hearing. So I guess just take that one step further. I believe Don Reinbold testified that you need to tear out the entire existing road and take various other measures. Do you believe that that's cost effective or necessary for this project? No, based on the type of facility we're building and, again, the recommendations from my geotechnical engineer, that would be, you know, best case scenario I guess from a roadway standpoint but, like I said, it's not necessary based on recommendations from my geotechnical engineer.</pre>	2 3 4 5 A 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 Q 16 17 18 19 A 20 21 Q 22 23	<pre>of professional certainty whether the public access road as designed in its final plans will meet sound engineering practices? I believe it will and also based on the recommendations from the geotechnical expert. ALJ BOLDT: I'm sorry, so you do have an opinion and your opinion is that yes, you can? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. ALJ BOLDT: Is that you said believe and that's not a standard for expert testimony. THE WITNESS: Okay. Yes, it is my opinion that we can build a reasonable roadway facility safe for the public use in this instance. And in worse case scenario if there is any movement subsequent to the as-built proof roll and prior to placement of asphalt, do you have engineering tools available to address those concerns? Yes, in conversations with my geotechnical expert there's other options that can be done. Thank you. ALJ BOLDT: Any other questions of this witness.</pre>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A Q	<pre>alignment. MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Judge. MS. CORRELL: I have two other questions elicited from these questions. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Number one is have you reviewed or received any competing recommendations in terms of the soils analysis and recommendations that should be followed for this project site competing to the GESTRA report? I guess what I've heard during the hearing. So I guess just take that one step further. I believe Don Reinbold testified that you need to tear out the entire existing road and take various other measures. Do you believe that that's cost effective or necessary for this project? No, based on the type of facility we're building and, again, the recommendations from my geotechnical engineer, that would be, you know, best case scenario I guess from a roadway standpoint but, like I said, it's not necessary based on recommendations from my geotechnical engineer. And Mr. Giese didn't provide you an alternate soils</pre>	2 3 4 5 A 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 Q 16 17 18 19 A 20 21 Q 22 23 24	of professional certainty whether the public access road as designed in its final plans will meet sound engineering practices? I believe it will and also based on the recommendations from the geotechnical expert. ALJ BOLDT: I'm sorry, so you do have an opinion and your opinion is that yes, you can? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. ALJ BOLDT: Is that you said believe and that's not a standard for expert testimony. THE WITNESS: Okay. Yes, it is my opinion that we can build a reasonable roadway facility safe for the public use in this instance. And in worse case scenario if there is any movement subsequent to the as-built proof roll and prior to placement of asphalt, do you have engineering tools available to address those concerns? Yes, in conversations with my geotechnical expert there's other options that can be done. Thank you. ALJ BOLDT: Any other questions of this witness. MR. HARBECK: Judge, I have a couple just
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A Q A	<pre>alignment. MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Judge. MS. CORRELL: I have two other questions elicited from these questions. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Number one is have you reviewed or received any competing recommendations in terms of the soils analysis and recommendations that should be followed for this project site competing to the GESTRA report? I guess what I've heard during the hearing. So I guess just take that one step further. I believe Don Reinbold testified that you need to tear out the entire existing road and take various other measures. Do you believe that that's cost effective or necessary for this project? No, based on the type of facility we're building and, again, the recommendations from my geotechnical engineer, that would be, you know, best case scenario I guess from a roadway standpoint but, like I said, it's not necessary based on recommendations from my geotechnical engineer.</pre>	2 3 4 5 A 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 Q 16 17 18 19 A 20 21 Q 22 23	<pre>of professional certainty whether the public access road as designed in its final plans will meet sound engineering practices? I believe it will and also based on the recommendations from the geotechnical expert. ALJ BOLDT: I'm sorry, so you do have an opinion and your opinion is that yes, you can? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. ALJ BOLDT: Is that you said believe and that's not a standard for expert testimony. THE WITNESS: Okay. Yes, it is my opinion that we can build a reasonable roadway facility safe for the public use in this instance. And in worse case scenario if there is any movement subsequent to the as-built proof roll and prior to placement of asphalt, do you have engineering tools available to address those concerns? Yes, in conversations with my geotechnical expert there's other options that can be done. Thank you. ALJ BOLDT: Any other questions of this witness.</pre>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A Q A	<pre>alignment. MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Judge. MS. CORRELL: I have two other questions elicited from these questions. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Number one is have you reviewed or received any competing recommendations in terms of the soils analysis and recommendations that should be followed for this project site competing to the GESTRA report? I guess what I've heard during the hearing. So I guess just take that one step further. I believe Don Reinbold testified that you need to tear out the entire existing road and take various other measures. Do you believe that that's cost effective or necessary for this project? No, based on the type of facility we're building and, again, the recommendations from my geotechnical engineer, that would be, you know, best case scenario I guess from a roadway standpoint but, like I said, it's not necessary based on recommendations from my geotechnical engineer. And Mr. Giese didn't provide you an alternate soils</pre>	2 3 4 5 A 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 Q 16 17 18 19 A 20 21 Q 22 23 24	of professional certainty whether the public access road as designed in its final plans will meet sound engineering practices? I believe it will and also based on the recommendations from the geotechnical expert. ALJ BOLDT: I'm sorry, so you do have an opinion and your opinion is that yes, you can? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. ALJ BOLDT: Is that you said believe and that's not a standard for expert testimony. THE WITNESS: Okay. Yes, it is my opinion that we can build a reasonable roadway facility safe for the public use in this instance. And in worse case scenario if there is any movement subsequent to the as-built proof roll and prior to placement of asphalt, do you have engineering tools available to address those concerns? Yes, in conversations with my geotechnical expert there's other options that can be done. Thank you. ALJ BOLDT: Any other questions of this witness. MR. HARBECK: Judge, I have a couple just
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A Q A	<pre>alignment. MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Judge. MS. CORRELL: I have two other questions elicited from these questions. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Number one is have you reviewed or received any competing recommendations in terms of the soils analysis and recommendations that should be followed for this project site competing to the GESTRA report? I guess what I've heard during the hearing. So I guess just take that one step further. I believe Don Reinbold testified that you need to tear out the entire existing road and take various other measures. Do you believe that that's cost effective or necessary for this project? No, based on the type of facility we're building and, again, the recommendations from my geotechnical engineer, that would be, you know, best case scenario I guess from a roadway standpoint but, like I said, it's not necessary based on recommendations from my geotechnical engineer. And Mr. Giese didn't provide you an alternate soils</pre>	2 3 4 5 A 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 Q 16 17 18 19 A 20 21 Q 22 23 24	of professional certainty whether the public access road as designed in its final plans will meet sound engineering practices? I believe it will and also based on the recommendations from the geotechnical expert. ALJ BOLDT: I'm sorry, so you do have an opinion and your opinion is that yes, you can? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. ALJ BOLDT: Is that you said believe and that's not a standard for expert testimony. THE WITNESS: Okay. Yes, it is my opinion that we can build a reasonable roadway facility safe for the public use in this instance. And in worse case scenario if there is any movement subsequent to the as-built proof roll and prior to placement of asphalt, do you have engineering tools available to address those concerns? Yes, in conversations with my geotechnical expert there's other options that can be done. Thank you. ALJ BOLDT: Any other questions of this witness. MR. HARBECK: Judge, I have a couple just
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A Q A	<pre>alignment. MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Judge. MS. CORRELL: I have two other questions elicited from these questions. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Number one is have you reviewed or received any competing recommendations in terms of the soils analysis and recommendations that should be followed for this project site competing to the GESTRA report? I guess what I've heard during the hearing. So I guess just take that one step further. I believe Don Reinbold testified that you need to tear out the entire existing road and take various other measures. Do you believe that that's cost effective or necessary for this project? No, based on the type of facility we're building and, again, the recommendations from my geotechnical engineer, that would be, you know, best case scenario I guess from a roadway standpoint but, like I said, it's not necessary based on recommendations from my geotechnical engineer. And Mr. Giese didn't provide you an alternate soils analysis with recommendations of must do items in</pre>	2 3 4 5 A 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 Q 16 17 18 19 A 20 21 Q 22 23 24	<pre>of professional certainty whether the public access road as designed in its final plans will meet sound engineering practices? I believe it will and also based on the recommendations from the geotechnical expert. ALJ BOLDT: I'm sorry, so you do have an opinion and your opinion is that yes, you can? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. ALJ BOLDT: Is that you said believe and that's not a standard for expert testimony. THE WITNESS: Okay. Yes, it is my opinion that we can build a reasonable roadway facility safe for the public use in this instance. And in worse case scenario if there is any movement subsequent to the as-built proof roll and prior to placement of asphalt, do you have engineering tools available to address those concerns? Yes, in conversations with my geotechnical expert there's other options that can be done. Thank you. ALJ BOLDT: Any other questions of this witness. MR. HARBECK: Judge, I have a couple just based upon those questions right there.</pre>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A Q A	<pre>alignment. MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Judge. MS. CORRELL: I have two other questions elicited from these questions. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Number one is have you reviewed or received any competing recommendations in terms of the soils analysis and recommendations that should be followed for this project site competing to the GESTRA report? I guess what I've heard during the hearing. So I guess just take that one step further. I believe Don Reinbold testified that you need to tear out the entire existing road and take various other measures. Do you believe that that's cost effective or necessary for this project? No, based on the type of facility we're building and, again, the recommendations from my geotechnical engineer, that would be, you know, best case scenario I guess from a roadway standpoint but, like I said, it's not necessary based on recommendations from my geotechnical engineer. And Mr. Giese didn't provide you an alternate soils analysis with recommendations of must do items in</pre>	2 3 4 5 A 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 Q 16 17 18 19 A 20 21 Q 22 23 24	of professional certainty whether the public access road as designed in its final plans will meet sound engineering practices? I believe it will and also based on the recommendations from the geotechnical expert. ALJ BOLDT: I'm sorry, so you do have an opinion and your opinion is that yes, you can? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. ALJ BOLDT: Is that you said believe and that's not a standard for expert testimony. THE WITNESS: Okay. Yes, it is my opinion that we can build a reasonable roadway facility safe for the public use in this instance. And in worse case scenario if there is any movement subsequent to the as-built proof roll and prior to placement of asphalt, do you have engineering tools available to address those concerns? Yes, in conversations with my geotechnical expert there's other options that can be done. Thank you. ALJ BOLDT: Any other questions of this witness. MR. HARBECK: Judge, I have a couple just based upon those questions right there.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A Q A	<pre>alignment. MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Judge. MS. CORRELL: I have two other questions elicited from these questions. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Number one is have you reviewed or received any competing recommendations in terms of the soils analysis and recommendations that should be followed for this project site competing to the GESTRA report? I guess what I've heard during the hearing. So I guess just take that one step further. I believe Don Reinbold testified that you need to tear out the entire existing road and take various other measures. Do you believe that that's cost effective or necessary for this project? No, based on the type of facility we're building and, again, the recommendations from my geotechnical engineer, that would be, you know, best case scenario I guess from a roadway standpoint but, like I said, it's not necessary based on recommendations from my geotechnical engineer. And Mr. Giese didn't provide you an alternate soils analysis with recommendations of must do items in</pre>	2 3 4 5 A 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 Q 16 17 18 19 A 20 21 Q 22 23 24	<pre>of professional certainty whether the public access road as designed in its final plans will meet sound engineering practices? I believe it will and also based on the recommendations from the geotechnical expert. ALJ BOLDT: I'm sorry, so you do have an opinion and your opinion is that yes, you can? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. ALJ BOLDT: Is that you said believe and that's not a standard for expert testimony. THE WITNESS: Okay. Yes, it is my opinion that we can build a reasonable roadway facility safe for the public use in this instance. And in worse case scenario if there is any movement subsequent to the as-built proof roll and prior to placement of asphalt, do you have engineering tools available to address those concerns? Yes, in conversations with my geotechnical expert there's other options that can be done. Thank you. ALJ BOLDT: Any other questions of this witness. MR. HARBECK: Judge, I have a couple just based upon those questions right there.</pre>

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

	SHEET 50		
1	CROSS-EXAMINATION	1	question then for the record.
2 3 (BY MR. HARBECK: I'd like to just point you to Exhibit 143.	2 3	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL:
4 A		4 Q	
5 Ç	And you were here for the testimony when both	5	additional wetland impacts beyond those contemplated
6	Mr. Giese and Mr. Reinbold testified as to the	6	by the design I'm sorry, by the design that Kapur
7 8	calculations reflected in here in this exhibit?	7 8 A	created, is that correct? I believe so. I think all the numbers on here were
0 9 A	Were you here? The wetland calculations?	8 A 9	not generated by Kapur.
10 Q		10 Q	
11 A		11	includes failure of the access road, is that correct?
12 Q 13 P		12 13	MR. HARBECK: That's I object to the
13 F 14	A Yes. MS. KAVANAUGH: Their wetland impact	13	form of the question, that's not what they testified to.
15	calculations?	15	MS. CORRELL: Right.
16 Ç		16	ALJ BOLDT: The objection is sustained just
17 18 P	additional wetlands impacts? A Right.	17 18 Q	for the record. I think she's rephrasing it. Does the hand-drawn I quess trapezoidal and
10 F 19 Q		10 Q 19	various do the hand-drawn areas shown on
20	done any calculations of wetlands impacts from the	20	Exhibit 143 indicate following the design standards
21	construction of this road?	21	and design implementation that Kapur intends to
22 A 23	Working my project engineer we created the areas of our wetland impacts for the roadway that's portrayed	22 23 A	follow? No, those do not.
23	right here.	23 A 24 Q	
25 Ç		25 Ã	-
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES		LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES
	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 197		(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 199
	171		177
1	little different way. Have you personally analyzed	1	of wetland to build the roadway. Larger meaning
2	little different way. Have you personally analyzed the conclusions personally, yourself, analyzed the	2	of wetland to build the roadway. Larger meaning further impacts to the north in this case.
2 3	the conclusions personally, yourself, analyzed the conclusions and opinions that they testified to with	2 3 Q	further impacts to the north in this case. And I believe you've already testified to this, but
2 3 4	the conclusions personally, yourself, analyzed the conclusions and opinions that they testified to with respect to the additional wetlands impact from the	2 3 Q 4	further impacts to the north in this case. And I believe you've already testified to this, but in your professional opinion, within a reasonable
2 3	the conclusions personally, yourself, analyzed the conclusions and opinions that they testified to with respect to the additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road? Have you done those	2 3 Q	further impacts to the north in this case. And I believe you've already testified to this, but in your professional opinion, within a reasonable degree of professional certainty, do you believe that
2 3 4 5 6 7 <i>P</i>	the conclusions personally, yourself, analyzed the conclusions and opinions that they testified to with respect to the additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road? Have you done those calculations personally yourself? I haven't verified those calculations, no.	2 3 Q 4 5 6 7	further impacts to the north in this case. And I believe you've already testified to this, but in your professional opinion, within a reasonable degree of professional certainty, do you believe that amount of excavation is necessary for this site? MR. HARBECK: Object, Your Honor,
2 3 4 5 6 7 <i>P</i> 8 Q	the conclusions personally, yourself, analyzed the conclusions and opinions that they testified to with respect to the additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road? Have you done those calculations personally yourself? I haven't verified those calculations, no. Okay. At this point, you don't have any personal	2 3 Q 4 5 6 7 8	further impacts to the north in this case. And I believe you've already testified to this, but in your professional opinion, within a reasonable degree of professional certainty, do you believe that amount of excavation is necessary for this site? MR. HARBECK: Object, Your Honor, foundation, he's already testified he hasn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 <i>P</i> 8 Q 9	<pre>the conclusions personally, yourself, analyzed the conclusions and opinions that they testified to with respect to the additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road? Have you done those calculations personally yourself? I haven't verified those calculations, no. Okay. At this point, you don't have any personal ability to dispute the calculations reflected on</pre>	2 3 Q 4 5 6 7 8 9	<pre>further impacts to the north in this case. And I believe you've already testified to this, but in your professional opinion, within a reasonable degree of professional certainty, do you believe that amount of excavation is necessary for this site? MR. HARBECK: Object, Your Honor, foundation, he's already testified he hasn't done his own calculation on this. He hasn't</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 <i>P</i> 8 Q	<pre>the conclusions personally, yourself, analyzed the conclusions and opinions that they testified to with respect to the additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road? Have you done those calculations personally yourself? I haven't verified those calculations, no. Okay. At this point, you don't have any personal ability to dispute the calculations reflected on Exhibit 143, correct?</pre>	2 3 Q 4 5 6 7 8	further impacts to the north in this case. And I believe you've already testified to this, but in your professional opinion, within a reasonable degree of professional certainty, do you believe that amount of excavation is necessary for this site? MR. HARBECK: Object, Your Honor, foundation, he's already testified he hasn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 <i>F</i> 8 9 10 11 <i>F</i> 12 (2	<pre>the conclusions personally, yourself, analyzed the conclusions and opinions that they testified to with respect to the additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road? Have you done those calculations personally yourself? I haven't verified those calculations, no. Okay. At this point, you don't have any personal ability to dispute the calculations reflected on Exhibit 143, correct? No, I don't. You don't have the ability to do that, correct?</pre>	2 3 Q 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<pre>further impacts to the north in this case. And I believe you've already testified to this, but in your professional opinion, within a reasonable degree of professional certainty, do you believe that amount of excavation is necessary for this site? MR. HARBECK: Object, Your Honor, foundation, he's already testified he hasn't done his own calculation on this. He hasn't personally analyzed it. MS. CORRELL: I didn't ask that question. MS. KAVANAUGH: She didn't ask that, she</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 2 13 <i>F</i>	<pre>the conclusions personally, yourself, analyzed the conclusions and opinions that they testified to with respect to the additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road? Have you done those calculations personally yourself? I haven't verified those calculations, no. Okay. At this point, you don't have any personal ability to dispute the calculations reflected on Exhibit 143, correct? No, I don't. You don't have the ability to do that, correct? Well, I</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<pre>further impacts to the north in this case. And I believe you've already testified to this, but in your professional opinion, within a reasonable degree of professional certainty, do you believe that amount of excavation is necessary for this site? MR. HARBECK: Object, Your Honor, foundation, he's already testified he hasn't done his own calculation on this. He hasn't personally analyzed it. MS. CORRELL: I didn't ask that question. MS. KAVANAUGH: She didn't ask that, she asked whether he thought</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 9 10 11 12 2 13 7 14 0	<pre>the conclusions personally, yourself, analyzed the conclusions and opinions that they testified to with respect to the additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road? Have you done those calculations personally yourself? I haven't verified those calculations, no. Okay. At this point, you don't have any personal ability to dispute the calculations reflected on Exhibit 143, correct? No, I don't. You don't have the ability to do that, correct? Well, I You haven't done it?</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<pre>further impacts to the north in this case. And I believe you've already testified to this, but in your professional opinion, within a reasonable degree of professional certainty, do you believe that amount of excavation is necessary for this site? MR. HARBECK: Object, Your Honor, foundation, he's already testified he hasn't done his own calculation on this. He hasn't personally analyzed it. MS. CORRELL: I didn't ask that question. MS. KAVANAUGH: She didn't ask that, she asked whether he thought ALJ BOLDT: The objection is overruled.</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 9 10 11 7 12 0 13 7 14 0 15 7 16 0	<pre>the conclusions personally, yourself, analyzed the conclusions and opinions that they testified to with respect to the additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road? Have you done those calculations personally yourself? I haven't verified those calculations, no. Okay. At this point, you don't have any personal ability to dispute the calculations reflected on Exhibit 143, correct? No, I don't. You don't have the ability to do that, correct? Well, I You haven't done it? I haven't done it. Okay. So sitting here today, you don't personally</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A	<pre>further impacts to the north in this case. And I believe you've already testified to this, but in your professional opinion, within a reasonable degree of professional certainty, do you believe that amount of excavation is necessary for this site? MR. HARBECK: Object, Your Honor, foundation, he's already testified he hasn't done his own calculation on this. He hasn't personally analyzed it. MS. CORRELL: I didn't ask that question. MS. KAVANAUGH: She didn't ask that, she asked whether he thought ALJ BOLDT: The objection is overruled. Answer it if you can. No, the wetland impacts we calculated were based on</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 9 10 11 7 12 0 13 7 14 0 15 7 16 0 17	<pre>the conclusions personally, yourself, analyzed the conclusions and opinions that they testified to with respect to the additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road? Have you done those calculations personally yourself? I haven't verified those calculations, no. Okay. At this point, you don't have any personal ability to dispute the calculations reflected on Exhibit 143, correct? No, I don't. You don't have the ability to do that, correct? Well, I You haven't done it? I haven't done it. Okay. So sitting here today, you don't personally have you can't personally say you've done</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A 17	<pre>further impacts to the north in this case. And I believe you've already testified to this, but in your professional opinion, within a reasonable degree of professional certainty, do you believe that amount of excavation is necessary for this site? MR. HARBECK: Object, Your Honor, foundation, he's already testified he hasn't done his own calculation on this. He hasn't personally analyzed it. MS. CORRELL: I didn't ask that question. MS. KAVANAUGH: She didn't ask that, she asked whether he thought ALJ BOLDT: The objection is overruled. Answer it if you can. No, the wetland impacts we calculated were based on the recommendations from our geotechnical GESTRA</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 9 10 11 7 12 0 13 7 14 0 15 7 16 0 17 18	<pre>the conclusions personally, yourself, analyzed the conclusions and opinions that they testified to with respect to the additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road? Have you done those calculations personally yourself? I haven't verified those calculations, no. Okay. At this point, you don't have any personal ability to dispute the calculations reflected on Exhibit 143, correct? No, I don't. You don't have the ability to do that, correct? Well, I You haven't done it? I haven't done it. Okay. So sitting here today, you don't personally have you can't personally say you've done calculations within which you can dispute that</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A 17 18	<pre>further impacts to the north in this case. And I believe you've already testified to this, but in your professional opinion, within a reasonable degree of professional certainty, do you believe that amount of excavation is necessary for this site? MR. HARBECK: Object, Your Honor, foundation, he's already testified he hasn't done his own calculation on this. He hasn't personally analyzed it. MS. CORRELL: I didn't ask that question. MS. KAVANAUGH: She didn't ask that, she asked whether he thought ALJ BOLDT: The objection is overruled. Answer it if you can. No, the wetland impacts we calculated were based on the recommendations from our geotechnical GESTRA engineering in this instance.</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 9 10 11 7 12 0 13 7 14 15 7 16 0 17 18 19	<pre>the conclusions personally, yourself, analyzed the conclusions and opinions that they testified to with respect to the additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road? Have you done those calculations personally yourself? I haven't verified those calculations, no. 0 Kay. At this point, you don't have any personal ability to dispute the calculations reflected on Exhibit 143, correct? No, I don't. You don't have the ability to do that, correct? Well, I You haven't done it? I haven't done it. 0 Kay. So sitting here today, you don't personally have you can't personally say you've done calculations within which you can dispute that additional wetlands impact from the construction of</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A 17	<pre>further impacts to the north in this case. And I believe you've already testified to this, but in your professional opinion, within a reasonable degree of professional certainty, do you believe that amount of excavation is necessary for this site? MR. HARBECK: Object, Your Honor, foundation, he's already testified he hasn't done his own calculation on this. He hasn't personally analyzed it. MS. CORRELL: I didn't ask that question. MS. KAVANAUGH: She didn't ask that, she asked whether he thought ALJ BOLDT: The objection is overruled. Answer it if you can. No, the wetland impacts we calculated were based on the recommendations from our geotechnical GESTRA engineering in this instance. And do you believe that the type of more complete</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 9 10 11 7 12 0 13 7 14 0 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>the conclusions personally, yourself, analyzed the conclusions and opinions that they testified to with respect to the additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road? Have you done those calculations personally yourself? I haven't verified those calculations, no. 0 Kay. At this point, you don't have any personal ability to dispute the calculations reflected on Exhibit 143, correct? No, I don't. You don't have the ability to do that, correct? Well, I You haven't done it? I haven't done it? Okay. So sitting here today, you don't personally have you can't personally say you've done calculations within which you can dispute that additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road as testified to by Mr. Giese and Mr. Reinbold, correct?</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>further impacts to the north in this case. And I believe you've already testified to this, but in your professional opinion, within a reasonable degree of professional certainty, do you believe that amount of excavation is necessary for this site? MR. HARBECK: Object, Your Honor, foundation, he's already testified he hasn't done his own calculation on this. He hasn't personally analyzed it. MS. CORRELL: I didn't ask that question. MS. KAVANAUGH: She didn't ask that, she asked whether he thought ALJ BOLDT: The objection is overruled. Answer it if you can. No, the wetland impacts we calculated were based on the recommendations from our geotechnical GESTRA engineering in this instance. And do you believe that the type of more complete excavation that Mr. Reinbold testified to is necessary in your professional opinion to complete</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 9 10 11 7 12 0 13 7 14 0 15 7 16 0 17 18 19 20 21 22 7	<pre>the conclusions personally, yourself, analyzed the conclusions and opinions that they testified to with respect to the additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road? Have you done those calculations personally yourself? I haven't verified those calculations, no. Okay. At this point, you don't have any personal ability to dispute the calculations reflected on Exhibit 143, correct? No, I don't. You don't have the ability to do that, correct? Well, I You haven't done it? I haven't done it? Okay. So sitting here today, you don't personally have you can't personally say you've done calculations within which you can dispute that additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road as testified to by Mr. Giese and Mr. Reinbold, correct? I can't dispute utilizing the excavation methods they</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>further impacts to the north in this case. And I believe you've already testified to this, but in your professional opinion, within a reasonable degree of professional certainty, do you believe that amount of excavation is necessary for this site? MR. HARBECK: Object, Your Honor, foundation, he's already testified he hasn't done his own calculation on this. He hasn't personally analyzed it. MS. CORRELL: I didn't ask that question. MS. KAVANAUGH: She didn't ask that, she asked whether he thought ALJ BOLDT: The objection is overruled. Answer it if you can. No, the wetland impacts we calculated were based on the recommendations from our geotechnical GESTRA engineering in this instance. And do you believe that the type of more complete excavation that Mr. Reinbold testified to is necessary in your professional opinion to complete this access road?</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 7 12 9 10 11 7 12 0 13 7 14 0 15 7 14 0 17 18 19 20 21 22 7 23	<pre>the conclusions personally, yourself, analyzed the conclusions and opinions that they testified to with respect to the additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road? Have you done those calculations personally yourself? I haven't verified those calculations, no. Okay. At this point, you don't have any personal ability to dispute the calculations reflected on Exhibit 143, correct? No, I don't. You don't have the ability to do that, correct? Well, I You haven't done it? I haven't done it? Okay. So sitting here today, you don't personally have you can't personally say you've done calculations within which you can dispute that additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road as testified to by Mr. Giese and Mr. Reinbold, correct? I can't dispute utilizing the excavation methods they discussed. I can't dispute those numbers, no.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 A	<pre>further impacts to the north in this case. And I believe you've already testified to this, but in your professional opinion, within a reasonable degree of professional certainty, do you believe that amount of excavation is necessary for this site? MR. HARBECK: Object, Your Honor, foundation, he's already testified he hasn't done his own calculation on this. He hasn't personally analyzed it. MS. CORRELL: I didn't ask that question. MS. KAVANAUGH: She didn't ask that, she asked whether he thought ALJ BOLDT: The objection is overruled. Answer it if you can. No, the wetland impacts we calculated were based on the recommendations from our geotechnical GESTRA engineering in this instance. And do you believe that the type of more complete excavation that Mr. Reinbold testified to is necessary in your professional opinion to complete this access road? No, I believe the recommendation that GESTRA put</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 7 12 9 10 11 7 12 0 13 7 14 0 17 18 19 20 21 22 7	<pre>the conclusions personally, yourself, analyzed the conclusions and opinions that they testified to with respect to the additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road? Have you done those calculations personally yourself? I haven't verified those calculations, no. Okay. At this point, you don't have any personal ability to dispute the calculations reflected on Exhibit 143, correct? No, I don't. You don't have the ability to do that, correct? Well, I You haven't done it? I haven't done it? Okay. So sitting here today, you don't personally have you can't personally say you've done calculations within which you can dispute that additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road as testified to by Mr. Giese and Mr. Reinbold, correct? I can't dispute utilizing the excavation methods they discussed. I can't dispute those numbers, no.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>further impacts to the north in this case. And I believe you've already testified to this, but in your professional opinion, within a reasonable degree of professional certainty, do you believe that amount of excavation is necessary for this site? MR. HARBECK: Object, Your Honor, foundation, he's already testified he hasn't done his own calculation on this. He hasn't personally analyzed it. MS. CORRELL: I didn't ask that question. MS. KAVANAUGH: She didn't ask that, she asked whether he thought ALJ BOLDT: The objection is overruled. Answer it if you can. No, the wetland impacts we calculated were based on the recommendations from our geotechnical GESTRA engineering in this instance. And do you believe that the type of more complete excavation that Mr. Reinbold testified to is necessary in your professional opinion to complete this access road?</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 F 12 0 13 F 14 0 17 18 19 20 21 22 F 23 24 0 21 22 24 0 24 0 20 21 22 24 0 20 20 21 22 24 20 20 20 21 22 24 22 24 20 20 21 21 22 22 24 22 22 24 22 22 24 22 22	<pre>the conclusions personally, yourself, analyzed the conclusions and opinions that they testified to with respect to the additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road? Have you done those calculations personally yourself? I haven't verified those calculations, no. Okay. At this point, you don't have any personal ability to dispute the calculations reflected on Exhibit 143, correct? No, I don't. You don't have the ability to do that, correct? Well, I You haven't done it? I haven't done it. Okay. So sitting here today, you don't personally have you can't personally say you've done calculations within which you can dispute that additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road as testified to by Mr. Giese and Mr. Reinbold, correct? I can't dispute utilizing the excavation methods they discussed. I can't dispute those numbers, no. Okay. Thank you.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 A 24	<pre>further impacts to the north in this case. And I believe you've already testified to this, but in your professional opinion, within a reasonable degree of professional certainty, do you believe that amount of excavation is necessary for this site? MR. HARBECK: Object, Your Honor, foundation, he's already testified he hasn't done his own calculation on this. He hasn't personally analyzed it. MS. CORRELL: I didn't ask that question. MS. KAVANAUGH: She didn't ask that, she asked whether he thought ALJ BOLDT: The objection is overruled. Answer it if you can. No, the wetland impacts we calculated were based on the recommendations from our geotechnical GESTRA engineering in this instance. And do you believe that the type of more complete excavation that Mr. Reinbold testified to is necessary in your professional opinion to complete this access road? No, I believe the recommendation that GESTRA put forth is adequate and will provide the proper</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 F 12 0 13 F 14 0 17 18 19 20 21 22 F 23 24 0 21 22 24 0 24 0 20 21 22 24 0 20 20 21 22 24 20 20 20 21 22 24 22 24 20 20 21 21 22 22 24 22 22 24 22 22 24 22 22	<pre>the conclusions personally, yourself, analyzed the conclusions and opinions that they testified to with respect to the additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road? Have you done those calculations personally yourself? I haven't verified those calculations, no. Okay. At this point, you don't have any personal ability to dispute the calculations reflected on Exhibit 143, correct? No, I don't. You don't have the ability to do that, correct? Well, I You haven't done it? I haven't done it. Okay. So sitting here today, you don't personally have you can't personally say you've done calculations within which you can dispute that additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road as testified to by Mr. Giese and Mr. Reinbold, correct? I can't dispute utilizing the excavation methods they discussed. I can't dispute those numbers, no. Okay. Thank you.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 A 24	<pre>further impacts to the north in this case. And I believe you've already testified to this, but in your professional opinion, within a reasonable degree of professional certainty, do you believe that amount of excavation is necessary for this site? MR. HARBECK: Object, Your Honor, foundation, he's already testified he hasn't done his own calculation on this. He hasn't personally analyzed it. MS. CORRELL: I didn't ask that question. MS. KAVANAUGH: She didn't ask that, she asked whether he thought ALJ BOLDT: The objection is overruled. Answer it if you can. No, the wetland impacts we calculated were based on the recommendations from our geotechnical GESTRA engineering in this instance. And do you believe that the type of more complete excavation that Mr. Reinbold testified to is necessary in your professional opinion to complete this access road? No, I believe the recommendation that GESTRA put forth is adequate and will provide the proper</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 F 12 0 13 F 14 0 17 18 19 20 21 22 F 23 24 0 21 22 24 0 24 0 20 21 22 24 0 20 20 21 22 24 20 20 20 21 22 24 22 24 20 20 21 21 22 22 24 22 22 24 22 22 24 22 22	<pre>the conclusions personally, yourself, analyzed the conclusions and opinions that they testified to with respect to the additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road? Have you done those calculations personally yourself? I haven't verified those calculations, no. Okay. At this point, you don't have any personal ability to dispute the calculations reflected on Exhibit 143, correct? No, I don't. You don't have the ability to do that, correct? Well, I You haven't done it? I haven't done it. Okay. So sitting here today, you don't personally have you can't personally say you've done calculations within which you can dispute that additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road as testified to by Mr. Giese and Mr. Reinbold, correct? I can't dispute utilizing the excavation methods they discussed. I can't dispute those numbers, no. Okay. Thank you.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 A 24	<pre>further impacts to the north in this case. And I believe you've already testified to this, but in your professional opinion, within a reasonable degree of professional certainty, do you believe that amount of excavation is necessary for this site? MR. HARBECK: Object, Your Honor, foundation, he's already testified he hasn't done his own calculation on this. He hasn't personally analyzed it. MS. CORRELL: I didn't ask that question. MS. KAVANAUGH: She didn't ask that, she asked whether he thought ALJ BOLDT: The objection is overruled. Answer it if you can. No, the wetland impacts we calculated were based on the recommendations from our geotechnical GESTRA engineering in this instance. And do you believe that the type of more complete excavation that Mr. Reinbold testified to is necessary in your professional opinion to complete this access road? No, I believe the recommendation that GESTRA put forth is adequate and will provide the proper</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 F 12 0 13 F 14 0 17 18 19 20 21 22 F 23 24 0 24 0 24 0 25 24 0 20 21 22 24 24 25 20 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	<pre>the conclusions personally, yourself, analyzed the conclusions and opinions that they testified to with respect to the additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road? Have you done those calculations personally yourself? I haven't verified those calculations, no. Okay. At this point, you don't have any personal ability to dispute the calculations reflected on Exhibit 143, correct? No, I don't. You don't have the ability to do that, correct? Well, I You haven't done it? I haven't done it. Okay. So sitting here today, you don't personally have you can't personally say you've done calculations within which you can dispute that additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road as testified to by Mr. Giese and Mr. Reinbold, correct? I can't dispute utilizing the excavation methods they discussed. I can't dispute those numbers, no. Okay. Thank you. MS. CORRELL: And I guess I have to ask a LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 A 24	<pre>further impacts to the north in this case. And I believe you've already testified to this, but in your professional opinion, within a reasonable degree of professional certainty, do you believe that amount of excavation is necessary for this site? MR. HARBECK: Object, Your Honor, foundation, he's already testified he hasn't done his own calculation on this. He hasn't personally analyzed it. MS. CORRELL: I didn't ask that question. MS. KAVANAUGH: She didn't ask that, she asked whether he thought ALJ BOLDT: The objection is overruled. Answer it if you can. No, the wetland impacts we calculated were based on the recommendations from our geotechnical GESTRA engineering in this instance. And do you believe that the type of more complete excavation that Mr. Reinbold testified to is necessary in your professional opinion to complete this access road? No, I believe the recommendation that GESTRA put forth is adequate and will provide the proper roadway. LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 7 12 0 13 7 14 0 15 7 14 0 17 18 19 20 21 22 7 23 24 0 20 21 22 24 24 20 20 21 22 24 24 20 20 21 22 24 24 20 20 21 21 22 24 24 24 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	<pre>the conclusions personally, yourself, analyzed the conclusions and opinions that they testified to with respect to the additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road? Have you done those calculations personally yourself? I haven't verified those calculations, no. Okay. At this point, you don't have any personal ability to dispute the calculations reflected on Exhibit 143, correct? No, I don't. You don't have the ability to do that, correct? Well, I You haven't done it? I haven't done it. Okay. So sitting here today, you don't personally have you can't personally say you've done calculations within which you can dispute that additional wetlands impact from the construction of this road as testified to by Mr. Giese and Mr. Reinbold, correct? I can't dispute utilizing the excavation methods they discussed. I can't dispute those numbers, no. Okay. Thank you. MS. CORRELL: And I guess I have to ask a</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 A 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 A 24	<pre>further impacts to the north in this case. And I believe you've already testified to this, but in your professional opinion, within a reasonable degree of professional certainty, do you believe that amount of excavation is necessary for this site? MR. HARBECK: Object, Your Honor, foundation, he's already testified he hasn't done his own calculation on this. He hasn't personally analyzed it. MS. CORRELL: I didn't ask that question. MS. KAVANAUGH: She didn't ask that, she asked whether he thought ALJ BOLDT: The objection is overruled. Answer it if you can. No, the wetland impacts we calculated were based on the recommendations from our geotechnical GESTRA engineering in this instance. And do you believe that the type of more complete excavation that Mr. Reinbold testified to is necessary in your professional opinion to complete this access road? No, I believe the recommendation that GESTRA put forth is adequate and will provide the proper roadway.</pre>

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 51	
1QWould it be a different situation if you were designing a public highway?3AWell, it might be but, like I said, we've done other roadways where we haven't done the full depth excavation as well so, you know, it's kind of a case-by-case basis on the project and our constraints.7Constraints.8QAll right. Thank you. MR. MEYER: Just for the record,9MR. MEYER: Just for the record, Mr. Examiner, can I just make the suggestion that the recent comments about what is that exhibit number?13MR. GLEISNER: 143, Counsel. MR. MEYER: 143 were relevant where related to the calculations in green that appear thereon and (inaudible) additional lines. Just so it's clear for the record.18ALJ BOLDT: I think that's right. I think that was understood wasn't it, Mr. Harbeck? MR. GLEISNER: I think so, Your Honor. ALJ BOLDT: And the same for the witness, that's what you understood? THE WITNESS: Yes. ALJ BOLDT: Okay.	1there was that objection that certainly these2witnesses were disclosed. The confusion,3insomuch as there was any confusion, was related4to the use of the word rebuttal rather than5responsive, is the way I interpreted it.6MR. HARBECK: Your Honor, if I could just7for the record also say they were disclosed8after the deadline for disclosure of witnesses.9And there's more to it which we've already put10on the record so I don't want to belabor the11point, but that was part of it so12MS. KAVANAUGH: And I'd like to put on the13record that some of Mr. Gallo's witnesses were14disclosed after the deadline for exchanging15witness lists as well for the record two16twice.17MR. HARBECK: The only other difference is18ours any witnesses disclosed by Mr. Gallo19before the discovery deadline, we would have20made them available for deposition. Yours came21after the discovery deadline so that was it part22and parcel.23MS. CORRELL: Well, you deposed Mr. Wakeman24after that deadline as well so25ALJ BOLDT: Okay. I mean certainly if the
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 201	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 203
1MS. CORRELL: And I guess I would mark and2move the resume. I'm not sure what number we're3at.4ALJ BOLDT: 223 is received. Okay. Thank5you very much. And just since that was the one6where you objected about the depositions I'll7just note that NR211 talks about discovery and8Class 1 and Class 3 proceedings and it reads as9follows. NR211(2) for good cause shown the10Department or Administrative Law Judge may allow11pre-hearing discovery and the preservation of12evidence in any Class 1 proceeding or Class 313proceeding as provided under Chapter 804 Stats.14Any order allowing discovery or the preservation15of evidence may include any reasonable16limitations on the scope and extent of discovery17as the Department or Administrative Law Judge18deems appropriate under the circumstances. In19Class 1 and Class 3 proceedings they give some20factors to determine when you can preserve21evidence for the purpose of using a deposition at23hearing in place of live testimony.24Okay. With that, the witness is excused	1issue of the depositions came up I obviously2used my discretion to allow a lot of discovery,3including multiple depositions of some witnesses4from the Department.5MS. KAVANAUGH: Without you having to show6good cause.7ALJ BOLDT: I certainly would have been8inclined to allow you to take those depositions9if you'd raised the issue or if you had a10question about those supplemental witnesses so11that's we don't want to get into that again,12but that's I just thought it was important to13make the record complete.14Okay. Let's move on to the next witness.15MS. KAVANAUGH: Can we take a two-minute16bathroom break? Just a glass of water and17MS. CORRELL: We're going to be calling18Mr. Kruger so we can start getting that ready.19ALJ BOLDT: Okay. We'll go off the record.20Let's keep it real close though.21(Recess taken)22ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Now we are on the record23and can I ask you to raise your right hand. Do24you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and
25 and I would also note just for the record since LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 202	25 nothing but the truth, so help you God? LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 204

1	SHEET 52	
2 3 4 2 5 6 A 7 8 9 A 10 21 20 21 22 23 24 25 A	<pre>work address for the record? Kurt Kruger, K-U-R-T, K-R-U-G-E-R and my work address is 7711 North Port Washington Road, Milwaukee. And your current employer, sir? Kapur and Associates. And your current position? I'm a survey project manager. Okay. And are you a registered land surveyor? Yes. Okay. If you take a look at the first exhibit and I haven't marked the number because I wasn't sure the one that says A. Can you identify what that packet of documents is? Yes, it's my resume and some of my other work experience. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's 224. MS. KAVANAUGH: 224? Okay. And can you go through that packet and just briefly identify each document you provided in regard to your work experience and educational training?</pre>	<pre>1 it's a job that we're doing a survey for a design on 2 and get the job set up (inaudible) get the right 3 datum, get the right methods picked for the right end 4 result that we're desiring. And then we watch the 5 data as it's collected and keep track of it through 6 the process and then a final check at the end to make 8 sure that it's what we needed to get while we were 8 out there. 9 Q Okay. Are you familiar with the surveying work that 10 Kapur and Associates performed for DNR in regard to 11 the boat launch site that's the subject of this 12 hearing? 13 A Yes. 14 Q Did you have a role in performing or overseeing that 15 work? 16 A Yes, I did. 17 Q And what was your role? 18 A Again, pretty much what I've just stated, 19 we my you know, talked with Kurt because he was 20 going to be designing it, ascertained what he needed 21 to do his job and got him the right datum and used 22 the right methods and the right equipment to get to 23 that end result that was desirable of Kurt. 24 Q Okay. So you performed the functions you just 25 mentioned for this particular site?</pre>
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 205	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 207
1	and and thick is any multiplicity of the	1 1 1 1
1 2 3 Q 4 A 5 6 7 8		 A Yes. Q Okay. Have you visited the DNR site? A Yes. Q How often? A Once. Q Okay. And who performed the actual survey and field
9 10 11 12 Q 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 Q 24 25 A	<pre>an award that I received working on the Marquette Interchange Project in Milwaukee. Exhibit F is another award of appreciation for work that I did on the Marquette Interchange. Okay. So referring to those exhibits can you just briefly highlight your professional education experience and accreditation for us? Just kind of hit the highlights.</pre>	<pre>7 work at the DNR site? 8 A We had a number of different party chiefs out there. 9 Probably the guy that was out there the most was 10 Chris Morazik (phonetic). 11 Q Okay. And in the packet of information provided, I 12 believe there's a resume for Mr. Morazik. Hopefully 13 there is. And then were there any other surveying 14 techs that had visited the site and done work out 15 there? 16 MR. GLEISNER: Wait. Counsel, wait a 17 minute. Did you say that there's another resume 18 here? 19 MS. KAVANAUGH: I thought there was one for 20 Chris unless I stuck them all in the wrong 21 place. I thought I put it in Number 2 for Chris 22 MR. HARBECK: No, no, we have this. Are 25 you just simply asking has he included it in the</pre>

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

	SHEET 53	
21 22	Q The question was have you is there provided there a resume for Chris Morazik?	 and reliability of their field work? A Yes. Q Does Kapur have certain protocols and standards that its survey techs use in the field when they're selecting points to survey, carrying out the survey, and recording the results? A Yes, they do. Q And does Kapur train its survey crews in their protocols and standards? M Yes. Q Was anyone from DNR on site with the surveying crews when surveying was being performed? A Yes, they were. Q And do you know who that was? A (Inaudible) was out there. Pete Wood was out there, Andy Hudak was out there. Q Okay. And so Kapur let's discuss the surveying they did do in relation to the DNR project. Did they do any surveying outside of the DNR property? A No. Q Okay. Did they do any surveying in the large wetland west of the DNR property? A No, with a couple of exceptions. We went into that wetland a little bit to locate the flags that were set for us delineating the wetlands.
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 209	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 211
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q Okay. Have you worked with them before? A Yes, I've worked with each of them for more than ten years.	<pre>1 Q The ordinary high water mark? 2 A Yeah, the ordinary high water mark. 3 Q Okay. And so the two exceptions are you delineated 4 the ordinary high water mark and the flags were set. 5 Do you know who set the flags? 6 A I believe that Andy set them. 7 Q And I think that's what he testified. And then you 8 helped you did the surveying for the delineation 9 that had been performed on the wetland? 10 A Yes. 11 Q Okay. Can you briefly explain the surveying that 12 Kapur did for the DNR project? 13 A Well, we located the access road horizontally and 14 vertically and we located the areas along in 15 between the two residences. We also spent a little 16 bit of time in the depressed area, the channel where 17 water goes in and out along the north edge of the 18 property, and the ordinary high water mark of the 19 lake itself. We also located some elevations in the 10 water, you know (inaudible) 12 Q Of North Lake? 13 Q Okay. And what about that small tongue of wetland 14 that they talked about, did you guys survey that, the 15 one that's in the parking lot area?</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 MS. KAVANAUGH: And is there a resume for someone else in that packet? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: A single page loose one. MS. KAVANAUGH: Oh, I thought there were more than one. Anthony Batcher (phonetic)? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 226. MS. KAVANAUGH: Should be one in both of those. Thank you. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's the last one. MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. Q Were these survey technicians and survey chiefs part of the team that did work on the DNR project? A Yes. Q Okay. And Chris' resume shows he's a surveying crew chief for Kapur and Associates, correct? A Yes. Q Okay. And Tony's shows that he has an AD in surveying from Nicolet Technical College, correct? A Yes. Q Okay. Have you worked with them before? A Yes, I've worked with each of them for more than ten years. 	 2 A Yeah, the ordinary high water mark. 3 Q Okay. And so the two exceptions are you delineated the ordinary high water mark and the flags were set. 5 Do you know who set the flags? 6 A I believe that Andy set them. 7 Q And I think that's what he testified. And then you helped you did the surveying for the delineation that had been performed on the wetland? 10 A Yes. 11 Q Okay. Can you briefly explain the surveying that Kapur did for the DNR project? 13 A Well, we located the access road horizontally and vertically and we located the areas along in between the two residences. We also spent a little bit of time in the depressed area, the channel where water goes in and out along the north edge of the property, and the ordinary high water mark of the lake itself. We also located some elevations in the water, you know (inaudible) 10 Q Okay. And what about that small tongue of wetland that they talked about, did you guys survey that, the

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

S 1 A 2 Q 3 A 4 Q 5 6 7 A 8 Q 9 10 A 11 12	as Andy had located it. Okay. And did you survey the mass points to create the topo maps that show the contour lines of the site? Yes. Okay. And did you survey and locate the property lines and the easement?	benchmark near the monument that's a lot more vertically stable and so that's what we used as the more vertically stable marks out there and on this particular job they're very reliable. We've gone through projects where we've tied into 400 of these and then one was out of bounds, but so we also checked the second one and ran between the two to check and make sure that the elevations matched each other and that one of the benchmarks was not disturbed. And so horizontally and vertically these are all of our the basis for our values. Control points? Okay. So before you what you're
13 Q 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 A 22 23 24	Okay. In fact, I think it might have been a survey admitted into evidence in one of their things. Okay. Can you tell us a bit, you know, for we non-scientists, when you're surveying, what are you trying to do when you survey to create a topo map or determine the elevations of ordinary high water marks and points and contour lines? What's the theory here?	<pre>13 trying to do in surveying is determine, like you 14 said, the relative positions of things and this is 15 horizontal and vertical so we're talking 3D right? 16 A Yes. 17 Q And these points you just measured are where the 18 control points where you start from to figure out 19 what's a good number or 20 A Yes, these were the starting these values were 21 what we based our values on. 22 Q Okay. 23 A We transferred these values into the site. 24 Q Okay. So the fact that they're good stable confirmed</pre>
25	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 213	25 values enhances the reliability of what you've done LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 215
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 9 10 11 A 12 0 13 A 14 15 16 0 17 18 19 A 20 21 22 23 24 25 5 5 5 6 7 8 2 7 8 2 7 8 2 9 8 2 9 8 9 9 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	 MS. KAVANAUGH: There's another exhibit and I think I might have marked it A again by accident so you'll have to re-number it Tim maybe. Would that be 227 maybe? Can you identify this one that says at the bottom Control Summary Survey Diagram Section Surveys Town of Merton? Yes. Is that the control points you're talking about? Yeah, these are the control points that well, we found these monuments and we used them for horizontal positions. Okay. And can you go through this exhibit pretty fairly briefly and just identify, so it'd be 227A, the first page and the different pages here? 	<pre>1 because 2 A Yes. 3 Q you're starting with something that's good? 4 A Yes. 5 Q Okay. So what and once you have your control 6 points here and your benchmarks, is the purpose I 7 know you go out into field and then you start 8 shooting points. Is the purpose for which you're 9 locating various features on the land relevant as far 10 as deciding how many points you need to shoot in the 11 field? 12 A Yes, absolutely. 13 Q Okay. And why is that? 14 A You can spend a lot of time gathering information 15 that won't be used. 16 Q Okay. So what you're trying to do is figure out what 17 you need to be pretty sure about what you need to 18 know? 19 A Yeah. 20 Okay. And anything past that, any surveying past 21 that, is just wasted time and money, is that 22 A Yes. 23 Q Okay. Now, some of the earlier witnesses testified 24 that Kapur should have surveyed the bed of the 25 adjacent wetland to determine if there were any 27 A Yes. 28 Okay. Now, some of the realier were any 29 A Yeah. 20 Okay. Now, some of the earlier witnesses testified 20 Kay. Now, some of the earlier witnesses testified 21 that Kapur should have surveyed the bed of the 25 adjacent wetland to determine if there were any</pre>
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 214	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 216

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 55 channels on the bed, etcetera. For the purpose that was any of that information needed to ensure	1 MS. KAVANAUGH: But you're contesting what 2 should have been done, the scope yes, so we've
 this survey was accurate for the purpose for which you were asked to survey? A The purpose for which we were asked to survey was for constructability of the access road and the boat launch and, you know, parking lot facilities. It was not for the purpose of determining any channels out in the wetlands. Q Okay. Now, you did establish elevations for certain regulatory things though I think you testified like the ordinary high water mark and things like that? A Yes, things that would affect we specifically located things that would affect construction. Q Okay. And that would be the so you measured like the access road elevations? A Yes. Q And the culverts, the inverts and Wh-huh. Q heights, and all of that in locations Yes. Q and okay. Now, can you explain to us how points are shot in the field nowadays from what I the protocol? A These. 	 got to talk about what they did do and why it was adequate for the scope MR. GALLO: I would stipulate to the accuracy. MS. CORRELL: But you won't stipulate to surveying that needed to be done? MS. CORRELL: Your allegation that MR. HARBECK: If you want to just go on, just go on and do what you want to do. MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. I'll finish. It's pretty quick. Q Okay. Can you explain the equipment you mentioned, the equipment that's robotic total stations? How does that work? Well, it follows the man in the field. It's just a one-man operation and his task then is to be able to generate enough data to generate a surface model. Q Okay. And so that means like the lay of the land, the topography, and that kind of thing, you know? A Yeah. Q And how accurate is all the observations, the shots
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 217	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 219
1 equipment that was used out here was robotic total 2 stations and 3 Q 4 Robotic, R-0-B-0-T-I-C. Total station is T-0-T-A-L 5 and station, S-T-A-T-I-0-N. 6 O 7 A 8 and it's a tool that measures horizontal and vertical 8 angles. The ones that we had out here are capable of 9 three-second measurements three-second angular 10 measurements. 11 MR. GALLO: Excuse me, I don't think we're 12 contesting anything they did. 13 MS. KAVANAUGH: Well, you are contesting 14 that there have been at least hints about 15 they should have shot here, they should have 16 done this, there should have been more shots, 17 points in the grove of trees, they may have 18 missed some of the elevations in the grove of 19 trees, blah, blah, blah. You know, so what I'm 20 establishing here is what they did here to show 21 that the surveying was adequate for what they 22 did and that it was top of the line.	1 they make here, in terms of tolerance and 2 A Well, it depends a little bit on how far away they 3 are from the instrument, but we always check how 4 accurate they actually are. That's you know, it's 5 based on a positional tolerance of where the gun is 6 and the positional tolerance of what they viewed to 7 orient and the distance that they are from it and all 8 of those accuracies were about a quarter of an inch 9 or three-eights of an inch at the worst. 10 Q Okay. And does it shoot just one observation at each 11 point shot the machine? 12 A You can set it to take five. It goes pretty quick 13 usually set it to take five. It goes pretty quick 14 and it's a pretty easy check and if there's 15 Q Like yeah. 16 A any kind of obstruction that would influence the 17 distance, one of those five measurements will be 18 reflected 19 Will show it. 20 A and it will warn us that your distance is no 19 <t< td=""></t<>

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 56	
1 A Yes. 2 Q Okay. And you're shooting a bunch of them. How do they decide where to go and shoot on the property where a shot needs to be taken? 5 A Well, originally before this technical was available we would take at individual stations that would be specified to us or individual intervals, maybe they'd be 100 feet or 50 feet, and walk sideways from that and try to establish the elevation of each break in the ground. And they can tend to kind of follow that now, but where it becomes very flat additional points just aren't necessary because the computer will use the information that they do collect and cut the sections itself. 1 Q Okay. Okay. So and can you explain to the Judge what a break point is a break line, I think you 1 A Yeah. We induce break lines in the field and the purpose of that is because the computer is a computer and at random it can connect like say one top of ditch to the adjacent top of ditch and not realize that there's a ditch in the middle unless there's a point directly 2 Q Yeah, because it's making lines 2 A or it can connect a culvert up underneath a	<pre>of thing? Do they record their do they do a notebook, do they have, you know A Well, they do do a notebook and they make sure that what they're starting from that day, every day, and what they're getting oriented to, hasn't moved from the day before and they record that by hand outside of the electronic recording and also inside the electronic recording is the first shot and the last shot in any one individual setup so that we know everything in between was good. O Okay. And Exhibit 228 in front of you, is that one of those field notebooks? MR. HARBECK: I'm sorry, which exhibit? MR. GLEISNER: 228? MS. KAVANAUGH: Exhibit 228. Well, it's not marked yet, I'm sorry. It shows a bunch of numbers. The one that looks like this. MR. HARBECK: This one? MS. KAVANAUGH: Yes. A I see one over here, yes. MS. KAVANAUGH: And, forgive me, I'm asking a couple of little semi-leading questions to speed things along, but you can object if you've got a problem. MR. HARBECK: You've noticed I've </pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 221	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 223
<pre>1 roadway and the profile of the roadway will go down 2 the elevation of the culvert and back up again. So 3 we induce break lines and the instruction into the 4 computer is they can't connect any points that cross 5 this line. 6 Q So it's basically telling the computer say if there's 7 a ridge here or if there's a 8 A Yes, a top of a bank or a 9 Q a culvert or a depression, when you're drawing 10 your line you can't just go straight across from 11 dot-to-dot 12 A Exactly. 13 Q you know, when you're doing that triangle? Okay. 14 A Yep. 15 Q Okay. And then when you so they're looking for 16 interruptions your folks out there? 17 A Yes. 18 Q And then the machine, when you take those five 19 observations, at least one of those observations, if 20 there is one, is going to catch it, right? 21 A Yes. 22 Q Okay. So then you once you get all that information 23 how do you what type of controls do you have like 24 the work they're doing in the field to make sure that 25 they're properly recording break lines and that type 20 LECAL VIDEO SERVICES 21 A 22 LECAL VIDEO SERVICES 22 LECAL VIDEO SERVICES 23 A So then you can't properly recording break lines and that type 34 A type 35 A So then you folks break lines and that type 35 A So then you have like 36 A So then you have like 37 A Yes A So then you folks break lines and that type 36 A So then you have like 37 A Yes A So then you folks break lines and that type 37 A So then you have like 38 A So then you have like they're properly recording break lines and that type 39 A B So then you have like they're properly recording break lines and that type 30 A B So then you have like they're properly recording break lines and that type 30 A B So then you have like they're properly recording break lines and that type 30 A B So then you have like they're properly recording break lines and that type 30 A B So then you have like they're properly recording break lines and that type 30 A B So then you have like they're properly recording break lines and tha</pre>	1 refrained. 2 MS. KAVANAUGH: I'm sorry? 3 MR. HARBECK: You've noticed I've 4 refrained. 5 MS. KAVANAUGH: Yes, you've been a dear. 6 MS. KAVANAUGH: We're trying to speed this 7 along. 8 MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. 9 Q So they do these field notebooks and then that shows 10 the breaks and then that should corroborate what the 11 machine is recording as well? 12 A Well, there's this is there's just a few of the 13 days of the hand notes that they took out there and 14 it's kind of their diary 15 Q A sample? 16 and it's a hand documentation of the checks that 17 they performed to make sure that they're where they 18 think they are. 19 Q Q ot so sort of similar to the field notes (inaudible) well, you weren't here, but where they 19 go out and you take field notes and then you might 11 put it into a better the computer has it in a 13
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES	

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 57	
done their field notes, they've gone out and they've looked for their break lines to make sure that they're not extending lines in directions that they haven't. All of this information goes where all of these observations? A Well, it comes back in as an electronic data file and it's brought into Auto Desk's Civil 3D program. Auto Desk is a worldwide company, well-respected for their (inaudible) packages and drafting programs. Q And is that pretty accepted as a, you know, professionally adequate, as a good program, superior program, in the surveying field? A yes, very much so. Q And well-used, I mean? A Well, the computer will take the mass points or the random shots that are out there and use the break lines that were developed in the field and develop they call it a triangular or irregular network where three points are connected together and it's assumed to be a flat plain in between those three points and that is a surface model. And then once that's completed it will display contours at whatever	1 A On the cover there's just a graphic depiction of where the points were that they shot that day. 9 Okay. 4 A And on the inside are the actual coordinates that were developed, the codes for what they were, and the standard deviation to each one of those points (inaudible) elevation. 9 Okay. So you can set what the standard deviation is 9 that's acceptable? 10 A Yes. And then as an additional check we usually sort 11 all the points for that day based on the worst 12 standard deviation and see how bad the worst shots 13 are. 14 Q Okay. So then once you get all of that you said 15 that, you know, you generate these triangles and I 16 guess they sort of fit together almost like if you 17 were putting together a model except it's in the 18 computer like, you know, you've got this one at this 19 elevation, a triangle, and the elevation is like this 10 or this other one, the elevation is like that, and 11 they sort of all fit together and you've got a 3D 12 picture, is 13 A Yes, all the triangles have common sides, you know, 19 and but they're all tipped in the direction that 20 the data that they shot in the field told you
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 225	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 227
<pre>interval as long as we're you can be a half by foot or (inaudible) standards you can be a half a contour interval off and still be okay. Obviously, most of our shots are three-eights of an inch. You're not going to make a contour of a half an inch out there. Everything would be black. So we'll receate a contour map with whatever density that we need to, to be able to show to the man that was in the field this is what your data created and they'll back check it and make sure that, you know, what he thought he was doing out there was actually done. So to make sure that it sort of looks that what they were working on out there Yes, right. You know, if you come up with a mountain and there isn't a mountain Right. You know, if you come up with a mountain and there isn't a mountain M. Right. You so I guess this will be 220 MS. KAVANAUGH: Is it 228, Tim? No, 229, the one with the points? Yeah, that's a different day, but it's the same concept. You know. Can you identify what that is?</pre>	<pre>1 know, ascertained. 2 Q And the break lines have to be a side of one of 3 those? 4 A The break lines have to be the side of the triangles, 5 yeah. 6 Q Because otherwise the lines would be crossing? 7 A Right, exactly. 8 Q And making an improper an incorrect picture of 9 what's out there? 10 A Right. 11 Q Okay. So once you've got all of that then the 12 contour lines, how do they come up with those because 13 we've looked at some exhibits that have, you know, 14 contour lines on the maps and they'll show, you know, 15 the elevations. Are those prepared from the 3D 16 computer models or how does that work? How do you 17 get from A to B? 18 A Yeah, the contour is one way to display the surface 19 model in a way that a human can understand. 20 Q Okay. 21 A And so if there's a triangle out there that has a 21 line that starts out at an elevation of say 100 and 23 ends up at an elevation of 102, well, the 101 contour 24 would run halfway across that line and it just keeps 25 following that elevation based on the interpretation</pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 226	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 228

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 58	
<pre>1 of the elevations of the points of the triangles 2 until it gets out of sight. 3 Q So it is sort of fair to say it's kind of like the 3D 4 map that's been generated by the computer squashed 5 down into two dimensions, is that and then the 6 lines indicate the up and down instead of actually 7 having a 3D model? 8 A It's one way to visualize the elevations from a top 9 down viewpoint. We also can look at cross-sections 10 from a sideways viewpoint instead of a top down 11 viewpoint and those can be expanded to enhance your 12 ability to understand the site. 13 Q Okay. The sideways ones, is that what you all were 14 talking about as the cross-sections or is that 15 something different? 16 A No, cross-sections are I think there was an 17 exhibit up here that had a profile in it that 18 followed the line of those triangles. 19 Q Okay. But is that the sideways ones you're talking 20 about? 21 A Yes. 22 Q Okay. Gotcha. So if your surveying techs were out 23 there and they noticed 24 MS. KAVANAUGH: No. Okay, let me withdraw 25 that. </pre>	<pre>1 grove of trees and I probably would have done the 2 same thing that they did. 3 Q It's pretty flat? 4 A Yeah. 5 Q Okay. Regard the complaint that and I think 6 someone testified well, they didn't even locate the 7 grove of trees or show it on the survey map. Would 8 it have cost more to locate and draw that grove of 9 trees? I think their expert did. He had this big 10 green area showing the drip lines their surveyor. 11 Would that have cost more to locate and draw that 12 grove of trees on the plan? 13 A It would have cost more to spend the time to walk out 14 all the drip lines out there. You know, there's a 15 lot of different trees out there and so the emphasis 16 was on the larger trees that would affect the cost 17 the most. 18 Q Okay. And would drawing that grove of trees have 19 provided any useful information for the construction 10 project? 14 I don't believe it would have. 25 Okay. So the computer program, I think you mentioned 26 the name of it already. Is the data stored directly 27 into the surveying equipment and I think you said 28 that it takes the shots and stores the data there, is</pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 229	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 231
1 Q The survey techs, are they trained in how to	1 that correct?
<pre>1 g The survey techs, are they trained in now to 2 recognize these discontinuities and designate break 3 lines? 4 A Yes. 5 Q Okay. And some of the witnesses, earlier witnesses, 6 testified Kapur should have shot more points in the 7 grove of trees that is at issue in this hearing and 8 should have drawn the trees onto the survey map so 9 maybe they were thinking more mass points in that 10 vicinity would have revealed better topography? I 11 don't know, but they were, you know, saying well, 12 there should have been more points here, there should 13 have been you know, they should have surveyed more 14 in there. Now, if your surveying techs that have 15 been trained to recognize these discontinuities, if 16 they were out in the field and they noticed an 17 interruption of slope in the grove of trees, if they 18 noticed a deep dip, a steep line, a bank, would they 19 have recorded those areas as break lines? 20 A Yes, and to the extent that would have affected 21 constructability and 22 Q So the fact that there aren't many survey points in 23 that area, that doesn't mean the techs just ignored 24 or missed that area, does it? 25 A No. And when I was on the site I looked through the 27 A Yes and to the aster I looked through the 28 A So the fact hat area, does it? 29 A Yes and when I was on the site I looked through the 20 A Yes and yes on the site I looked through the 20 A Yes and yes on the site I looked through the 20 A Yes and yes on the site I looked through the 20 A Yes and yes on the site I looked through the 29 A Yes and yes on the site I looked through the 20 A Yes and yes on the site I looked through the 20 A Yes and yes on the site I looked through the 21 A Yes A Yes and Yes on the site I looked through the 22 A Yes and Yes on the yes on the site I looked through the 23 A Yes and Yes on the site I looked through the 24 A Yes and Yes on the site I looked through the 25 A Yes and Yes on the site I looked through the 26 A Yes and Yes on the site I looked</pre>	A Yes, that's correct. They store it on board. Q Okay. And then is that input manually into the computer or do they just connect and A Yes, they take the information out of the data collectors and put them directly in the computer. Q Okay. And then once the data is transferred is it available? I think you were talking about standard deviations and looking for the first ones. You guys get to do a check of the data? A Yes, all of the raw data is not Q Okay. N We always store all of the raw data so that we know what we've got instead of the coordinates just at the end of it. Q Okay. And you said you looked for the (inaudible) when you were doing that, like the worst the worst standard Yeah, we try to sort them by no, we don't try to, we always sort them by their positional qualities and then look to see which the worst ones are. And if we have one that we think is starting to approach a problem, we'll look and see where it is and how it's going to be used and we'll take it out of the data set and reshoot it again if it's necessary to have a
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

	SHEET 59	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22	<pre>point at that location. Q Okay. MS. KAVANAUGH: And I think I've only got one copy of these so we don't have to enter it if you object. Q But, basically, can you identify what these are for the Judge and then I'll show it MR. GLEISNER: Do we have copies of that? MS. KAVANAUGH: No, I have one copy. That's what I just finished saying so I was showing it to him to identify and I'll show it to you. We don't have to put it in as an exhibit if you object, but we're using it to explain to the Judge MR. GLEISNER: Okay. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: This probably causing havoc with the mic. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. MR. GLEISNER: May we approach, Your Honor, as he testifies ALJ BOLDT: Sure. Yeah, yeah, that's an efficient way to do it. Good suggestion. Q And just basically you don't have to show where it is, I'm just asking, you know, what type of map what type of document is this? MS. MALENDAL MS. MALENDAL MS. CAUBERS IN STANDAL MS. CAUBERS IN STANDAL M</pre>	1all the way to the intersection, but it'd be2close, yeah, and the lake is down here.3MR. GLEISNER: To speed things along, Your4Honor, may I ask a question?5ALJ BOLDT: Go ahead.6MR. GLEISNER: Take a look at Exhibit 16 in7the white book, would you sir, and compare it8with what we've got here. I am very sorry, I9think I no, that's all right, this drawing is10different than in my book. I'm sorry, Your11Honor.12MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. And what's the13question?14MR. GLEISNER: The question is, is that the15same as this?16THE WITNESS: Well, it is it's from the17same data, but these contours are at a bigger18interval and it's a small area. There's a small19window of the site and this profile that you see20up on the top is the tipped up view of this line21looking at it from a slightly down angle.22MR. GLEISNER: We'd like to get copies of23this.24MS. KAVANAUGH: Yeah, we can get you a25copy.
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 233	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 235
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>MR. GALLO: This is the north/south road from Redland Road. A Yeah, this is the intersection, if you want to call it that. Q Okay. And this is showing like the lines and the triangles?</pre>	1MR. GLEISNER: Pardon? MR. GALLO: How do you track this line on this map?4THE WITNESS: Well, zero here and then the different stations. This would be 100 feet away from zero and then here is zero on the map and this is 100 feet away from zero. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hang on a second.9Stop with the paper while he's talking, please. MS. KAVANAUGH: Sorry.11THE WITNESS: Okay. So zero here, 100, zero, that's on a sideways view, zero here and 100 on the top down view. And so as you follow that line the computer is going to follow that line and follow each one of the faces of the triangles as it's doing it and raise and lower this line accordingly. This line can be exaggerated.19MR. GALLO: I understand, but is this the street line or is this a line ALJ BOLDT: Okay. We're not really indicating what this is and THE WITNESS: Yeah, this is a line24QThis being the zero plus 00 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We're on 16-001,
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 234	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 236

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<pre>data and you probably input it and it creates these maps I think you said that your folks do once you generate the 3D document, the 3D visual, they ground proofed it by going out and comparing it, right? A Yeah, they can go back out again to the site, but if they've spent a week out there already, most of the</pre>	<pre>someone might have testified about some of the Waukesha County or other maps having two foot or ten foot intervals. Is it fair to say that a 2.4 inch interval is going to give you a much more precise picture of what's really out there? A Well, if you look at the amateur standards for how the contour maps were developed at Waukesha County provides even if there GIS, those were flown from an airplane and the company that flew those was restricted to follow the standards for their scope, for their contract, in two-foot contour intervals respect. That meant that they could fly higher and have a different focal length on their camera and their control could be a little bit looser, but they had to stay within so that each contour itself was within a foot of the truth on the ground. And they get checked after they fly it, but you can only</pre>
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	what the contour intervals are for those maps the ones that you generated for this project or do you have to look at one?	<pre>18 really rely on them to the nearest foot if it's a 19 two-foot contour. 20 Q Okay. And so if it's a 2.4 inch contour, what can 21 you rely on it to what extent? 22 A Well, because of our methodology here, we could rely 23 on them to the easily to the nearest half inch. 24 Q Okay. 25 A And we can just keep making them denser by the 26 LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES</pre>
	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 237	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 239
6	<pre>contours, you know, into the tenth of a foot, but I think that the ones on the plans that we have are probably one foot intervals. I don't know that, I'd have to look. Q Okay. I think there are some that show two-tenths of a foot.</pre>	 visualization. Q Okay. So based on the information we've reviewed, your testimony, your personal knowledge, your experience as a registered land surveyor, the work you performed in overseeing the surveying on this project, have you formed a professional opinion to a
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q That's the ones I'm talking about. Okay. And so basically that means that the elevation of the ground between one contour line and another rises or falls by about 2.4 inches? Is that one-tenth two-tenths of a foot? I'm thinking one-tenth is 1.2? A Yeah, about yeah, two-and-three-eights inches, yeah. Q Okay. Okay. Are contour intervals that precise in all maps? 	<pre>reasonable degree of professional certainty as to whether the maps and the diagrams generated by Kapur for this project adequately and accurately represent the site? MR. HARBECK: You mean with respect to the survey elevations? MS. KAVANAUGH: Yes, with respect to the survey elevations. MR. HARBECK: Okay. MR. GALLO: And with respect to the areas being surveyed? MS. KAVANAUGH: Yeah, in respect to yeah, well, of course, they can't represent what they didn't survey. Is that what you're saying? MR. GALLO: Yes. MS. KAVANAUGH: Yes. A And then I'd like to add and for the purpose of the survey.</pre>

	HEET 61		
1 Q 2 A 3 Q 4 5 A 6 7 8 Q 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	<pre>Right. Okay. Yes. Okay. Is there anything else you want to add to your testimony at this point? No, and I guess other than the fact that I walked out to the site after the mapping was done and I didn't see anything that I would have changed. Okay. MS. KAVANAUGH: I've got no further questions. I'd like to move those into evidence if ALJ BOLDT: Do you want to mark one of these really cool ones? MR. GLEISNER: Yes, Your Honor. MS. KAVANAUGH: Yes. ALJ BOLDT: I guess I've been doing this too long when I think these are really cool, but MS. KAVANAUGH: No, they are. I thought they were pretty cool too. MR. GLEISNER: I think, Your Honor, we would like to have all of these marked. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Yeah, let's go off the record. (Recess taken)</pre>	3 AFour o'clock to p4UNIDENT5disturbed a6THE WIT7a buck was r8so I hope he9ALJ BOL0Okay. Than1Are you read2MS. KAV3soon as I ca4ALJ BOL5the whole tr6help you God7MR. WOO8ALJ BOL9record. We0order. We'r1All rig2while we're3ALJ BOL	<pre>INESS: I believe I did. As we left, running his way down the (inaudible) e stuck around. .DT: Any other questions, gentlemen? uk you very much. You're excused. dy to call your next witness? VANAUGH: Yes, I'd call Pete Wood as an find his stuff. .DT: Do you swear to tell the truth, .DT: Do you swear to tell the truth, .DT: Do you swear to tell the truth, .DT: I do. .DT: All right. We're on the need to keep order. We need to keep re all getting tired and punchy. yht. Let's go off the record here</pre>
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 241	LEG (608) 279-529	AL VIDEO SERVICES 95 Prairie du Sac WI 243
1		1	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Q 10 11 A 12 Q 13 A 14 Q 15 A 16 Q 17 A 18 19 20 Q 21 22 A 23 24 25	ALJ BOLDT: We're back on the record and we've marked 230 and then there's 230A through F which are all the big printouts that we were talking about earlier. Okay. Any questions, Mr. Meyer? MR. MEYER: Very briefly. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. MEYER: Mr. Kruger, you said you were out on the site a long time? Yes. Can you tell us when that was, if you recall? Just recently. And what does that mean? I stopped out there last night on the way home. So it's fresh in your mind? It is fresh in my mind, yeah. I really didn't have any reason to not trust the guys. I've been working with them for, you know, 15 years so And nothing you saw when you were out there changed your opinion at all? No, nothing. MR. MEYER: No further questions. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Mr. Gallo? CROSS-EXAMINATION	3 ALJ BOL 4 to G. Okay. 5 received. 6 DI 7 BY MS. KAVANAUGH: 8 Q 9 your work address 9 your work address 1 address is DNR, S 2 (phonetic) Road, 3 Q 4 State of Wisconsi 5 Q 4 State of Wisconsi 5 Q 7 Q 6 Water resources e 7 Q 7 Q 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 Q 0 Kay. 9 Q 0 A 9 Q 0 A 1 Q 0 May. 2 MS. KAV 3 going to mar 4 I'll just ha	ISNER: No, Your Honor. DT: Including the we're now up 224 through 230A through G are all RECT EXAMINATION Sate and spell your full name and s for the record? L. Last name is W-O-O-D. Work Sturtevant Service Center, 9531 Rain Sturtevant, Wisconsin. current employer? n, Department of Natural Resources. position?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Q 10 11 A 12 Q 13 A 14 Q 15 A 16 Q 17 A 16 Q 17 A 16 Q 17 A 12 Q 10 23 A 16 Q 17 A 16 Q 17 A 12 Q 13 A 14 Q 15 A 14 Q 15 A 16 Q 17 A 18 20 21 A 18 20 21 A 18 20 21 A 22 A 23 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24	<pre>we've marked 230 and then there's 230A through F which are all the big printouts that we were talking about earlier. Okay. Any questions, Mr. Meyer?</pre>	2 MR. GLE 3 ALJ BOL 4 to G. Okay. 5 received. 6 DI 7 BY MS. KAVANAUGH: 8 Q 9 your work address 9 your work address 1 BY MS. KAVANAUGH: 8 Q 1 BY MS. KAVANAUGH: 8 Q 1 Okay. Can you st 9 your work address 1 Gokay. Can you st 9 Your work address 1 Gokay. Can you st 1 Gokay. And your curent 6 A 7 Q Kay. And your curent 6 A 8 A 9 Q Kay. And where 8 A 9 Q Kay. So the sou 0 A 1 Q 0 May. 2 MS. KAV 3 going to mar 4 I'll just ha 5 won't pu	<pre>ISNER: No, Your Honor. .DT: Including the we're now up 224 through 230A through G are all RECT EXAMINATION tate and spell your full name and s for the record? 1. Last name is W-O-O-D. Work Sturtevant Service Center, 9531 Rain Sturtevant, Wisconsin. current employer? .n, Department of Natural Resources. position? engineer. are you stationed? evant Service Center. atheast region, correct? YANAUGH: And I realize that I was theast region, correct? YANAUGH: And I realize that I was the this, didn't make copies, so maybe twe you read it. It's and we the in unless</pre>

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 62	
1 MR. GLEISNER: I don't know what it is, 2 Counsel. 3 MS. KAVANAUGH: It's a brief resume. Okay. 4 And then we'll mark it and then you'll get a 5 copy of it when 6 Q 7 A Do you want me to identify this? 8 ALJ BOLDT: Sure. 9 Q 9 Yes. 10 A This is just a brief resume, including my education 11 and work experience. 12 Q 13 MS. KAVANAUGH: And that would be exhibit 14 what, Tim? 15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 231. 16 MS. KAVANAUGH: 231. Okay. 17 Q 18 A It covers 1988 through the present. 19 Q 10 Way. And then just 10 MS. KAVANAUGH: Right. Well, I think we'll 12 MS. KAVANAUGH: Right. Well, I think we'll 13 MS. KAVANAUGH: Right. Well, I think we'll 14 yust make copies but we can have him read 15 MR. MEYER: Okay.	1water resources engineer focused in the storm water2management program at DNR. And my duties under the3storm water management program are primarily in4construction site permitting and municipal storm5water regulation. Through that program I do6engineering plan review, permitting and site7inspections and I currently am working predominantly8in Racine and Kenosha Counties and provide just9general water engineering assistance when needed to10other DNR staff throughout the southeast region.11Q12MS. KAVANAUGH: And this is I believe13Page 2, I'm sorry, of the DNR listing. They14never seem to be on one page.15UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's part of16MS. KAVANAUGH: Part of the listing17of yes, of his18MR. HARBECK: Is that part of Exhibit 232?19UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.20Okay. Are you a professional engineer?2A Yeah, registered in Wisconsin since 1996.2Q Okay. So in your duties as an engineer do you review24of engineering input on applications for DNR25permits or approvals?
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 245	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 247
1MS. KAVANAUGH: And then I'm going to have2him I'm sorry, this is off the DNR website3but we'll make copies basically the listing4of what he does and the areas he's responsible5for.6Can you identify that, please?7A8Sure. This is just a datasheet off of the Wisconsin9DNR website that indicates the different job duties,9areas of expertise and the counties that I work in.10Q11MS. KAVANAUGH: And that would be12Exhibit 232, Tim right?13UNIDENIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.14MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay.15Q16briefly highlight your post-high school education?17A18environmental technology from Paul Smith's College19and Paul Smith's Newark and a bachelor's degree in20forest engineering from the State University of21New York College, environmental science and forestry22at Syracuse, New York. I've been working for DNR23since 1991. I initially was hired as a municipal24water supply engineer, worked there for approximately25seven years, and for the last 13 years I've been a	 1 A That's primarily my role at DNR, is a plan review engineer for development projects that come in. 2 Okay. And when you say development projects, is that anyone's or just DNR? 5 A It's development projects that require NR216 permits 6 which is our construction site storm water discharge permit program so that would be construction sites 8 that will disturb in excess of one acre. 9 O Okay. So when you're reviewing these is it typical or unusual to go on field investigations of surveys regarding these projects? 1 A I very rarely do any kind of field investigation as part of plan review. Most of my field work is during construction as an erosion control inspector. My field experience is primarily with construction inspection. 10 Okay. So you're going out to see if they're doing what they're supposed to do and if there's any erosion occurring? 2 A Yes, that's true. 2 Okay. And Waukesha County I think you said you're primarily in Racine and Kenosha now, but is Waukesha County an area for which you have these responsibilities? 2 A Not currently, no.
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 246	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 248

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

2 build a public boat launch 3 A Yes. Yes, I'm familiar wi	th the project. 3 role in the application for 4 his proposed boat launch? 5	to get a feel for the lar in the time when we were	
<pre>7 engineering consultant, wh 8 that I thought I could 9 could help with. 10 Q Okay. So it's fair to say 11 engineering, Kapur did tha 12 A Right, I was not responsit 13 Q Okay. And you're not the 14 the project either? 15 A No, no. 16 Q And that would be who? 17 A Lynette Check (phonetic) i 18 project manager. 19 Q Okay. And I believe the a 20 Exhibit 200, will show tha 21 signed it. The manual coc 22 Exhibit 201 in the blue bi 23 Lynette Check and that's b </pre>	that someone thought I y you didn't do the that someone thought I y you didn't do the the for any engineering, no. project manager (inaudible) 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 14 15 16 18 19 14 15 16 18 19 14 15 16 18 19 14 15 16 18 19 14 15 16 17 18 19 10 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 10 10 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 10 10 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 10 10 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 10 10 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	<pre>calling the channel or th end of the DNR boat laund time was with the group of site in I believe it was Q And that was during the of A Right, exactly. Q And you've heard descript descriptions you've be testimony during this hea A All of it, yes. Q And you've heard descript generally agree with the described, fairly flat, a the swale on the north, t North Lake on the east? A Yes, I would agree with e Q Okay. Now, when you s</pre>	he wetland swale on the north ch property and the third of us that went out to the August of this year. discovery process, correct? cions, I think various een here for most of the aring? cions of the site. Do you way the site has been a little bit of a depression, the big wetland on the west, everything that's been said. said that at one point you
24 evidence and was issued by 25 testified, a water managen LEGAL VIDEO (608) 279-5295 249	nent specialist. So it's 25	were asked for your opini site and you said it migh LEGAL VIDEC (608) 279-5295 251	nt have come up) SERVICES Prairie du Sac WI
<pre>2 for compliance with Chapte 3 A Correct, I wasn't involved 4 Q Okay. And you're not the 5 who reviewed it to see if 6 statute and administrative 7 A No, that's one of my count 8 Q And who would that be? 9 A Brian Hartsook (phonetic). 10 Q Okay. So your role in rec</pre>	l in that. storm water staff person it met the storm water e ferparts out of Waukesha. 8 9	<pre>believe? A Yes, I believe there was been generated by Dr. O'F map that showed some arro mentioned by Kurt, the su Engineering, that map was publicly available contou</pre>	urveyor from Kapur
16 recently there were some c	ie what that was exactly?11it was just to give some12the storm water treatment13be necessary for the boat14secondarily, it was more15questions that came up, I16new process, about draining17anderstand that a little20whowledge three times.23urpose of each visit and24	generated on behalf or So and as mentioned be somewhat crude, a two-foo crude, and because this p general area, my thought enough detail to really r around in this direction. recommended that Kapur go particularly of the north not shown up to my knowle anything any plans. S and that's why I went out observe getting data on t in turn, Kapur turned that the site and of the ir	efore that the map is ot contour map is somewhat property is so flat, this process was it didn't give hail down how water moves . So that's why I bo out and pick up some data, n channel because that had edge on any previous maps or So that was my recommendation the field, was to that north swale. And then, at into a topographic map of

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 64	
<pre>1 exhibit in the blue binder, Exhibit 210, and can you 2 identify that? 3 A Yes, I finally get to talk about my famous exhibit. 4 Yes, I'm very much aware of this one as is everybody 5 else by now. Yes, this is the map that I'm referring 6 to that I was just previously referring to. 7 Q Okay. So this is the one that you looked at 8 A This is the information that was the information 9 gathered by Kapur with the north swale plus all the 10 other data points they had in development of a 11 contour map, right. 12 Q Okay. And I'd ask if you could look at Exhibit 212 13 and identify that the documents in there. 14 A Yes, 212 is another representation of the information 15 that was obtained during the survey data, a 16 representation of my assessment of a low path from 17 the DNR property. 18 Q Okay. 19 MS. KAVANAUGH: And I don't remember if 20 those have been entered into evidence yet. If 21 not, I'd ask that they be. 22 MR. GLEISNER: I think they have been. 23 They were marked 24 MS. CORRELL: I think so too. 25 MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. Yeah, I don't 26 MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. Yeah, I don't 27 MS. CORRELL: I think so too. 28 MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. Yeah, I don't 29 MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. Yeah, I don't 20 MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. Yeah, I don't 21 MS. CORRELL: I think so too. 25 MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. Yeah, I don't 26 MS. CORRELL: I think so too. 27 MS. CORRELL: I think so too. 28 MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. Yeah, I don't 29 MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. Yeah, I don't 20 MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. Yeah, I don't 20 MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. Yeah, I don't 21 MS. CORRELL: I think so too. 22 MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. Yeah, I don't 23 MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. Yeah, I don't 24 MS CORRELL: I think so too. 25 MS CORRELL: I think so too. 26 MS CORRELL: I think so too. 27 MS CORRELL: I think so too. 28 MS CORRELL: I think so too. 29 MS CORRELL: I think so too. 20 MS CORRELL: I think so too. 20 MS CORRELL: I think so too. 21 MS CORRELL: I think so too. 22 MS CORRELL: I th</pre>	1212 in connection2MS. KAVANAUGH: (Inaudible).3MR. HARBECK: Is this a piece of 210?4MS. KAVANAUGH: That's a piece of yeah,5I kept trying to blow it up or something where6it'd be easier to read, but the higher it got7the fuzzier the numbers got, you know,8so okay.9MS. CORRELL: Oh.10MS. KAVANAUGH: Yeah, so it's not that11useful. I was trying to look at some of the12numbers.13Q14testimony to try to answer the question of where's15the drainage from the DNR site?16A17water falling on the DNR proposed boat launch site,18what would happen to that drop of water, so that's19the perspective I came from in developing these maps.20Q kay. So looking at 210, show me how you decided21where that water would go?22A23Yes. And a lot of this has been testified to and so24there is an elevation of about 899 where the access25road, the current access road, comes in to the
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 253	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 255
1remember, but 210 and 212.2ALJ BOLDT: Yep, they're both in.3MS. KAVANAUGH: They're already in? Okay.4ALJ BOLDT: Yes. I'm sorry, no, 210 was5not in previously.6MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. 212 was though?7ALJ BOLDT: Any objection to 210?8MR. GLEISNER: No, Your Honor, none at all.9ALJ BOLDT: Okay.10MR. GLEISNER: I think it came in under a11different number, just so we're aware of that.12ALJ BOLDT: Okay.13MS. KAVANAUGH: (Inaudible).14MR. GLEISNER: Correct, I think we have it15in, Your Honor, at let me just quickly get16here and I'll tell you. We have that one in as17Exhibit 16-002 I believe, Tim.18MS. KAVANAUGH: (Inaudible).19MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor, just for the20record, if I may? 16-002 needs to stay in21because there's additional annotation on that.22ALJ BOLDT: Sure, sure. We could mark it23210A if you want.24MS. KAVANAUGH: (Inaudible).25Q20So you prepared these documents at Exhibit 210 and	<pre>proposed boat launch area from the west. That elevation kind of holds for the most part running along the north end of the DNR proposed boat launch site along the south end of the channel, working its way towards the lake. Q Okay. So you're talking about the north part of Yes. So just laying out the lay of the landscape Q Oh, okay. A and this had been kind of a test essentially, people had pointed this out. I'm just verifying. I think Mr. Peters actually made a good summary of this. Q Okay. That's fine. A There's essentially a ridge at elevation, and I'm just going to estimate, 899 running along the north end of the DNR property adjacent to the wetlands, adjacent to the wetland swale, heading towards the lake. When it gets near the lake it takes a turn to the south and runs down and connects into the Hanson property. Q Okay. A So the process of that ridge creates a depression within the DNR boat launch site so that's what I tried to MR. MEYER: Clarification. And that ridge</pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 65	
SHEET 65 is sort of where the road comes towards the lake? THE WITNESS: Yes. A And it really holds essentially almost to the same elevation as the road. MR. MEYER: Okay. A It holds within inches of that Q Okay. So I guess I'm A so it creates it contains this depressional area that I depicted essentially. Q Okay. And is that what you outlined on Exhibit 210? A Yes, essentially, yes. Q And then I've duplicated the outline on here. Okay. A So what I next understanding that, what I tried to do is find out what is the lowest point elevation from this area that would be essentially the first point of outlet and I found that point elevation that's highlighted at the start of this black dashed line with the arrow of 898.68. Q Okay. And that would be right where the west side of that black arrow, the dash, right next to it? A Right. So that is the lowest point that I could find looking at this the spot elevations Q Okay. So Q where water would leave that would be the	<pre>1 Q contour line? 2 A Yes. 3 MR. GLEISNER: Can Counsel approach, Your 4 Honor? 5 MR. MEYER: And can I ask a that's the 6 wetland that's been referred to as a 7 federally-designated wetland that appeared near 8 the grove of trees? 9 THE WITNESS: That's correct, right. 10 MS. KAVANAUGH: Yes, yes, the grove of 11 trees is (inaudible). 12 A So what would happen again 13 Q So it looks like that is 898.4 for the line 14 A Right, exactly. 15 Q and then there's it looks like there's a 16 couple of points inside that line? 17 A Yes, like any contour map, there would be lower spot 18 elevations that represent 19 Q Okay. So those are those 20 A The ultimate lowest point is actually a little bit 21 lower, a few inches 22 Q Okay. 23 A An inch or so lower than this contour. 24 Q Okay. 25 A So there is an ultimate low point.</pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 257	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 259
<pre>1 primary location water would prefer to go, again, 2 following the laws of gravity, water flowing 3 downhill. That would be the point 4 Q Okay. 5 A where water would flow off the DNR property. 6 Q So this is sort of like a bowl, this whole 7 outline 8 A Yes, so the outline yes. 9 Q here that's going to be like the lip of the bowl? 10 A Yes, so the outline is a bowl. 11 Q And this is the spout or this is like if you took a 12 bowl, if you were making one with clay, and you put 13 your finger in to lower it at that point? 14 A Yes yeah. Now, there is there's obviously a 15 lower contour elevation, 898.4, essentially 16 represents the bottom of this bowl. 17 Q Right. 18 A It's where essentially that delineated wetland that 19 people have mentioned 20 Q Okay. 21 A It's essentially down in that area, okay? 22 Q Okay. If you want to maybe 23 A So that's 898.4, yeah. 24 Q Maybe you want to outline the lowest 25 A Sure.</pre>	<pre>1 Q Okay. And the contour is at 898.4? 2 A Yes. 3 Q And the top of the the rim of the bowl is what? 4 A Is 898.8, okay? 5 Q Okay. So you're talking about 6 A So to project this out, the drop of water 7 scenario 8 Q Okay. 9 A several drops of water start filling up this low 10 spot, the elevation rises until it gets to the 11 elevation of 898.68 which is approximately talking 12 about three inches or three or four inches up to this 13 elevation where it will start to flow. 14 ALJ BOLDT: And that's where the black dash 15 line is? 16 THE WITNESS: Yes, right. 17 A But that's when flow would start, but the reason why 18 I added in the I went up to the next contour 19 elevation to just show, depict, that there has to be 20 some reasonable flow depth so that would basically 21 represent if you project from 898.68 up to the 22 next contour which is 898.8, water would be flowing 23 through this area at a depth of about an 24 inch-and-a-half or so. So the point of that was 25 saying this would be the point where you could</pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 66 1 actually physically see flow. 2 Q Okay. Because it would have to get high enough 3 A A couple inches, yes. 4 Q to fill all of this 5 A Right.	<pre>1 Q and flows downhill is what I've heard over and 2 over in this okay. 3 A So that was the whole point of this map, is try to 4 represent 5 Q Okay.</pre>
A Right. 6 Q and get out to this 7 A Right. 8 Q 8.6 8.98 9 A Right. So water would be flowing through this area 10 at a depth of a couple inches 11 Q Okay. 12 A is how that's the point of making it so I had 13 to show, you know I could go backwards and try to 14 make my own contour at 698.6 to show the actual 15 isolated depression where water would in other 16 words, water would fill up to that point and it would 17 just sit there. 18 Q Okay. 19 A So it doesn't flow out of there until it gets to the 88 or 898.68 it would start flowing 21 Q Okay. 22 A so I put in the pink line to show a reasonable 23 depth of flow where you could actually see water 24 flowing through this area. 25 Q So if water wasn't flowing out of this bowl, would be	6 A that concept. 7 Q Okay. So once you what is the difference between the elevation at the outside edge of this lip, the pink line, and the lowest contour elevation? I think you've got 898.4, is that correct, for that blue line? 12 A Right, 890 from the lowest contour elevation 0 Okay. 14 A the contour shown is 898.4 15 Q Okay. 16 A so the 898.8 would be four-tenths of a foot which is 18 Q Okay. 19 A five and some odd you know, somewhere in that neighborhood. 21 Q Yeah, so we're talking about 22 A Five inches, yeah. 23 Q 4.8 inches or something? 24 A Right, right. 25 Q So maybe five inches again, you know?
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 261	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 263
<pre>1 sort of the deepest it could get based on the lower 2 and the upper elevations here? Would it be the 3 difference between like the very low point of 4 A Yeah. 5 Q 898.36 and 898.68 or 6 A There's actually a little bit there's 7 one there's an 898.27. 8 Q Okay. 9 A So it'd be the difference between 898.27 and 898.68. 10 Q 898.68. So we're talking 11 A Which is in that four to five inch 12 Q Okay. 13 A range. 14 Q Yeah, about .41 of a foot. Yeah, okay, so about five 15 inches? 16 A Right. At the deepest, right. 17 Q Okay. And then once 18 A And then when water was flowing it'd be another 19 couple inches so that's 20 Q Right, right, because you'd have to have enough 21 A Right.</pre>	1 A Right. 2 Q Okay. So you concluded then that it drained to the southwest here. And then Exhibit 212, is that sort of the continuation of 5 A Yes. Well, let's go back to 212. 6 MR. HARBECK: And do you mean 212, Page 2? THE WITNESS: Yes, right. 8 So this was my effort to make it a little simpler to understand and put in a broader context of water 9 A So this was my effort. You know, I did some rounding because this is just a you know, it gets confusing when you start talking hundredths of a foot so I did some rounding. So the first the point surface 16 runoff discharge location elevation 898.7 is 17 that is really the 898.68 that I mentioned. I rounded up just for the ease of this document. 19 Q Right. Okay. Okay. 20 A So that's the point that I talked about, the discharge point from the depression area within the DNR boat launch
22 Q inches above it for the water to start 23 equalizing, right, because water seeks its own 24 level 25 A Right.	23 Q Okay. 24 A which would head west, okay? Now, this is 25 essentially I think I mentioned this at deposition

2 trind to do is find the next known elevation quiert units 2 0 (kgy. 3 and the point [picked was the existing quiert units 3 A 4 the existing access read, the 19-inch quiert. The sing as elevation - 0 thts the bottom of that culvert or the bottom elevation - 0 the culvert from the Exposure of the bottom. 3 A 5 is and the bottom.		1 THE WITNESS: Yep.
(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 265 1 A There was quite a bit of surveying done in the area 265 2 that that drainage channel connects to the lake. 1 you know, it enters probably a pool of water, the 2 that that drainage channel connects to the lake. 1 you know, it enters probably a pool of water, the 3 It's very people have mentioned that before. It's 4 at this time when the water DNR's launch is 5 channel characteristics and 6 0 Over here, you mean? 4 at this time when the water DNR's launch is 7 A there's humps and yes. I mean if you look at 8 So, yeah, it wasn't designed to represent any kind of 9 others that Mr. Peters had described. It's kind of 10 a or, yeah, Mr. Peters. There's kind of a 10 a or, yeah, Mr. Peters. There's kind of splits in two. 14 So this is what I did. I picked the lowest elevation 15 A So this is what I did. I picked the lowest elevation 10 a channel, if you're got 18 Right. 17 a chanel, if you're got 18 19 will travel from 16 MR. GLEISNER: Counsel, to expedite matters<	 and the point I picked was the existing culvert under the existing access road, the 18-inch culvert. The invert elevation of that culvert or the bottom elevation It's the bottom. A of the culvert from the Kapur surveying Q Okay. So that had been surveyed in on the Kapur stuff used in the standards? A Right. Q Okay. A Which is 897.6. Q Okay. A so then what I basically did is connect the dot from that to the next lowest known location in this general area which was the outlet from the north swale location, the area marked in blue on the previous exhibits, to the lake. So there was a bunch of surveying that was collected in kind of that MR. GLEISNER: Are you referring to Exhibit THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GLEISNER: 2-002? 	3 A So that's really what this is, is a connect the dot exercise with known elevations. Again, this is my as best I could do assess the question that was asked about where is you know, what happens with water from the DNR boat launch site, where does it end. I think I mentioned this in the deposition also that this is not I don't have this is based on the only information we have so it's my best guess at that based on the elevation data that we have. Q Okay. Now, the green arrow on Exhibit 212, this Page 2, I think there was some testimony earlier where people were asking did that represent a stream, did that represent a channel. Were you indicating by drawing that, that there was a channel there or just that discreet low elevations? A It was just the it wasn't intended to represent a possible again, this drop of water flow path, how would a drop of water eventually make its way to the lake. No, it wasn't because yeah, it's not knowing that these are very large wetland complexes, it probably doesn't exactly work this way.
 that that drainage channel connects to the lake. It's very people have mentioned that before. It's very confusing. It starts to lose its nice uniform channel characteristics and Q Over here, you mean? A there's humps and yes. I mean if you look at the detailed surveys it's just like Andy and some others that Mr. Peters had described. It's kind of a or, yeah, Mr. Peters. There's kind of a build-up of material. The single channel, the nice wide single channel, that works its way towards the lake, when it gets there, it kind of splits in two. Q Okay. A So this is what I did. I picked the lowest elevation an dwhere the split occurs. Q Okay. Because the water, again A Right. Q will travel from M R. GLEISNER: Counsel, to expedite matters can I just clarify? So you're saying that the water flows out on your Exhibit 212, Page 2, at the eastern end of the blue line? 23 	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI
25 MR. GLEISNER: Thank you. 25 flow from a higher to a lower elevation and I guess	2 that that drainage channel connects to the lake. 3 It's very people have mentioned that before. It's 4 very confusing. It starts to lose its nice uniform 5 channel characteristics and 6 Q Over here, you mean? 7 A there's humps and yes. I mean if you look at	<pre>2 wetlands probably 3 Q Right. 4 A at this time when the water DNR's launch is 5 flowing back, there's probably already water in the 6 wetland or some comingling. 7 Q Okay.</pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 266 LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 268	9 others that Mr. Peters had described. It's kind of a or, yeah, Mr. Peters. There's kind of a build-up of material. The single channel, the nice wide single channel, that works its way towards the lake, when it gets there, it kind of splits in two. Q Okay. So this is what I did. I picked the lowest elevation and where the split occurs. Q Okay. Because the water, again Right. Q will travel from MR. GLEISNER: Counsel, to expedite matters can I just clarify? So you're saying that the water flows out on your Exhibit 212, Page 2, at the eastern end of the blue line? THE WITNESS: Exactly, yes.	9 channel, it was just to represent 10 Q But just the idea that water goes downhill 11 A ultimately yes, ultimately where water would 2 end up, yes. 13 Q and that and is it true that like even with 14 sheet you know, I think Dr. O'Reilly had 15 testified, you know, about there being flow, you 16 know, sheet flow. I mean even if something is not in 17 a channel, if you've got 18 MR. GLEISNER: Objection, I don't think he 19 testified there was sheet flow. I don't think 20 he disagreed with that as I recall. 21 MS. KAVANAUGH: No, I didn't say he 22 testified that there was sheet flow. I guess 23 I'll withdraw what I said because what he 24 Q He said something about even with sheet flow it would

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

1	SHEET 68	1	wetland or is it going to go in the other direction?
1 2 3 4 5 A 6 7 8 9 10 2 11 12 13 14 A 15 2 16 17 18 A 19 20 21 A 21 23 2 24 A 25 A	<pre>water to flow from a higher to a lower elevation or do you just need or can sheet flow flow to a higher Well, there's different mechanisms of water flow and this was not intended to represent any particular condition, it was just a graphical represent not meant to simulate so as far as the arrows and the flow path, not to represent anything particular. Okay. So based on the elevations then, you know, the water, if water is flowing, if things are fairly where you're just tracing this drop of water, it's going from higher to lower elevations? Right, exactly. Are there other things going on in the watershed that could influence the direction that the water would flow? Yes, and I think a lot of this has already been talked about. Right. And do I mean it is acknowledged that water could go both ways at this location. It's just an elevation. Okay.</pre>	2 A 3 4 5 6 7 8 Q 9 A 10 11 Q 12 13 14 15 16 17 A 18 19 20 21 22 Q 23 A 24 25	<pre>Welland of 15 it going to go in the other diffection: Well, yeah, people have talked about that. I mean there's obviously no way to back flow from the lake through the channel. And, again, water will find its elevation so it if the elevation rises high enough, if it raises above 898.68, it will in the lake it'll back flow into this depressional area. Right. And even if it raised to that elevation in the wetland complex it would do the same thing. Okay. So now you I think that during your deposition you said that you tried to determine where the water would go once it entered the southern portion of the wetland, is that correct? I don't but at some point we were talking about that. Well, the only yeah, well, I mean when we talked about this, that's the culvert. That's the only information that is available to me that is of sufficient detail is the elevation of the existing culvert. Okay. Okay. So that's why I picked that elevation. It's the lowest elevation that's that we could that was available to me.</pre>
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 269		LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 271
1			
1 2 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 A 12 0 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 A 24 0 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	 The opposite could occur when water increased to, you know, I'm going to say about a foot of depth in the larger wetland complex to the west. It could overflow or would overflow towards the DNR depressional area. Right. And if North Lake was gathering I think there's been testimony it has a pretty big watershed, correct North Lake? Oh, yeah, North Lake, of course, yes, right. So if a lot of stuff was happening, a lot of rain or flooding, upstream or snow melt and things entering North Lake pretty fast and I think there was testimony there's no control structure on the lake, correct, no dam or anything like that, it's just a natural there's nothing to control the elevation there? So if a lot of water was coming in so fast that it couldn't go out the river fast enough because the Oconomowoc comes in at both ends, right? I think it enters on the northeast and exits on the southwest I think? 	1 Q 2 3 4 5 6 A 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 Q 16 17 A 18 Q 19 20 A 21 Q 22 A 23 24 25	<pre>Okay. Now, if the water flowed from the depressed area of the DNR property into the southern part of the wetland, is it possible that it would flow in another direction other than north through the culvert with the invert? Yes, well, it is definitely possible, again, because we talked about the level of detail that's available with the publicly available maps. The two-foot contour interval essentially shows this whole area bounded by the we'll call it a bluff to the west of the wetland complex, including Redland Road essentially at the same elevation. So the two-foot contour map doesn't give that answer either way. It's not of enough detail so So we've got better detail about what's going on, on here, because of our 2.4 Right, exactly. Our 2.4 inch contours than we do with the county maps Exactly, right. those two-foot contours? Okay. Because the two-foot does not distinguish other than a couple it shows a couple bumps along the way, but it shows essentially no distinguishing difference in the contour in that whole area so</pre>
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 270 Legal Video Servi		LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 272

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

	SHEET 69		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	<pre>think everyone agrees that the water is not going to go west, right, because I think there's been testimony there's a ridge on the west side of the wetland, correct? Yes, the two-foot contour map is suitable to tell you that. Okay. It does tell you that it's bounded, this whole area is bounded, by a contour elevation of 900 essentially which is also the same as approximately the flood plain elevation. So it's enough detail to tell you that, that the whole area is bounded, but between there and the lake there's not enough detail in the two-foot contour map to provide a lot of answers. Okay. Now, there's been some testimony, and I don't remember if it was Dr. O'Reilly, that at certain times the water would back up from the southern portion of the west wetland into the DNR depression. Is that possible to? Yes. Okay. Now, the culvert under the access road is, I think you said, 897.6? Yes.</pre>	<pre>somewhere in that neighborhood of 897.6, around the same elevation as the existing culvert. That seems like a pretty good number to represent the wetland complex. Q And usually A So right. Q people try to put culverts on the bottom? A Right. So what would need to happen is that water would need to fill up about a foot and then it would start flowing back into the DNR wetland complex. Q Okay. But there'd be I'm not sure what the elevation do we know what the elevation of the to of the access road is? A Yeah, it runs from on the western part it's basically the same elevation as the bottom of the bluff or slope, about 900. Q Okay. What about over A As it works towards the - over here? A boat launch it gets about a foot lower, 899. Q 899. A Right. Q So once the water A So it kind of acts as a little bit of dam there. O Okay. Well, once it got to 899 the water would A So yea. Well, once it got to 899 the water would A So yea. Well, once it got to 899 the water would A So yea. Well, once it got to 899 the water would A So yea. A so yea how yea how yea how yea here yea here yea here. A So yea here yea here yea here yea here yea here yea here. A So yea here yea here yea here yea here yea here. A So yea here yea here yea here yea here yea here yea here. A So yea here yea here yea here yea here yea here. A So yea here yea here yea here yea here yea here yea here. A So yea here yea here. A So yea here yea</pre>	
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 273	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 275	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<pre>to the southern portion of the wetlands is this 898.63 or 68? A 68, right. I rounded it up to 898.7, yes. Q Right. Okay. So if that I'm trying to get a sense of if the culvert is at 8.98 8.976, the invert of the culvert, and this is at 898.68, it doesn't seem that under normal well, under normal</pre>	1 go would it overtop the road or 2 A Right, yes. Right. 3 Q Okay. So I guess I'm trying to get a sense of how 4 far up this water is likely to come in the absence o 5 flood conditions into this depression. If you don't 6 have flood conditions and you've got a road that 7 might be a barrier until you get to 899, but you've 8 got culverts and you don't know what the low or	
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	<pre>conditions where you aren't getting flow from North Lake, would it be likely that the water would go up into the depression or A Well, it would have to okay. Q From that 14-acre A The wetland complex obviously would have to fill up with water to about a foot depth. Q Okay. And the wetland complex is A Now, again, we don't have a lot of detailed information about the all the points, all the elevation data, in the wetland, but we can you know, you can make an assessment that you see a wetland, it's the lower area, there's some points that I know that Lake Country Engineering had developed, that gives you a kind of a feeling for what the bottom elevation is in that whole wetland complex and I think it's probably around that it's not hard to believe that the wetland complex is LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES</pre>	got culverts and you don't know what the low or southern elevation is, you know, do we have any idea of how far the water would come up into this depression? A I don't personally. I didn't run any calculations o do any kind of analysis of that 14 Q Okay. 5 A so I don't really have a good feeling for that. Q Okay. And this I think this wetland was testifie that it was 14 acres I believe, the whole thing 1 something approximately? MS. CORRELL: Point 57. MS. KAVANAUGH: 14.57? Okay. MR. GLEISNER: I believe that was correct, Counsel. Q So in terms of volume of water flowing into this wetland to raise the elevation of the wetland water enough to start backing up, that would be quite a LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES	or ed

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 70	
1quantity of water, correct?2MR. HARBECK: Objection, he just said he3didn't analyze it and hasn't looked at it so4QNo, I'm not asking for a number, I'm asking if you've5got 14 if you've got to raise it from you've6got 897.6 is the bottom I think you said, we've7got 898.68 as being this exit point, so we're talking8about that's a foot if my math is right, huh, from9the bottom of the culvert? So you're going to have10to have over a foot11MR. GLEISNER: Wait, can he answer Counsel?12I thought he was going to answer.13Q14bottom of the wetland was probably 897.6 or close?15A16culvert.17MR. HARBECK: That's the point at the18culvert.19MS. KAVANAUGH: At the culvert, the invert,20yes.21MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay.22BS. KAVANAUGH: Okay.23MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay.24low you know, we're assuming it's a low25point.	<pre>1 A a 10-acre feet of water 2 Q Right, in that wetland before it's going to start 3 backing up? 4 A all right? Right. So it'd be more than okay. 5 I mean it would have to rain in order to fill a 6 wetland of just direct rainfall, it'd have to rain 12 7 inches. 8 Q Okay. Okay. 9 A Okay? So that the water and that's not a normal 10 rain event so 11 Q Right. Okay. 12 A there'd have to be water from the upland 13 Q Right. 14 A drainage area that also 15 Q Okay. So you'd have to have that 16 A helps fill that wetland up so it couldn't 17 Q and that's just to reach the low point and the 18 low point is 898.68 and to get up and start filling 19 this whole area that is a stream according to 20 Dr. O'Reilly that's at 898.8, is it? 21 A That'd be the area bounded in pink on 22 Q Yes. 23 A Exhibit yes, that's 898.8, right. 24 Q Yes, and the other one is 898.68? 25 A Right. 21 A Right. 22 A Right. 23 A Exhibit yes, that's 898.8, right. 24 Q Yes, and the other one is 898.68? 25 A Right. 27 A Right. 28 A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A</pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 277	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 279
<pre>1 Q And the low point exiting is 898 the DNR property, 2 898.68, right? 3 A Right, yes. 4 Q So that's about a foot of water? 5 A It'd be about a foot of rise above the 6 Q Well, a foot of water from the bottom I guess to 7 the 8 A From the bottom of the culvert, right. 9 Q Right. 10 A And assuming the wetland bottom is in that 11 neighborhood 12 Q Right. 13 A right, it would be a foot of water 14 Q So you'd need at least a foot of water to even reach 15 that low point? 16 A over the wetland complex being 14 acres, but I 17 guess we should segment the south from the north 18 because, you know, the south is probably 19 three-quarters of that, right, or 20 Q Okay. So then it reaches 21 A So we could probably call the south southern wetland 22 maybe 10 acres 23 Q Okay. Okay. 24 A so that'd be 25 Q So you'd need 25 Q So you'd need 26 D So you'd need 27 D So you'd need 28 D So you'd need 29 Okay. Okay. 20 So you'd need 20 Okay. So you'd need 20 D So you'd need 21 A So you'd need 22 D So you'd need 23 D So you'd need 24 D So you'd need 25 D So you'd need 25 D So you'd need 26 D So you'd need 27 D So you'd need 27 D So you'd need 28 D So you'd need 29 D So you'd need 20 D So you'd</pre>	1 Q So we're talking about you're going to have to get a half an inch more of rain all over the whole wetland before it starts backing up into here too, correct? MR. HARBECK: Object to the form of the question, it's completely leading and MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. Well, I'm asking if a map MR. HARBECK: he said he hasn't analyzed any of this and he's not that's not his job. MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. Well, I'm asking him to sort of I'm asking him then sort of to do that now, to give us a sense of the 4 Q How many inches of rain of water would you have to have in this wetland above the culvert to start filling up this thing? A Right, about a foot. Q Okay. About a foot in the wetland? A Yes, from the data that we have, right. Q Okay. And then to come above the low point and get all the way up to the lip of this thing? A Maybe another couple inches, right, I mean so Q Okay. All right. Now, we've been talking about, you now, the water going in different directions depending on the North Lake how much water is
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 278	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 280

SHEET 711there or how much water is in the wetland. Would2adding more or larger diameter culverts under the3west/east access road than the number that are there4now help the water exit the southern wetland faster5than it does now?	te for
 than it does now? than it does now? A It's possible. It's complicated. Q Okay. All right. If you can't if you don't know, you don't know. A So, yeah, I can't I mean it would take some analysis. Q Okay. Now ALJ BOLDT: I'm sorry, were you asking about the current proposal vis-à-vis what's there now? MS. KAVANAUGH: Yes. ALJ BOLDT: Is that how you understood the must accordance to 216 and 151. There are that in any kind of detail. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. I just want to make sure that in any kind of detail. MS. KAVANAUGH: All right. Okay. So based on the information DNR had available you So based on the information DNR had available you So based on the information DNR had available you So based on the information DNR had available you So based on the information DNR had available you So based on the information DNR had available you So based on the information DNR had available you So based on the information DNR had available you So based on the information DNR had available you So based on the information DNR had available you So based on the information DNR had available you So based on the information DNR had available you So based on the information DNR had available you So based on the information DNR had available you So based on the information DNR had available you So based on the information DNR had available you So based on the information DNR had available you So based on the information DNR had available you So based on the information DNR had available you So based on the information DNR had available you So based on the information DNR had available you So based on the information DNR had available you So based on the information DNR had	plan ermit to orm other ould ed n m
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 281 LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 283	
1elevations on the southern part of the wetland and you reviewed and understanding that you lacked those a dditional elevations to areas south, you haven't do no formal analysis, did you form an opinion to a reasonable degree of professional certainty regarding the predominant direction of storm water flow from the DNR property?1MR. GLEISNER: Correct, Counsel. MS. CORRELL: As well as Exhibit 10. a mail the information I have 9 Q Okay.1A as I described 10 Q Okay. So basically you haven't earlier, yes.MS. CORRELL: Yeah, if we could also that up and there was a third exhibit in t 8 A I yea, but1Q Okay. So basically you haven't 14 your mind that that is the predominant flow?MS. CORRELL: a blue line that he mays16Q Okay. Under normal conditions? 17 A although acknowledging that water can go both 18 waysMR. GLEISNER: my memory fails me that. I'm not sure.19Q Right, right, okay. 20 A which was not the context that I'd looked at it 21 mitially so 22 Q Right, right.NO, wow, do you know whether there has been a20Q And Dr. O'Reilly, he testified that the area he circled he was talking about a one-foot depression a don't know whether he testified today or last t about a stream with about a one-foot depression MS. Hanson testified that the water depth in th	put erms drew. nes member - on nd I ime, and
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 282 284	

SHEET 72	
<pre>1 grove of trees identified in green on that well, 2 you can see the grove of trees there, was about one 3 foot deep. And I believe Mr. Schwartzburg testified 4 that when you stand in the grove of trees area when 5 the water was two feet deep he said 24 inches. 6 Now, can you we've got the pink outline on 7 Exhibit 210. Can you show us to get to a one foot 8 depth in this bowl, can you show us how far up the 9 water would have to come, in other words, follow the 10 contour line. If this lowest line is 290 I'm 11 sorry, 898.4, right? 12 A Yes. 13 Q So to get to 899.4 14 MR. HARBECK: Excuse me, Counsel, the 15 lowest point is 898.27. 16 MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. 17 MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. 17 MR. HARBECK: He already testified to that. 18 MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. A very good point. 19 Okay. 20 Q To get from 898.27 to 899. 21 MS. KAVANAUGH: I was talking about the 22 contour line and I think that's what he said. 23 A So to go one foot or to go two feet? 24 Q To go one foot, first of all. 25 A To 890</pre>	<pre>1 Q (Inaudible) the entire property except for the ridge 2 near the shore and I don't remember what we said the 3 elevation of the road was. 4 A Near the boat launch it's about 899. It's close to 5 899. 6 Q Okay. So that might be so that would be under 7 water too 8 A Right. 9 Q or just barely covered with water? 10 A Right. 11 Q Okay. And to get to the water to be two feet deep in 12 this area, as Mr. Schwartzburg testified that he was 13 in that grove of trees when there was 24 inches of 14 water, where would that water have to be? Where 15 would it have to get to? 16 ALJ BOLDT: I'm sorry, these mics are 17 really sensitive and we're picking you up when 18 you talk. You've got to cover your mic if 19 you're consulting. 20 Q If there is (inaudible). 21 A I guess everything would be under water at that point 22 because then you're below the under your flood 23 Q Okay. 24 A or your that elevation is higher than under 25 your flood elevation.</pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES
(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI
285	287
<pre>1 Q Let me give you a maybe I'll give you a green one</pre>	<pre>1 Q Okay.</pre>
2 this time.	2 A That would be above 900.
3 A So 899.3, correct?	3 Q Okay. So it's fair to say that the only time you
4 Q 899.3 or as close to that as you can get. I think	4 have one foot of water in this grove of trees is if
5 these are to get a foot of water in that bowl	5 this entire property was flooded
6 (inaudible). Can you find it?	6 A Right.
7 A Yeah, I'm trying. So 890 okay. 899.3, everything	7 Q and only this ridge was sticking out?
8 is other than a portion of the ridge that runs	8 A Right, right.
9 perpendicular to the or parallel with the lake	9 Q And the only time you've had two feet of water in
10 MR. GLEISNER: May we approach, Your Honor?	10 this on this property is if the whole property was
11 THE WITNESS: Yeah.	11 connected you know, flooded basically
12 A I'm just going to continue just so it makes sense.	12 A That'd be the 100-year
13 Q Yes.	13 Q it's in the lake, the 100-year flood?
14 A The only piece of land that would be visible would be	14 A Yeah, that'd be the 100-year flood condition in the
15 the ridge that runs parallel to the lake that	15 lake.
16 connects into the Hanson property. Everything else	16 Q Okay. And that would probably cover even the
17 would be submerged with that elevation.	17 channel
18 Q Okay. And even up here too? I don't know what the	18 A Yes. Oh, yes, right.
19 elevation	19 Q and flow over the road and
20 A There might be some. I mean it gets really confusing	20 A Well, the whole are would be I mean anything
21 over here, but these are basically these are less	21 below as we talked about the two-foot contour kind
22 than 899.3 up in here.	22 of containing this whole (inaudible) shown on
23 Q Okay. Okay. So okay. So	23 that
24 A So everything would be under water basically except	24 Q Right. And I know we don't have elevations for
25 for	25 Redland Road, but have you observed have you
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES
(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI
286	288

SHEET 73 1 looked down Redland Road? Do you have a sense of 2 whether the water would be covering going down this 3 way too or 4 A Again, the only thing the only other information 5 we had for Redland Road is on the two-foot contour 6 map for the county and other than a few humps that 7 are shown, it'd all be below that flood plain 8 elevation of 900. 9 Q Okay. Okay. Now, I'd ask you to look at DNR 10 Exhibit 205 which has been identified I think as the 2008 FEMA flood plan map from Waukesha County. 12 A Yes.	1has in this2MR. MEYER: I object.3MS. KAVANAUGH: I take it back. I take it4back.5Q6MS. CORRELL: (Inaudible) property line.7It's their exhibit and Neil drew on it. What8are you trying to9MS. KAVANAUGH: I'm trying to show have10him show where the property is. There is a tax11information document in here that shows what we12own.
13 Q Does that map show the DNR property? And I think there is another exhibit that gives tax information if you need that to find it. 15 If you need that to find it. 16 A Is it where they where the X's are? 17 Q Well, you tell me. 18 A I think it is because I can you know, I think this 19 is the easement 20 Q Okay. 21 A so I'm 22 MS. KAVANAUGH: I mean I think Counsel 23 would probably stipulate that this area here 24 where the X's are is the DNR property in 25 Exhibit 205?	 MS. CORRELL: Oh, yes. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. You know, everything is recorded so let's MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. I'm looking for the tax information document in Exhibit okay. Okay. Well, let me just ask we'll find the tax information number and then you can record it based on that. But is it fair to say that this map shows the properties in the area that's at issue? Okay. Yes, right, correct. Q And is it fair to say the red hatched lines, what's your understanding of what they represent? The flood the 2008 FEMA flood plain boundaries.
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 289	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 291
1MR. GLEISNER: We're not going to stipulate2to that without testimony.3MR. HARBECK: Which area is she talking4about?5MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. This area.6MS. CORRELL: There's already been7testimony on8MS. KAVANAUGH: I think there has been9testimony.10MS. CORRELL: What is the question?11MS. CORRELL: What is the question?12identification number on here.13MR. GLEISNER: No, we're not going to14stipulate to that.15MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay.16Q17MS. CAREER: May it please, Your Honor?18MR. GLEISNER: This testimony has led to19MR. GLEISNER: This testimony has led to20the need for another rebuttal witness and the21hour is growing late. I just want to urge that23we move as quickly as we can through this.24MS. KAVANAUGH: I'm moving as quickly as I25can. I'm moving quicker than any other attorney	1 Q And are 2 A Everything within that hatched area would be within 3 the FEMA flood plain (inaudible). 4 Q And how would you characterize the location of most 5 of those properties? Are they out of the flood 9 plain, in the flood plain, most of them in the flood 9 plain? 8 A Well, this particular snapshot, most of them are in 9 the flood plain. 10 Q Okay. So well, actually, the Judge when he's 11 looking through the documents can look at the tax 12 identification number on that map and the tax 13 identification number in Exhibit 200 something if we 14 can't find it, in 200, to identify the DNR property 15 since they won't stipulate to it. 16 ALJ BOLDT: Well, you can put it in your 17 brief too if it's in the record, sure. 18 MS. KAVANAUGH: Yes, yes, okay, but 19 MS. CORRELL: I think we already covered 20 this in the record with Mr. Hudak's testimony. 21 MS. CORRELL: There's no reason for 24 Q Okay. So looking at this map and considering the 25 information we've discussed about the elevations and 26 information we've discussed about the elevations and 27 information we've discussed about the elevations and 28 information we've discussed about the elevations and 28 information we've discussed about the elevations and 29 information we've discussed about the elevations and 20 information we've discussed about the elevations and 20 information we've discussed about the elevations and 29 information we've discussed about the elevations and 20 information we've discussed about the elevations and 20 information we've discussed about the elevations and information we've discussed about t
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 290	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 292

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 74	
 the 100-year flood and this being in the flood plain, do you have an opinion to a reasonable degree of professional certainty as to whether it's possible that the entire DNR property could flood from time to time? A Yes. Well, the flood plain map would suggest that's the case, that under a 100-year event it's within the regulatory flood plain. Q Okay, yes. And what about the other properties south of the DNR property and Redland Road, they're zoned in the flood plain too except for certain X Some of them are right, except for I mentioned the humps. I mean this Q Right. A map corresponds basically with the two-foot contour map. Q Right. So is it likely that those areas would flood from time to time as well? A Yes, when in the flood plain it's assumed that flooding will occur in a 100-year occurrence. Q Okay. MS. KAVANAUGH: I had a copy of NR16 here which I can't seem to find right now. Well, Judge, I guess I won't read it into the record, but I'd ask the ALJ to take judicial notice of 	<pre>1 frequency roughly? 2 A Yes, yes, it's commonly known 100-year event, 3 commonly known as the 100-year recurrence interval, 4 right, for a storm event. 5 Q Can you explain what percent occurrence level means? 6 A What that means what it basically means is that an 7 event of that size has a probability of 8 occurring has a one percent chance of occurring in 9 any given year essentially what that means. 10 Q If you know, what is a relative frequency of a 11 one-foot water over that area? Would you have 12 appreciation with even within broad parameters? 13 A One foot in the depressional area, we're talking 14 about? 15 Q Yes. 16 A Yeah, I don't have a good feeling for that, so no. 17 Q Okay. Then fine, thank you. 18 MS. KAVANAUGH: Can I ask a few I did 19 find 116 and I would like to have him read those 20 definitions, if that's okay. 21 ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Yeah, when Mr. Meyer is 22 finished. 23 MS. CORRELL: I think he can just take 24 official notice. 25 MS. KAVANAUGH: Huh? </pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 293	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 295
1 Chapter 2 MR. MEYER: Official notice. 3 MS. KAVANAUGH: I'm sorry, official notice, 4 of Chapter NR116 and read the definitions of 5 flood or flooding at Section NR116.03(12) and 6 the definition of flood plain at NR116.03(16). 7 ALJ BOLDT: Okay. I can officially notice 8 both of those. 9 MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. 10 Q 12 A bothing more to add. 13 MR. MEYER: Just a few questions if you're 14 finished, Counsel. 15 MS. KAVANAUGH: Yes, I'm done. 16 MR. MEYER: I'll be brief. 17 CROSS-EXAMINATION 18 BY MR. MEYER: 19 Q Mr. Wood, I believe you just testified that at 24 10 inches or two feet you're over the 100-year flood 11 level for this area? 2 A 2 A 4 we talked about, was the lowest point shown on the 5 Q 4 bouth, was the one percent occurrence 12 LEGAL V	1ALJ BOLDT: When Mr. Meyer is finished.2MS. KAVANAUGH: Oh, I'm sorry, when he's3done, yes. I'm sorry, Judge.4MR. MEYER: No problem.5QIn your career once again a broad range would be6fine for the purpose of this question, how many7surface water projects have you worked on in your8career?9AI'm not sure how to answer that. I mean in the storm10water program everything is related to surface water11in some way so I'm not sure how to answer that.12Q13A14Q15A16started doing this work I was myself and17Jim Ritchie, we were the only two storm water staff18people in this part of the State. We were probably19processing a couple hundred permit applications a20oway. So without trying to put any words in your21OOO, where you've looked at surface water projects?23AThat's probably a pretty good number. I've been
(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 294	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 296

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 75	
<pre>1 doing it for about 2 Q Okay. I'd like to refer you to Exhibit 210 and 3 that's the area the 4 MS. KAVANAUGH: It's the blowup too, Pete, 5 so if you wanted to use the bigger one. 6 THE WITNESS: Okay, yep. 7 Q And that's the area of the grove of trees, 8 encompasses the grove of trees, also the that 9 federal small federal designation wetland. You've 10 been to that into that site how many times? 11 A Three times that I recall. 12 Q Have you ever based on your experience in working 13 on hundreds of other projects have you seen anything 14 there that you would call, from your professional 15 standpoint as an engineer, a stream? 16 A That's a good question. I guess I don't look at 17 things that way so the projects I've been involved 18 with I guess I don't have a I can't give you a 19 real good feeling on that. 20 Q That's a good answer. I appreciate that. Thank you 21 for an honest answer. Thank you. 22 MS. KAVANAUGH: (Inaudible) Judge, if you 23 permit me. 24 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 25 BY MS. KAVANAUGH:</pre>	<pre>normally dry land areas caused by (a) the overflow or rise of inland waters, (b) the rapid accumulation or runoff of surface waters from any source", skipping (c) to (d), "the sudden increase caused by an unusual high water level in a natural body of water accompanied by a severe storm or by an unanticipated force of nature such as a (inaudible) or some similar unusual event." Q Okay. And then could you read the definition of flood plain at Paragraph 16 in that same section? A "Flood plain means that land which has been or may be covered by flood water during the regional flood. The flood plain includes a floodway, flood fringe, shallow depth flooding, flood storage and coastal flood plain areas." Q Okay. Now, you testified that to get two feet of water to get one foot of water on this property, on the DNR property, the only piece that would be still above the water was that ridge that you outlined in green, I believe, correct, on Exhibit 210A? A That's correct. Q Okay. MS. KAVANAUGH: And did I walk off with your 210A?</pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 297	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 299
1 Q I would ask you to read this definition at 116.03 2 MR. MEYER: I'm finished. 3 MS. KAVANAUGH: I'm sorry. I'm sorry, 4 Judge, I'm not meaning to be impolite. I'm too 5 efficient. 6 MR. GLEISNER: Judge, we'll stipulate to 7 this definition and 8 MS. KAVANAUGH: Well, I'd like to have it 9 read into the record. 10 MR. GLEISNER: Okay. 11 MR. GALLO: 116. What's the 12 MS. KAVANAUGH: Exhibit 116 which is flood 13 plain 14 Q 15 NR116, can you read the title of Chapter 16 A Chapter NR116, Wisconsin Flood Plain Management 17 Program. 18 Q 19 of flood. I think you could skip subparagraph (c) 10 because that talks about Lake Michigan and 11 Lake Superior. 12 MR. GLEISNER: Good, we can leave them out. 13 MS. KAVANAUGH: Right, we'll make it quick. 14 "Flood and flooding means a general and temporary 15	1ALJ BOLDT: It looks like you did.2MS. KAVANAUGH: I'm sorry. Good thing I3didn't mark on it.4QAnd then I believe you testified that if you had524 inches, two feet, of water on that property that6the whole property would be covered, correct?7A7A8Q9Okay. In your opinion I know you're not a flood9plain engineer, but looking at that definition of10flood, would that happen during flood conditions?11MR. HARBECK: Objection, foundation. I12mean he's got no13MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. Well, he's got the14definition to apply.15MR. HARBECK: If you want to make the16argument you can, but he's already said that's17not his area of expertise or competency so18MS. KAVANAUGH: Well, it's a matter of law,19Your Honor.20MR. GLEISNER: And this is a matter of a21definition. I'm asking as a layperson for a22flood.23MR. GLEISNER: He is an expert.24MS. KAVANAUGH: He's not an expert in flood25plain, he's a storm
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 298	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 300

SHEET 76	
1MR. HARBECK: Well, if you're asking the opinion of a layperson then it's not relevant.3MS. KAVANAUGH: No, I'm asking ALJ BOLDT: The objection is sustained.5MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. Okay. All right.6ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, the objection is7sustained.8MS. KAVANAUGH: Never mind. Okay. I've9got no further questions. Thank you.10ALJ BOLDT: Mr. Gallo?11CROSS-EXAMINATION12BY MR. GALLO:13Q14No, I'm not have no experience in navigability15A No, I'm not have no experience in that.16Q Okay. Did any of your work on the Krause site17involve a hydrology study beyond the areas you18testified to and that are covered under 210?19A No, I didn't conduct any kind of hydrology20study hydrology or hydraulics, no.21ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Thank you. Now sir.23MR. GLEISNER: I have a few questions.24CROSS-EXAMINATION25BY MR. GLEISNER:	<pre>1 northwest from the Hanson property. 2 A Okay. 3 Q And I'm going to show you 4 MS. CORRELL: I'd object to entry of additional exhibits at this eleventh hour. 6 MR. GLEISNER: This is rebuttal and we're 7 going to bring in testimony 8 ALJ BOLDT: I think it's fair 9 cross-examination. 10 MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Your Honor. 11 ALJ BOLDT: It's on your list and 12 MS. CORRELL: Oh, it's on the list, I'm 13 sorry. 14 ALJ BOLDT: Yes. 15 MS. CORRELL: I thought you said it was a 16 new exhibit. 17 MR. GLEISNER: No, it's not a new exhibit. 18 Thank you, Counsel, it's not a new exhibit. 19 Q And I'm going to show you another photograph of the 19 grove of trees from earlier this year and I'm not 10 asking you to comment on these right now, I just want 11 to put these in your you also saw, did you not, 12 Exhibit 17N which was a videotape of a young lady 14 paddling out of the grove of trees, correct? 15 A Yes, correct. 16 Data And I'm going to show you another photograph of the 17 going to the grove of trees, correct? 18 Yes, correct. 19 A Yes, correct. 10 A Yes, correct. 11 A Yes, correct. 11 A Yes, correct. 12 A Yes, correct. 13 Yes, correct. 14 Yes, correct. 15 A Yes, correct. 15 A Yes, correct. 16 Yes A Yes, correct. 17 Yes A Yes, correct. 18 Yes A Yes, correct. 19 Yes A Yes A Yes, correct. 10 Yes A Yes</pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES
(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI
301	303
<pre>1 Q You've been present for all of the first of all,</pre>	1 Q And I believe you heard testimony from
2 good afternoon, Mr. Wood.	Mr. Schwartzburg and Mr. Peters. It's late and my
3 A Thanks.	recollection may fail me, but I believe they said
4 Q You've been very patient and always unfailingly civil	that this type of accumulation occurred on more or
and courteous and I think truthful. Can you see that	less an annual basis, do you recall that?
6 okay?	A Yes. That sounds familiar, yes.
7 A Yes.	Q Could it possibly be that this is an area that is
8 Q This is what was produced by Mr. Peters and he	subject to flooding more often than in a 100-year
9 testified that that was in the area of the boat	basis or filling with water more often than in a
10 launch looking north. I believe he said it was in	100-year basis?
11 2006.	A Yes. Yeah, we've talked about that, right.
12 MR. HARBECK: Do you want to identify it?	Q Now, I'm going to ask you some questions and I'm
13 Q And it is Exhibit 35-002, a photograph of waters that	going to try and expedite it. I'm going to base them
14 he says he paddled a canoe across. Do you see that,	on responses that you gave in your deposition, but I
15 sir? Do you recognize it?	don't expect you to read from that. Have you done
16 A Yes, yes. I've seen that picture, yes.	any studies with regard to runoff that will be
17 Q And he testified also I believe he said it was	occasioned from the farm fields?
18 about two feet deep there, do you recall that?	A No.
19 A I think he I don't remember the exact depth he	Q Now, directing your attention to Exhibit 10 can you
10 mentioned, but I do recall him talking about it.	identify where the farm fields might be located with
20 Okay. Now, I am going to try and short circuit the	regard to the Krause property and you can stand up to
21 need for too much rebuttal and recalling witnesses.	do that and
23 I'd like to show you, it hasn't been admitted yet,	A This map is not doesn't show far enough
24 Exhibit 34-001, and there is testimony available that	Q Right.
25 that is a picture from earlier this year looking	A west, but they would be here. We need another
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES
(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI
302	304

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 77 1 I'm going to call up what we have marked as 16-002. map. 2 Now, I know that has been marked as Exhibit 212, ALJ BOLDT: They're about a foot or so off 3 the --3 Page 2, I believe, by the --4 4 A Yeah, it's too zoomed in on the launch --MS. CORRELL: No, I think it's actually 5 Q 5 210. Okay. 6 -- because it would be -- the farm fields are 6 А Α 210? 7 7 obviously on the west side of the wetland -- the 0 210, yeah. 8 larger wetland complex. 8 MS. CORRELL: The other exhibit is 212. 9 MS. KAVANAUGH: And I think they're visible 9 MR. GLEISNER: Thank you very much. 10 10 on some of the other photos. 0 When you were at your deposition I believe you put MR. GLEISNER: Right. 11 some blue lines on that exhibit --12 Q 12 And, again --A Correct. 13 MR. MEYER: Can't we describe those in 13 -- which don't appear on Exhibit 210. Can you Q 14 distance maybe? 14 describe for the Judge what those blue lines 15 MS. CORRELL: Well, one of Pete's 15 represent? 16 photographs depicts them. 16 You had asked me to try to outline the north swale А 17 MR. GLEISNER: What I'm attempting to do is 17 channel that we had discussed during deposition and 18 just move quickly through this, Your Honor, and 18 that was my best try to draw some lines to represent 19 I'm ---19 the confinements of the channel. 20 20 Thank you very much. And so, in other words, that ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, by all means. 0 21 MR. GLEISNER: That's what I'm trying to 21 red area that -- or pink area that you have 22 22 identified on Exhibit 210 and again now on 16-002, do. 23 I just wanted to get -- now, what Mr. Wood has done 23 that would be the relative location approximately of 0 24 is he has shown where the -- where -- and I'll let 24 that depression to the swale, stream, ditch, whatever 25 you do that in a moment. He's shown where the farm 25 it is, that runs east to west and is represented on LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 305 307 fields would be by gesturing to the west and Exhibit 2-002 by a blue line, is that correct? 1 1 2 northwest of the green area on Exhibit 10 and you MS. KAVANAUGH: That's a long question. 3 were about to take Exhibit 2-002 and also show where 3 A I think I follow the gist. 4 the farm fields are? 4 MS. CORRELL: Objection, foundation, 5 It's a little easier because I'm still -- I'd be on 5 but --Α 6 the board at least, but the farm fields are up in 6 Or maybe not. A 7 7 this general area to the west of the current Q Well, all right, let me try -- I'm just trying to do 8 8 north/south access road. this quickly. 9 9 ALJ BOLDT: Where the legal description is, А Yep, yep. 10 is that what that --10 Q Are the blue lines on Exhibit 16-002 the same as the THE WITNESS: Yes. blue line on Exhibit 2-002? 11 11 12 0 You've heard testimony --12 A Yes THE WITNESS: It's not a great map for 13 13 0 And are you aware of the elevations in the -- where 14 14 the -- we could bring up the exhibit, but are you this. 15 You've heard testimony from Mr. -- or from 15 aware of the elevations in the actual grove of trees, 0 16 Dr. O'Reilly and from others that the farm fields 16 itself? 17 empty into the wetlands that are depicted on 17 I believe -- I guess we'd have to further define the A 18 Exhibit 2-002, have you not? 18 grove of trees. I know it's been mentioned. I'm 19 That's -- yes. 19 unclear whether it's my pink area or if it's another A 20 And is it my understanding from your testimony Q 20 smaller part --21 previously that no studies have been made by the DNR 21 Did you see the exhibit where we had the green on the Q 22 of the effect of the runoff from the farm fields into 22 map? 23 the wetlands, is that correct? 23 А Yes, I think I saw that. 24 A That's correct. 24 0 Okay. 25 0 Now, let me just call up a couple of exhibits here. 25 MR. GLEISNER: Let me just bring that up LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES Prairie du Sac WI (608) 279-5295 (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 306 308

SHEET 78 1 here if I may, Judge. This is excuse me 1 MR. GLEISNER: Well, we move	
2everybody. I hope I don't commit any torts2of his deposition, Your Honor, ar3here.3MS. KAVANAUGH: That's fine.4QThe exhibit that is now up on this board has been4exhibit is I think that Don ag5introduced previously as Exhibit5included or maybe you did?6MS. CORRELL: 2-007.6MR. GLEISNER: Exhibit 15 fr7MR. GLEISNER: Thank you very much,7deposition.8Counsel. That is correct.9MS. CORRELL: And actually thre is a9MS. CORRELL: And actually thre is a9MS. GLEISNER: Thanks, Tim.10depiction of the grove of trees on the marked10admission11exhibit by Dr. O'Reilly.11MS. KAVANAUGH: And that's F12MR. GLEISNER: Okay. 2-006, Counsel?12Exhibit 15? Okay.13MS. KAVANAUGH: Oke of those he marked.13MR. HARBECK: Yes, ma'am. M14I'm not positive.14MS. KAVANAUGH: Oke of those he marked.1715MS. CORRELL: I believe it's 2-007.15MS. KAVANAUGH: No, no, no, no16MS. CORRELL: No, I think it's 2-007.15MR. HARBECK: No, no, no, no, no17then.18MS. KAVANAUGH: No, I think it's 2-007.1918MS. CORRELL: No, I think it's 2-007.19MS. KAVANAUGH: No, that's I19MS. CORRELL: No, I think it's 2-007.19MS. KAVANAUGH: No, that's I20least my copy is. I went up and he helped me20ALJ BOLDT: Yea	nd here it is. And which yain from his We move the Redland Road Yes, ma'am. always tell Do, no. Don Gallo? S the hink we need to hey're in the e, I just don't
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 309 311	Sac WI
1that's marked though if they both depict MR. GLEISNER: Certainly, Judge.1ALJ BOLDT: 0h, it's in Don'2MR. GLEISNER: Certainly, Judge.3MR. HARBECK: Yes.4ALJ BOLDT: so the record is coherent.3MR. HARBECK: Yes.5MR. GLEISNER: Is clear, you bet.5111. I mean they're all in there6Q This is Exhibit 2-006 and the grove of trees, as we have had a surveyor mark them, is in the green area here. Do you have any way of knowing how that grelates to the pink on your Exhibit 210?5111. I mean they're all in there for aclitate grelates to the pink on your Exhibit 210?1A Sure. Yes, I mean within a reasonable assessment it appears to fall within my pink bounded area.7MS. KAVANAUGH: That would H MR. GLEISNER: Does anybody11appears to fall within my pink bounded area.10MR. GLEISNER: Does anybody1112Q Okay. Thank you very much. Now, did you do you recall this drawing?11MS. KAVANAUGH: That would H MR. GLEISNER: All except th ALJ BOLDT: And Don, you put14A Again, I must it was probably another one of our depositional drawings11MR. GLEISNER: All except th ALJ BOLDT: May.15Mgift. It was marked as Exhibit 15 at your mgift deposition. Is that essentially the same? I just want to make sure that we got this straight. Is that essentially the same as Exhibit 210A and Exhibit 16-002?11MR. GLEISNER: I think do 2224A. It seems to be, correct, yes.24ALJ BOLDT: I don't have the MA GLEISNER: I think do 22220425A.	<pre>enk it might be e. e things can we exhibits into be fine with me. have an c all of them ne last one. e of o you have that of Mr. Wakeman? e new one I</pre>
24 ALJ BOLDT: I guess I better have his 24 don't believe. Okay. So I'll re 25 deposition then. 25 MR. GLEISNER: Oh, you did -	

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 79	
1October 17th Mr. Wakeman? Thank you for that.2UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think so.3ALJ BOLDT: Oh, you left it up here? Okay4Well, let me stay on task first. 111, 1125MS. KAVANAUGH: I think Exhibit okay.6ALJ BOLDT: 113 and 114 are all7received.8MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor, I'm almost done9I'm not going to10MR. HARBECK: Just so we're clear, do you11have the second Wakeman deposition?12ALJ BOLDT: Yes, I do. I do.13MR. HARBECK: Okay. The one that's dated14October15ALJ BOLDT: I didn't think it would be that16thick, but17MS. KAVANAUGH: We don't, do we?18MS. CORRELL: No, we haven't received a copy.20MS. KAVANAUGH: We haven't received a copy21MS. KAVANAUGH: Thank you.22going into evidence.23MS. CORRELL: Oh, thank you.24MS. CORRELL: Oh, thank you.25ALJ BOLDT: My error.	4MR. GLEISNER: And I've got three more5questions, Your Honor.6QWith reference to the large green circle on7Exhibit 2-002 I asked you at your deposition,8assuming that large circle became full with water is9there any way that it could wash east over the homes10that are located on Redland Road. Do you recall11getting that question?12A13Q14Yes.15Q16MS. KAVANAUGH: I'm sorry, Counsel, was the17question could or would or, I'm sorry, I18didn't19MR. GLEISNER: I said if it filled with20water could it wash east over the homes
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 313	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 315
1 Q Just to get back here and make sure that the record is complete, you also testified at your deposition with regard to Exhibit 2-002, did you not? 4 A Correct. 5 Q And you made some markings on here and I'm principally going to call your attention to your marking of the blue arrow with your initials next to it. Is that your initial on it? 9 A Yes. 10 Q And you were drawing basically on Exhibit 2-002 the arrow which also appears on Exhibit 210A or on 12 A Correct. 13 Q Okay. And thank you. You're not disputing, are you, that people could float a kayak at various time on the Krause site? 16 A The video apparently showed that so no, I wouldn't dispute that. 18 Q At intermittent times and throughout the year you could float a kayak on that property, is that correct? 12 MR. MEYER: Objection MS. CORRELL: 14 MS. KAVANAUGH: All he can testify to is what he's seen.	 8 believe. 9 MS. CORRELL: And also I guess I'd ask, we 10 have all the depositions in the record so 11 MS. KAVANAUGH: He had yes. 12 MS. CORRELL: do we really have to go 13 through all this right now at twenty to six?
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 314	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 316

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 80	
<pre>1 might as well use 2-002 as a reference point. The 2 grove of tree area, if I'm I'm just trying to 3 clarify to make sure I understand what you testified 4 to in response to Mr. Gleisner's questions. That red a area is the grove of trees, correct? Within that red 6 area is the grove of trees? 7 A As much of the grove of trees that's on the DNR 7 property because I think the red circle I believe is 9 just the DNR property. 10 Q Right, but 11 A But I believe the grove of trees extends onto the 12 Hanson property. 13 Q I understand, but that portion 14 A Right. 15 Q that's the subject of this hearing? 16 A Right. 17 Q And the blue line shows what's been called a stream, 18 a swale, a waterway, is that correct? 19 A That's correct. 20 Q The depressional area within that red area, grove of 21 trees area, you've testified to flows when it does 22 have water it flows to the southwest, is that 23 correct? 24 A That would be the preferred initial flow path. 25 Q Okay. What prevents it from going to the north to</pre>	1Mr. Wood.2THE WITNESS: Thank you.3MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor, I'm losing my4wingman.5ALJ BOLDT: You're heading out?6MR. HARBECK: I have to. I have a two-hour7drive and I've got a meeting that I need to get8to so9ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Sure, yep, absolutely.10Wow, another meeting. Okay.11MR. GLEISNER: Another deposition.12ALJ BOLDT: All right. Are you ready to13call your next witness?14MS. KAVANAUGH: Yes.15MS. CORRELL: We are.16MS. KAVANAUGH: Yes, we'll call17Warden Kyle Drake.18ALJ BOLDT: Do you swear to tell the truth, so19the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so20help you God?21MR. DRAKE: I do.22DIRECT EXAMINATION23BY MS. KAVANAUGH:24Q25work address for the record?
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 317	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 319
1	
1 the swale? 2 A 1 the swale? 2 A 1 the ridy in the state of t	 1 A Kyle Drake, K-Y-L-E, D-R-A-K-E, 141 Northwest Barstow Street, Waukesha, Wisconsin. 3 Q Okay. And your current employer? 4 A Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. 5 Q And your current position? 6 A Recreational Safety Warden. 7 Q Okay. And how long have you been employed in that position? 9 A Since January of this year. 10 Q Okay. Can you briefly summarize your education after high school? 12 A I have a bachelor's in science from the University of Wisconsin at Stevens Point in biology and wildlife management. Employment history was limited term employment with the Wisconsin DNR in both the fisheries and wildlife department for approximately two years, took a position as a wildlife biologist with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, spent about a year-and-a-half there, went back to the DNR as a wildlife biologist for about a year-and-a-half and then finally was hired as a conservation warden in January of 1992. 12 Q Okay. So you've been a warden since 1992? 14 A Correct. 15 Q Have you been stationed at any other locations
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 318	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 320

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 DNR Waukesha office? A I've been a warden in Waukesha County since April of 1993. Q Okay. And can you briefly summarize your duties or job responsibilities as a DNR recreational and safety warden in regard to navigable water bodies? A As a Recreational Safety Warden I act as a liaison with the municipal boat patrols, any of the county or, excuse me, municipalities that have boat patrols, I work with them, and that is about it for the current position. Q Okay. Now, do you receive any well, any training at DNR to help you carry out your DNR duties or responsibilities in regard to your duties? A We receive training every year. 	 not being met or a possible enforcement action, I'd be consulted with that as well. Q Okay. And are you asked to opinion on, you know, when there are navigability issues just in terms of obstructions to navigation or history of navigation in an area, that type of thing? A Correct. Q Okay. Are you familiar with North Lake? A Yes. Q And when did you first visit North Lake? I A It would have been shortly after taking this position in Waukesha County so sometime in early May, April/May, of 1993. Q Okay. And have you ever visited have you visited it in a personal and professional capacity, or just professional? A Both. Q Okay. And have you ever visited it to boat or fish, you know, recreate on the lake? A I have fished on the lake, yes. Q Okay. And is it within the geographic area for which you have duties as a DNR warden? A La me further to the solution and solution and solution and professional capacity.
23 24	Q Okay. Do you receive and I don't know the answer to this. Do you receive any training while employed	23 A In my current position, yes and in my former 24 position.
25	at DNR in navigation and navigational issues?	25 Q Okay. And so how many years has North Lake been in
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 321	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 323
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<pre>and some related NR codes. Q Okay. A And that's updated periodically. Q Okay. And how about the State law, you know, in terms of well, you have Chapter 30, the permitting stuff, and then you get I guess, well, Chapter 30 is boating too, right, so I guess A Correct, Chapter 30 is both boating and then the water law. Q Okay. In your duties as a DNR warden do you sometimes offer input on applications for DNR permits or approvals? A Yes. Q Okay. And can you give us some examples of the types of projects for which you've been your comments have been sought? When would you get involved? A S far as Chapter 30 issues? Q Uh-huh.</pre>	<pre>1 your area? I think you said '93 is when you 2 first 3 A April of '93, correct. 4 Q Okay. So in performing your duties as a DNR warden 5 do you have occasion to enter and navigate 6 North Lake? 7 A Yes. 8 Q Okay. And any idea how many times a boating season 9 you're entering and navigating on North Lake? 10 A I tried to get to all the lakes that were in my 11 administrative area at least once a week. 12 Q Okay. So is it fair to say that since 1992 you've 13 probably been on the lake on an average once a week 14 or is 15 A Depending on the season. They're really season 16 dependent. 17 Q Well, during the boating season. 18 A A lot more during the boating season, 19 fishing ice fishing season on the ice as well, not 10 as much in the fall or early spring. 11 Q Okay. Are you familiar with the DNR proposal to 12 build a public boat launch on North Lake in 13 Waukesha County? 14 A Yes. 25 Q And this area is on the west side of the north 14 Provide the season of the north 15 Provide the the the the the the the the the th</pre>
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 322	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 324

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 82	· .		
1 portion of North Lake, correct		1	MR. GLEISNER: It'd be the white book,
2 A It is on the west side of year 3 Q The north lobe I guess, yeah.		2 3	Warden. THE WITNESS: Thank you.
4 A portion of North Lake		4	ALJ BOLDT: Here's 2-002.
5 lake.		5	MS. KAVANAUGH: Correct. Okay.
6 Q Okay. And are you familiar w	ith that area of	6 Q	Well, actually, maybe you can just use this.
7 North Lake?		7 A	Sure.
8 A Yes. 9 Q Have you ever launched from th	he DND site?	8 Q 9	And I think previous testimony has identified this blue area as being the location of the swale, the
9 Q Have you ever launched from the 10 A Yes.		10	channel, the stream, depending on who talks about
11 Q Okay. And when did you first		11	this, the wetland, on the northern part of the DNR
12 how often do you think you've	done it?	12	property. Would you agree that that's the location
13 A I don't remember the exact year	1	13	of that channel?
14 of about two or three years wi		14 A	Correct.
<pre>15 site to launch boats for patr 16 permission from former owner,</pre>		15 Q 16	Okay. Have you ever seen standing water in that channel?
17 Q Okay. And did you have a role		10 17 A	Yes.
18 for manual code approval of t		18 Q	Have you ever seen standing water deep enough to
19 launch?		19	float a small watercraft in that channel?
20 A No, thankfully.		20 A	Yes.
21 Q Okay. And have you thank		21 Q	Have you ever seen water flowing in that channel?
22 think you said that you know 1 23 You do know that?		22 A 23	In the channel itself, no. The only time I have observed flowing water anywhere on the site was with
24 A Correct.		23	Mr. Hudak when he described the water flowing from
25 Q And now you've heard the desc:		25	the far eastern part of the channel into the lake.
-			
LEGAL VIDEO SER	VICES		LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES
(608) 279-5295 Pr	airie du Sac WI		(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI
325			327
1 lot of folks on T you't hu	t just cont of the	1 0	Al au
1 lot of folks so I won't bu 2 topography of it, sort of fla		1 Q 2 A	Okay. The trickle of water.
2 topography of it, sort of fla	t and, you know, with	1 Q 2 A 3 A	The trickle of water.
2 topography of it, sort of flat 3 that little bit of a depression 4 ridge over on the west, the west	t and, you know, with on, a little bit of a etland on the west, the	2 A 3 A 4	The trickle of water. Okay. So any idea how often you've seen water deep enough to float a canoe or a small watercraft in that
2 topography of it, sort of fla 3 that little bit of a depression 4 ridge over on the west, the west 5 swale on the north, the Hanson	t and, you know, with on, a little bit of a etland on the west, the n property on the south	2 Ã 3 A 4 5	The trickle of water. Okay. So any idea how often you've seen water deep enough to float a canoe or a small watercraft in that channel? I don't know whether you can estimate?
2 topography of it, sort of fla 3 that little bit of a depression 4 ridge over on the west, the work 5 swale on the north, the Hanson 6 and Redland Road. Would you point	t and, you know, with on, a little bit of a etland on the west, the n property on the south pretty much agree with	2 A 3 A 4	The trickle of water. Okay. So any idea how often you've seen water deep enough to float a canoe or a small watercraft in that channel? I don't know whether you can estimate? It'd be difficult to say. Some years it's very dry
2 topography of it, sort of fla 3 that little bit of a depressi 4 ridge over on the west, the we 5 swale on the north, the Hanson 6 and Redland Road. Would you p 7 those descriptions, you know?	t and, you know, with on, a little bit of a etland on the west, the n property on the south pretty much agree with	2 Ã 3 A 4 5 A 7 0	The trickle of water. Okay. So any idea how often you've seen water deep enough to float a canoe or a small watercraft in that channel? I don't know whether you can estimate? It'd be difficult to say. Some years it's very dry in there and the past several years it's been fairly
2 topography of it, sort of fla 3 that little bit of a depression 4 ridge over on the west, the work 5 swale on the north, the Hanson 6 and Redland Road. Would you point	t and, you know, with on, a little bit of a etland on the west, the n property on the south pretty much agree with	2 Ã 3 A 4 5	The trickle of water. Okay. So any idea how often you've seen water deep enough to float a canoe or a small watercraft in that channel? I don't know whether you can estimate? It'd be difficult to say. Some years it's very dry
2 topography of it, sort of fla 3 that little bit of a depressiv 4 ridge over on the west, the we 5 swale on the north, the Hanson 6 and Redland Road. Would you p 7 those descriptions, you know? 8 A Yes. 9 Q Okay. Now, the issue in this 10 failed to identify any navigal	t and, you know, with on, a little bit of a etland on the west, the n property on the south pretty much agree with case is whether DNR ble waters at this site	2 Ã 3 A 4 5 A 7 8	The trickle of water. Okay. So any idea how often you've seen water deep enough to float a canoe or a small watercraft in that channel? I don't know whether you can estimate? It'd be difficult to say. Some years it's very dry in there and the past several years it's been fairly wet.
2 topography of it, sort of fla 3 that little bit of a depressiv 4 ridge over on the west, the we 5 swale on the north, the Hanson 6 and Redland Road. Would you p 7 those descriptions, you know? 8 A Yes. 9 Q Okay. Now, the issue in this 10 failed to identify any navigal 11 so during your deposition in p	t and, you know, with on, a little bit of a etland on the west, the n property on the south pretty much agree with case is whether DNR ble waters at this site this case you were asked	2 A 3 A 4 5 A 7 A 9 Q 10 A 11	The trickle of water. Okay. So any idea how often you've seen water deep enough to float a canoe or a small watercraft in that channel? I don't know whether you can estimate? It'd be difficult to say. Some years it's very dry in there and the past several years it's been fairly wet. Okay. A lot more recent years than the past years previous to that.
2 topography of it, sort of fla 3 that little bit of a depressiv 4 ridge over on the west, the we 5 swale on the north, the Hanson 6 and Redland Road. Would you p 7 those descriptions, you know? 8 A Yes. 9 Q Okay. Now, the issue in this 10 failed to identify any navigal 11 so during your deposition in the 12 I believe if you'd ever seen p	t and, you know, with on, a little bit of a etland on the west, the n property on the south pretty much agree with case is whether DNR ble waters at this site this case you were asked water standing above the	2 A 3 A 4 5 A 7 8 9 Q 10 A 11 12 Q	The trickle of water. Okay. So any idea how often you've seen water deep enough to float a canoe or a small watercraft in that channel? I don't know whether you can estimate? It'd be difficult to say. Some years it's very dry in there and the past several years it's been fairly wet. Okay. A lot more recent years than the past years previous to that. Have you ever observed the waters of North Lake
2 topography of it, sort of fla 3 that little bit of a depressiv 4 ridge over on the west, the we 5 swale on the north, the Hanson 6 and Redland Road. Would you p 7 those descriptions, you know? 8 A Yes. 9 Q Okay. Now, the issue in this 10 failed to identify any navigal 11 so during your deposition in the 12 I believe if you'd ever seen p 13 surface anywhere on the DNR states.	t and, you know, with on, a little bit of a etland on the west, the n property on the south pretty much agree with case is whether DNR ble waters at this site this case you were asked water standing above the ite or anywhere near the	2 A 3 A 4 5 A 7 A 9 Q 10 A 11 12 Q 13	The trickle of water. Okay. So any idea how often you've seen water deep enough to float a canoe or a small watercraft in that channel? I don't know whether you can estimate? It'd be difficult to say. Some years it's very dry in there and the past several years it's been fairly wet. Okay. A lot more recent years than the past years previous to that. Have you ever observed the waters of North Lake flowing into that channel?
2 topography of it, sort of fla 3 that little bit of a depressiv 4 ridge over on the west, the we 5 swale on the north, the Hanson 6 and Redland Road. Would you p 7 those descriptions, you know? 8 A Yes. 9 Q Okay. Now, the issue in this 10 failed to identify any navigal 11 so during your deposition in the 12 I believe if you'd ever seen p	t and, you know, with on, a little bit of a etland on the west, the n property on the south pretty much agree with case is whether DNR ble waters at this site this case you were asked water standing above the ite or anywhere near the	2 A 3 A 4 5 A 7 8 9 Q 10 A 11 12 Q	The trickle of water. Okay. So any idea how often you've seen water deep enough to float a canoe or a small watercraft in that channel? I don't know whether you can estimate? It'd be difficult to say. Some years it's very dry in there and the past several years it's been fairly wet. Okay. A lot more recent years than the past years previous to that. Have you ever observed the waters of North Lake
<pre>2 topography of it, sort of fla 3 that little bit of a depressiv 4 ridge over on the west, the we 5 swale on the north, the Hanson 6 and Redland Road. Would you p 7 those descriptions, you know? 8 A Yes. 9 Q Okay. Now, the issue in this 10 failed to identify any navigal 11 so during your deposition in p 12 I believe if you'd ever seen 13 surface anywhere on the DNR st 14 access road, correct? 15 A Yes. 16 Q Okay. So and I think that Ree</pre>	t and, you know, with on, a little bit of a etland on the west, the n property on the south pretty much agree with case is whether DNR ble waters at this site this case you were asked water standing above the ite or anywhere near the dland Road probably has	2 A 3 A 4 5 A 7 A 9 Q 10 A 11 Q 13 A 14 A 15 Q 16	The trickle of water. Okay. So any idea how often you've seen water deep enough to float a canoe or a small watercraft in that channel? I don't know whether you can estimate? It'd be difficult to say. Some years it's very dry in there and the past several years it's been fairly wet. Okay. A lot more recent years than the past years previous to that. Have you ever observed the waters of North Lake flowing into that channel? No. Okay. But you said you did see a trickle once with Mr. Hudak, a trickle of water, coming out of the east
<pre>2 topography of it, sort of fla 3 that little bit of a depressiv 4 ridge over on the west, the w 5 swale on the north, the Hanson 6 and Redland Road. Would you p 7 those descriptions, you know? 8 A Yes. 9 Q Okay. Now, the issue in this 10 failed to identify any navigal 11 so during your deposition in p 12 I believe if you'd ever seen p 13 surface anywhere on the DNR s 14 access road, correct? 15 A Yes. 16 Q Okay. So and I think that Rec 17 the best</pre>	t and, you know, with on, a little bit of a etland on the west, the n property on the south pretty much agree with case is whether DNR ble waters at this site this case you were asked water standing above the ite or anywhere near the dland Road probably has	2 A 3 A 4 5 A 7 7 8 9 Q 10 A 11 Q 13 A 14 A 15 Q 14 A 15 Q 16 17	The trickle of water. Okay. So any idea how often you've seen water deep enough to float a canoe or a small watercraft in that channel? I don't know whether you can estimate? It'd be difficult to say. Some years it's very dry in there and the past several years it's been fairly wet. Okay. A lot more recent years than the past years previous to that. Have you ever observed the waters of North Lake flowing into that channel? No. Okay. But you said you did see a trickle once with Mr. Hudak, a trickle of water, coming out of the east end of the channel into the lake, correct?
<pre>2 topography of it, sort of fla 3 that little bit of a depressiv 4 ridge over on the west, the w 5 swale on the north, the Hanson 6 and Redland Road. Would you p 7 those descriptions, you know? 8 A Yes. 9 Q Okay. Now, the issue in this 10 failed to identify any navigal 11 so during your deposition in p 12 I believe if you'd ever seen p 13 surface anywhere on the DNR s 14 access road, correct? 15 A Yes. 16 Q Okay. So and I think that Rea 17 the best 18 MS. KAVANAUGH: I g</pre>	t and, you know, with on, a little bit of a etland on the west, the n property on the south pretty much agree with case is whether DNR ble waters at this site this case you were asked water standing above the ite or anywhere near the dland Road probably has uess I'd like him to	2 A 3 A 4 5 A 7 A 9 Q 10 A 11 Q 13 A 15 Q 16 A 17 A 15 Q 16 A 17 A	The trickle of water. Okay. So any idea how often you've seen water deep enough to float a canoe or a small watercraft in that channel? I don't know whether you can estimate? It'd be difficult to say. Some years it's very dry in there and the past several years it's been fairly wet. Okay. A lot more recent years than the past years previous to that. Have you ever observed the waters of North Lake flowing into that channel? No. Okay. But you said you did see a trickle once with Mr. Hudak, a trickle of water, coming out of the east end of the channel into the lake, correct? Correct.
<pre>2 topography of it, sort of fla 3 that little bit of a depressiv 4 ridge over on the west, the w 5 swale on the north, the Hanson 6 and Redland Road. Would you p 7 those descriptions, you know? 8 A Yes. 9 Q Okay. Now, the issue in this 10 failed to identify any navigal 11 so during your deposition in f 12 I believe if you'd ever seen p 13 surface anywhere on the DNR s 14 access road, correct? 15 A Yes. 16 Q Okay. So and I think that Ref 17 the best 18 MS. KAVANAUGH: I g 19 look at the exhibits. I</pre>	t and, you know, with on, a little bit of a etland on the west, the n property on the south pretty much agree with case is whether DNR ble waters at this site this case you were asked water standing above the ite or anywhere near the dland Road probably has uess I'd like him to don't know whether you	2 A 3 A 4 5 A 7 7 8 9 Q 10 A 11 Q 13 A 15 Q 16 17 18 A 19 Q	The trickle of water. Okay. So any idea how often you've seen water deep enough to float a canoe or a small watercraft in that channel? I don't know whether you can estimate? It'd be difficult to say. Some years it's very dry in there and the past several years it's been fairly wet. Okay. A lot more recent years than the past years previous to that. Have you ever observed the waters of North Lake flowing into that channel? No. Okay. But you said you did see a trickle once with Mr. Hudak, a trickle of water, coming out of the east end of the channel into the lake, correct? Correct. Okay. Now, on areas anywhere near the access road,
<pre>2 topography of it, sort of fla 3 that little bit of a depressiv 4 ridge over on the west, the w 5 swale on the north, the Hanson 6 and Redland Road. Would you p 7 those descriptions, you know? 8 A Yes. 9 Q Okay. Now, the issue in this 10 failed to identify any navigal 11 so during your deposition in f 12 I believe if you'd ever seen p 13 surface anywhere on the DNR s 14 access road, correct? 15 A Yes. 16 Q Okay. So and I think that Rea 17 the best 18 MS. KAVANAUGH: I g 19 look at the exhibits. I 20 object to him marking up 21 entered into evidence.</pre>	t and, you know, with on, a little bit of a etland on the west, the n property on the south pretty much agree with case is whether DNR ble waters at this site this case you were asked water standing above the ite or anywhere near the dland Road probably has uess I'd like him to don't know whether you the exhibits you've	2 A 3 A 4 5 6 A 7 8 9 Q 10 A 11 12 Q 13 14 A 15 Q 16 17 18 A 19 Q 20 21	The trickle of water. Okay. So any idea how often you've seen water deep enough to float a canoe or a small watercraft in that channel? I don't know whether you can estimate? It'd be difficult to say. Some years it's very dry in there and the past several years it's been fairly wet. Okay. A lot more recent years than the past years previous to that. Have you ever observed the waters of North Lake flowing into that channel? No. Okay. But you said you did see a trickle once with Mr. Hudak, a trickle of water, coming out of the east end of the channel into the lake, correct? Correct.
<pre>2 topography of it, sort of fla 3 that little bit of a depressiv 4 ridge over on the west, the w 5 swale on the north, the Hanson 6 and Redland Road. Would you y 7 those descriptions, you know? 8 A Yes. 9 Q Okay. Now, the issue in this 10 failed to identify any navigal 11 so during your deposition in f 12 I believe if you'd ever seen y 13 surface anywhere on the DNR s 14 access road, correct? 15 A Yes. 16 Q Okay. So and I think that Ref 17 the best 18 MS. KAVANAUGH: I gy 19 look at the exhibits. I 20 object to him marking up 21 entered into evidence. 22 MR. GLEISNER: Well</pre>	t and, you know, with on, a little bit of a etland on the west, the n property on the south pretty much agree with case is whether DNR ble waters at this site this case you were asked water standing above the ite or anywhere near the dland Road probably has uess I'd like him to don't know whether you the exhibits you've , why don't you tell me	2 A 3 A 4 5 6 A 7 8 9 Q 10 A 11 12 Q 13 14 A 15 Q 16 17 18 A 19 Q 20 21 22	The trickle of water. Okay. So any idea how often you've seen water deep enough to float a canoe or a small watercraft in that channel? I don't know whether you can estimate? It'd be difficult to say. Some years it's very dry in there and the past several years it's been fairly wet. Okay. A lot more recent years than the past years previous to that. Have you ever observed the waters of North Lake flowing into that channel? No. Okay. But you said you did see a trickle once with Mr. Hudak, a trickle of water, coming out of the east end of the channel into the lake, correct? Correct. Okay. Now, on areas anywhere near the access road, we've had testimony there, can you mark MS. KAVANAUGH: And I guess I'd like him to mark on your Exhibit 2-002 and 2-003 where he's
<pre>2 topography of it, sort of fla 3 that little bit of a depressiv 4 ridge over on the west, the w 5 swale on the north, the Hanson 6 and Redland Road. Would you y 7 those descriptions, you know? 8 A Yes. 9 Q Okay. Now, the issue in this 10 failed to identify any navigal 11 so during your deposition in f 12 I believe if you'd ever seen y 13 surface anywhere on the DNR s 14 access road, correct? 15 A Yes. 16 Q Okay. So and I think that Ree 17 the best 18 MS. KAVANAUGH: I g 19 look at the exhibits. I 20 object to him marking up 21 entered into evidence. 22 MR. GLEISNER: Well 23 what you're talking about</pre>	t and, you know, with on, a little bit of a etland on the west, the n property on the south pretty much agree with case is whether DNR ble waters at this site this case you were asked water standing above the ite or anywhere near the dland Road probably has uess I'd like him to don't know whether you the exhibits you've , why don't you tell me t, Counsel.	2 A 3 A 4 5 A 7 7 8 9 Q 10 A 11 12 Q 13 A 15 Q 16 A 17 18 A 19 Q 20 21 22 23	The trickle of water. Okay. So any idea how often you've seen water deep enough to float a canoe or a small watercraft in that channel? I don't know whether you can estimate? It'd be difficult to say. Some years it's very dry in there and the past several years it's been fairly wet. Okay. A lot more recent years than the past years previous to that. Have you ever observed the waters of North Lake flowing into that channel? No. Okay. But you said you did see a trickle once with Mr. Hudak, a trickle of water, coming out of the east end of the channel into the lake, correct? Correct. Okay. Now, on areas anywhere near the access road, we've had testimony there, can you mark MS. KAVANAUGH: And I guess I'd like him to mark on your Exhibit 2-002 and 2-003 where he's seen standing water, I think similar to the
2topography of it, sort of fla3that little bit of a depressive4ridge over on the west, the west5swale on the north, the Hanson6and Redland Road. Would you yest7those descriptions, you know?8A9Q0kay. Now, the issue in this10failed to identify any navigal11so during your deposition in fill12I believe if you'd ever seen yes13surface anywhere on the DNR s.14access road, correct?15A16Q17the best18MS. KAVANAUGH: I gr19look at the exhibits. I20object to him marking up21entered into evidence.22MR. GLEISNER: Well23what you're talking abour24MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay	t and, you know, with on, a little bit of a etland on the west, the n property on the south pretty much agree with case is whether DNR ble waters at this site this case you were asked water standing above the ite or anywhere near the dland Road probably has uess I'd like him to don't know whether you the exhibits you've , why don't you tell me t, Counsel. y. Redland Road	2 A 3 A 4 5 A 7 7 8 9 Q 10 A 11 12 Q 13 A 15 Q 16 A 17 18 A 19 Q 20 21 22 23 24	The trickle of water. Okay. So any idea how often you've seen water deep enough to float a canoe or a small watercraft in that channel? I don't know whether you can estimate? It'd be difficult to say. Some years it's very dry in there and the past several years it's been fairly wet. Okay. A lot more recent years than the past years previous to that. Have you ever observed the waters of North Lake flowing into that channel? No. Okay. But you said you did see a trickle once with Mr. Hudak, a trickle of water, coming out of the east end of the channel into the lake, correct? Correct. Okay. Now, on areas anywhere near the access road, we've had testimony there, can you mark MS. KAVANAUGH: And I guess I'd like him to mark on your Exhibit 2-002 and 2-003 where he's seen standing water, I think similar to the question you've asked him on
<pre>2 topography of it, sort of fla 3 that little bit of a depressiv 4 ridge over on the west, the w 5 swale on the north, the Hanson 6 and Redland Road. Would you y 7 those descriptions, you know? 8 A Yes. 9 Q Okay. Now, the issue in this 10 failed to identify any navigal 11 so during your deposition in f 12 I believe if you'd ever seen y 13 surface anywhere on the DNR s 14 access road, correct? 15 A Yes. 16 Q Okay. So and I think that Ree 17 the best 18 MS. KAVANAUGH: I g 19 look at the exhibits. I 20 object to him marking up 21 entered into evidence. 22 MR. GLEISNER: Well 23 what you're talking about</pre>	t and, you know, with on, a little bit of a etland on the west, the n property on the south pretty much agree with case is whether DNR ble waters at this site this case you were asked water standing above the ite or anywhere near the dland Road probably has uess I'd like him to don't know whether you the exhibits you've , why don't you tell me t, Counsel. y. Redland Road	2 A 3 A 4 5 A 7 7 8 9 Q 10 A 11 12 Q 13 A 15 Q 16 A 17 18 A 19 Q 20 21 22 23	The trickle of water. Okay. So any idea how often you've seen water deep enough to float a canoe or a small watercraft in that channel? I don't know whether you can estimate? It'd be difficult to say. Some years it's very dry in there and the past several years it's been fairly wet. Okay. A lot more recent years than the past years previous to that. Have you ever observed the waters of North Lake flowing into that channel? No. Okay. But you said you did see a trickle once with Mr. Hudak, a trickle of water, coming out of the east end of the channel into the lake, correct? Correct. Okay. Now, on areas anywhere near the access road, we've had testimony there, can you mark MS. KAVANAUGH: And I guess I'd like him to mark on your Exhibit 2-002 and 2-003 where he's seen standing water, I think similar to the
2topography of it, sort of fla3that little bit of a depressive4ridge over on the west, the west5swale on the north, the Hanson6and Redland Road. Would you y7those descriptions, you know?8A9Q0kay. Now, the issue in this10failed to identify any navigal11so during your deposition in fill12I believe if you'd ever seen y13surface anywhere on the DNR s.14access road, correct?15A16Q17the best18MS. KAVANAUGH: I gr19look at the exhibits. I20object to him marking up21entered into evidence.22MR. GLEISNER: Well23what you're talking abour24MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay	t and, you know, with on, a little bit of a etland on the west, the n property on the south pretty much agree with case is whether DNR ble waters at this site this case you were asked water standing above the ite or anywhere near the dland Road probably has uess I'd like him to don't know whether you the exhibits you've , why don't you tell me t, Counsel. y. Redland Road	2 A 3 A 4 5 A 7 7 8 9 Q 10 A 11 12 Q 13 A 15 Q 16 A 17 18 A 19 Q 20 21 22 23 24	The trickle of water. Okay. So any idea how often you've seen water deep enough to float a canoe or a small watercraft in that channel? I don't know whether you can estimate? It'd be difficult to say. Some years it's very dry in there and the past several years it's been fairly wet. Okay. A lot more recent years than the past years previous to that. Have you ever observed the waters of North Lake flowing into that channel? No. Okay. But you said you did see a trickle once with Mr. Hudak, a trickle of water, coming out of the east end of the channel into the lake, correct? Correct. Okay. Now, on areas anywhere near the access road, we've had testimony there, can you mark MS. KAVANAUGH: And I guess I'd like him to mark on your Exhibit 2-002 and 2-003 where he's seen standing water, I think similar to the question you've asked him on
2topography of it, sort of fla3that little bit of a depressive4ridge over on the west, the west5swale on the north, the Hanson6and Redland Road. Would you y7those descriptions, you know?8A9Q0kay. Now, the issue in this10failed to identify any navigal11so during your deposition in fill12I believe if you'd ever seen y13surface anywhere on the DNR s.14access road, correct?15A16Q17the best18MS. KAVANAUGH: I gr19look at the exhibits. I20object to him marking up21entered into evidence.22MR. GLEISNER: Well23what you're talking abour24MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay	t and, you know, with on, a little bit of a etland on the west, the n property on the south pretty much agree with case is whether DNR ble waters at this site this case you were asked water standing above the ite or anywhere near the dland Road probably has uess I'd like him to don't know whether you the exhibits you've , why don't you tell me t, Counsel. y. Redland Road	2 A 3 A 4 5 A 7 7 8 9 Q 10 A 11 12 Q 13 A 15 Q 16 A 17 18 A 19 Q 20 21 22 23 24	The trickle of water. Okay. So any idea how often you've seen water deep enough to float a canoe or a small watercraft in that channel? I don't know whether you can estimate? It'd be difficult to say. Some years it's very dry in there and the past several years it's been fairly wet. Okay. A lot more recent years than the past years previous to that. Have you ever observed the waters of North Lake flowing into that channel? No. Okay. But you said you did see a trickle once with Mr. Hudak, a trickle of water, coming out of the east end of the channel into the lake, correct? Correct. Okay. Now, on areas anywhere near the access road, we've had testimony there, can you mark MS. KAVANAUGH: And I guess I'd like him to mark on your Exhibit 2-002 and 2-003 where he's seen standing water, I think similar to the question you've asked him on
<pre>2 topography of it, sort of fla 3 that little bit of a depressiv 4 ridge over on the west, the w 5 swale on the north, the Hanson 6 and Redland Road. Would you y 7 those descriptions, you know? 8 A Yes. 9 Q Okay. Now, the issue in this 10 failed to identify any navigal 11 so during your deposition in f 12 I believe if you'd ever seen y 13 surface anywhere on the DNR s 14 access road, correct? 15 A Yes. 16 Q Okay. So and I think that Rea 17 the best 18 MS. KAVANAUGH: I gy 19 look at the exhibits. I 20 object to him marking up 21 entered into evidence. 22 MR. GLEISNER: Well 23 what you're talking abour 24 MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay 25 Exhibit 2-002 and 2-003.</pre>	t and, you know, with on, a little bit of a etland on the west, the n property on the south pretty much agree with case is whether DNR ble waters at this site this case you were asked water standing above the ite or anywhere near the dland Road probably has uess I'd like him to don't know whether you the exhibits you've , why don't you tell me t, Counsel. y. Redland Road	2 A 3 A 4 5 A 7 7 8 9 Q 10 A 11 12 Q 13 A 15 Q 16 A 17 18 A 19 Q 20 21 22 23 24	The trickle of water. Okay. So any idea how often you've seen water deep enough to float a canoe or a small watercraft in that channel? I don't know whether you can estimate? It'd be difficult to say. Some years it's very dry in there and the past several years it's been fairly wet. Okay. A lot more recent years than the past years previous to that. Have you ever observed the waters of North Lake flowing into that channel? No. Okay. But you said you did see a trickle once with Mr. Hudak, a trickle of water, coming out of the east end of the channel into the lake, correct? Correct. Okay. Now, on areas anywhere near the access road, we've had testimony there, can you mark MS. KAVANAUGH: And I guess I'd like him to mark on your Exhibit 2-002 and 2-003 where he's seen standing water, I think similar to the question you've asked him on MR. GLEISNER: Why don't we do it in the
<pre>2 topography of it, sort of fla 3 that little bit of a depressiv 4 ridge over on the west, the w 5 swale on the north, the Hanson 6 and Redland Road. Would you y 7 those descriptions, you know? 8 A Yes. 9 Q Okay. Now, the issue in this 10 failed to identify any navigal 11 so during your deposition in 12 12 I believe if you'd ever seen y 13 surface anywhere on the DNR st 14 access road, correct? 15 A Yes. 16 Q Okay. So and I think that Rea 17 the best 18 MS. KAVANAUGH: I gy 19 look at the exhibits. I 20 object to him marking up 21 entered into evidence. 22 MR. GLEISNER: Well 23 what you're talking abour 24 MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay 25 Exhibit 2-002 and 2-003. 26 27 27 28 29 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20</pre>	t and, you know, with on, a little bit of a etland on the west, the n property on the south pretty much agree with case is whether DNR ble waters at this site this case you were asked water standing above the ite or anywhere near the dland Road probably has uess I'd like him to don't know whether you the exhibits you've , why don't you tell me t, Counsel. y. Redland Road	2 A 3 A 4 5 A 7 7 8 9 Q 10 A 11 12 Q 13 A 15 Q 16 A 17 18 A 19 Q 20 21 22 23 24	The trickle of water. Okay. So any idea how often you've seen water deep enough to float a canoe or a small watercraft in that channel? I don't know whether you can estimate? It'd be difficult to say. Some years it's very dry in there and the past several years it's been fairly wet. Okay. A lot more recent years than the past years previous to that. Have you ever observed the waters of North Lake flowing into that channel? No. Okay. But you said you did see a trickle once with Mr. Hudak, a trickle of water, coming out of the east end of the channel into the lake, correct? Correct. Okay. Now, on areas anywhere near the access road, we've had testimony there, can you mark MS. KAVANAUGH: And I guess I'd like him to mark on your Exhibit 2-002 and 2-003 where he's seen standing water, I think similar to the question you've asked him on
2topography of it, sort of fla3that little bit of a depressiv4ridge over on the west, the w5swale on the north, the Hanson6and Redland Road. Would you y7those descriptions, you know?8A Yes.9Q9Okay. Now, the issue in this10failed to identify any navigal11so during your deposition in fill12I believe if you'd ever seen y13surface anywhere on the DNR s14access road, correct?15A16Q17the best18MS. KAVANAUGH: I gg19look at the exhibits. I20object to him marking up21entered into evidence.22MR. GLEISNER: Well23what you're talking abour24MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay25Exhibit 2-002 and 2-003.LEGAL VIDEO SER	t and, you know, with on, a little bit of a etland on the west, the n property on the south pretty much agree with case is whether DNR ble waters at this site this case you were asked water standing above the ite or anywhere near the dland Road probably has uess I'd like him to don't know whether you the exhibits you've , why don't you tell me t, Counsel. y. Redland Road	2 A 3 A 4 5 A 7 7 8 9 Q 10 A 11 12 Q 13 A 15 Q 16 A 17 18 A 19 Q 20 21 22 23 24	The trickle of water. Okay. So any idea how often you've seen water deep enough to float a canoe or a small watercraft in that channel? I don't know whether you can estimate? It'd be difficult to say. Some years it's very dry in there and the past several years it's been fairly wet. Okay. A lot more recent years than the past years previous to that. Have you ever observed the waters of North Lake flowing into that channel? No. Okay. But you said you did see a trickle once with Mr. Hudak, a trickle of water, coming out of the east end of the channel into the lake, correct? Correct. Okay. Now, on areas anywhere near the access road, we've had testimony there, can you mark MS. KAVANAUGH: And I guess I'd like him to mark on your Exhibit 2-002 and 2-003 where he's seen standing water, I think similar to the question you've asked him on MR. GLEISNER: Why don't we do it in the LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 831white book, Your Honor?2MS. KAVANAUGH: Right. That's what I'm3going to4MR. GLEISNER: Sure.5MS. KAVANAUGH: Yeah, which would be6Exhibit 2-002 and 2-003.7MR. GLEISNER: May Counsel approach, Your8Honor?9ALJ BOLDT: Sure.10Q11highlighter. I think that will work on those.12A13Q 2-002, can you mark with this blue marker any areas14or near the access road where you've seen standing15water?16A17Q Yeah, both of them.18 our DNR access road coming north from19Redland Road it goes east/west into the launch site.21into the launch area per se the yard.22O Kay. And how about along the road, have you ever23seen it on the road or alongside of the road?24AI have never observed water on the road. I have25observed water in the wetland areas.	 or in the wetland and waterways adjacent to the site, correct? A Correct. Q And I believe you responded you have seen water that deep in several areas, correct? A I think I responded I've never taken measurements or walked through it, but it did appear to be deep enough Q Right, right, yes. A to float a small watercraft. Q Okay. So using this purple highlighter, can you show the Judge the approximate areas on the site, the DNR site, the wetlands, the roads, where you've seen water deep enough, appear to be deep enough, to float a small watercraft? A Just on the DNR site? Q And on the well, we own the road so and the access road. We have an easement. All of that I guess. A Okay. Seen water deep enough to float a cance or a boat by the well, this area, this area going up towards the channel, and then this area of the DNR launch site, sorry, and then down Redland Road, including the Hanson property and a ways down Redland Road.
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES
(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI
329	331
 1 Q Okay. Any idea of where? 2 A Most of my observations have been going in and out of the road so it'd be close to the roadway. 4 Q Okay. 5 A Or access road, sorry. 6 Q Okay. So and would that be, you know, like whole sheets of water or any idea? I mean would it be ponds or a whole sheet of 9 A In the wetland areas? 10 Q Yes, on the sides of the road. 11 A In the wetland areas designated in green I've seen various depths of water in there. 12 Q Okay. Have you ever seen it completely inundated? 14 A The wetlands? 15 Q Uh-huh. 16 A Yes. 17 Q Okay. Are there particular times of the year when you're more likely to observe standing water in these areas? 10 A Yes. 11 My experience is any time of a hard rain event there may be water. In the wetlands, it'd be a hard rain event or during the spring melt off. 10 Okay. Now, have you during your deposition you were asked whether you'd ever seen water deep enough to float a small watercraft anywhere on the DNR site 	1 Q Okay. Could you mark down Redland Road how far you've observed water that appeared deep enough? Just an estimate. 4 A Ever? 5 Q Uh-huh. 6 A long ways. 7 Q Okay. 8 A If you're talking about ever, I've seen water probably deep enough to float a watercraft surrounding the houses off Redland Road. 10 Okay. 12 A So it'd be something like this I guess, not knowing the location of the houses 14 MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor, for the purposes of the record, I wonder if that purple is a little light. Maybe we could get a different color (inaudible). Maybe red. 18 ALJ BOLDT: Well, there's red on there. 19 MR. GLEISNER: Orange, actually. THE WITNESS: There's yellow, there's green, blue. 12 MS. KAVANAUGH: We're running out of colors. How about purple? THE WITNESS: Compare the orange with the red. That's a lot better.
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES
(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI
330	332

<pre>are you asking where I've seen navigable water deep enough to float a canoe in or a boat in? MS. KAVANAUGH: And my last question I believe had to do with I thought it had to do with how often, but maybe MS. CORRELL: In what area? THE WITNESS: In the areas I've MS. KAVANAUGH: Oh, in what area. Q Yeah, in what area on the DNR site? A Are you including the wetlands or just the launch site, parking site parking lot site? Q Let's just say the launch site right now. A Okay. Then I would stick to my previous answer about it. Q Okay. And, again, I think you said when there's you were talking about heavy rain, spring snow melt. Is that the times you're likely to see this type of water in all of these areas? I mean O Correct. Q Okay. I'd ask you to take a look at Exhibit 34, I think it was dash 002 and 001, which would be I believe in the white book. MR. GLEISNER: Yes, they would be, Counsel. MS. CORRELL: You just showed them, right? MS. KAVANAUGH: Yeah, that were just shown.</pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 335
1MR. GLEISNER: Yeah, do you want me to put2them up again?3MS. KAVANAUGH: Sure, that would be4helpful.5A 34 is way in back.6MR. GLEISNER: Warden, that's 001.7Q7Q7Q8Based on what appears to be sheet ice on the water,10I'd say that'd be again early spring.11Q9A8Based on what appears to be sheet ice on the water,10I'd say that'd be again early spring.11Q9Okay. And then 34-00212MR. GLEISNER: Was it 02 or 03, Counsel? I13think it was14MS. KAVANAUGH: I'm sorry, I thought it was15002.16MR. GLEISNER: I think it was 03, Counsel.17MS. KAVANAUGH: Oh. I had 34-002 so let's18see which one. The one that Mr. Peters19produced.20MR. GLEISNER: Oh, no, I'm sorry, Counsel.21That was 35-002. I'm sorry, I'm putting it up22right now.23MS. KAVANAUGH: Okay. Did he show 3 as24well?25MR. MEYER: He did all three of them.
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 336

SHEET 85	
MS. KAVANAUGH: Oh, okay. Well, let's look at all of them then. 35-002 then. MR. GLEISNER: It's up on the screen too, Warden, if you want. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you, sir. Can you get a sense of what time of the year that would be? A There appears to be buds forming on some of the trees, the deciduous trees, so again I'd go late spring, early And that would be like April? A April/May, correct. A April/May, correct. A April/May, correct. A Depending on the year, late spring March/April. A Depending on the year, late spring March/April. A Depending on the year, late spring March/April. A Depending on the year. I believe is the last one. MR. GLEISNER: I don't think we no, we put up 34-003, Counsel. MR. GLEISNER: It's up. And can you give us an idea of when what time of A Depending on you give us an idea of when what time of	1MR. GLEISNER: I'm going to object to2speculation, Your Honor.3MS. KAVANAUGH: No, I'm not asking him to4speculate, I'm asking him whether he can based5on his observations. If he can't, he can't.6MR. GLEISNER: He's a trained law7enforcement officer, I'll withdraw my objection.8MS. KAVANAUGH: He's trained in9observation.10AIt appears to be fairly flat.11QOkay.12AWhen I've seen water in one area, there's usually13water in all the areas.14QOkay. So by that you mean when you see water on the15DNR property you tend to see it further down16Redland Road?17ACorrect.18QOkay. Have you ever tried to access the DNR site19using the existing east/west road that we've20discussed and been unable to because of water21covering the road?22A23Q24No.25mentioned when you were out there with Andy at the
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES
(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI
337	339
<pre>1 year that might be?</pre>	<pre>east end of the channel, have you noticed any</pre>
2 A It looks again, no leaves on the trees. It could	perceptible flow or movement in any of these waters?
3 be extreme late fall or early spring.	A No.
4 Q Okay.	Q During your deposition I believe you were asked
5 A There's no snow so I don't it's wintertime, but	whether you'd ever seen anyone navigating in certain
6 Q Okay. And have you ever seen water to that extent	areas of the site. Have you ever seen anyone
7 portrayed in those photos on the property those	navigating a watercraft anywhere depicted on
8 three	Redland Road, Exhibit 2-002, except for the videos
9 A Similar, yes.	the other day? Have you ever, in person, observed
10 Q Okay. Now, from what you know, and I know you're not	anyone navigating a watercraft in those two green
11 a meteorologist, but in early spring or in early	areas, for example the wetlands?
2 spring, is that the time when typically you have snow	No.
13 melt or spring runoff?	Q Have you ever observed anyone navigating a watercraft
14 A Yes, hopefully.	on the north/south access road?
15 Q Okay. Hopefully, yes. Okay. Have you ever walked	No.
16 from the DNR Hanson property south on Redland Road or	Q How about in the east/west access road?
17 vice versa?	No.
18 A Yes.	Q How about in the northern channel that's identified
19 Q Okay. Based on your observations I know we don't	as blue on there?
18 have elevations show down lower Redland Road. Does	No.
19 the Hanson property, which has been identified as the	Q How about the red circled area that's the DNR
20 property just south of the DNR property, and then the	property?
21 other properties on Redland Road and Redland Road	A No.
24 itself, do they appear higher or lower in elevation	Q Okay. Now, where there's been a lot of well, you
25 than the DNR site? Can you form an opinion on that?	said you haven't seen okay, let's see. Have
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES
(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI
338	340

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

_	SHEET 86	
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>Q Okay.</pre>	1boat, two to three inches.2MR. GALLO: No further questions. Thank3you.4ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Any other questions of5the warden?6MR. GLEISNER: No.7ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Thank you very much.8You're excused. Any further witnesses on behalf9of the Department?10MS. KAVANAUGH: No.11ALJ BOLDT: Mr. Meyer, did you want to12testify?13MR. MEYER: I do not.14ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Any rebuttal witnesses?15MR. GLEISNER: We have some rebuttal16witnesses. I have one. It will be very short.17Mr. Gallo has two, I believe, Your Honor.18ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Who wants to go first?19MR. GLEISNER: Mr. Gallo.20MR. GALLO: I'd like to call Paul Giese and21this will be quick.22ALJ BOLDT: I'll remind you that you're23still under oath.24DIRECT EXAMINATION25BY MR. GALLO:
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 341	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 343
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22	Q In an average year, both either professional in your job or as recreation, how many days a year do you spend on non-frozen water in a watercraft? A It, again, is seasonal, depending how nice the weather is. Q Ball park. A In a typical boating season, late April through October, probably three to five days a week. MR. MEYER: No further questions. ALJ BOLDT: Any other questions? Mr. Gallo? CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GALLO: Q Warden, are you familiar with a navigability in fact test? A I'm familiar with what's been testified today and yesterday. Q Have you ever seen one of these tests? A Yes. Actually, yes, I am familiar with that, yes. Q In your opinion, how much water depth is necessary to be able to float a watercraft in this type of test?	1 Q Paul, I'd like to refer you 2 MR. GALLO: Is everybody ready? 3 Q I'd like to refer you to the GESTRA report. It's 4 Exhibit 7A. 5 MR. GLEISNER: It's in the white book. 6 It's in the white book. 7 A 9 Yes, Exhibit 7. 9 A 9 Yes, Exhibit 7. 9 A 9 Yes, Exhibit 7. 9 A 9 Okay. 10 MR. GALLO: Just one second, I want to make 11 sure everybody is on the same page. Are you 12 ready? 13 MS. CORRELL: Yeah, sorry. I didn't was 14 there a question that was posed? 15 ALJ BOLDT: Exhibit 7. 16 MR. GALLO: No, Exhibit 7, GESTRA report. 17 MS. CORRELL: Oh, we're back there. Okay. 18 Do I have it? No, this is the wrong binder. 19 Give me one minute. 20 MR. GALLO: Sure. 21 MS. CORRELL: Okay, got it. Thank you. 22<
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 342	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 344

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 87	
<pre>1 A Yes, I have. 2 Q And I'd like to 3 MR. GLEISNER: Pardon me, I'm sorry. 4 MS. KAVANAUGH: Is it the GESTRA report? 5 MR. GALLO: Yeah, the GESTRA report. 6 Q I'd like to refer you to Page 7-003. During your 7 analysis of this report you pointed something out to 8 me that I hadn't understood with regard to 9 Paragraph 2 regarding the focus of this report. Can 9 you do you recall that point? 11 A Yes, I do. 12 Q Can you explain for the record your thoughts with 13 regard to this second paragraph? 14 A Sure. What my thoughts were with regard to that 15 paragraph was that this report was based on the plan 16 that the new access road would follow the existing 17 access trail that exists today. 18 Q And what's the basis for your opinion? 19 A The basis would just be the fact that the let's 20 see, the fourth sentence in that paragraph, "The 21 roadway will generally follow an existing access 22 trail that is cleared but not paved." 23 Q Okay. I want to refer you to Boring 4, 7-017. 24 A Yes. 25 Q And are you familiar with the location of this</pre>	1ALJ BOLDT: Sure.2MR. GLEISNER: Thank you.3Q9Paul, I want to direct your attention to the log of4Test Boring B4, Page 7-017.5A7Yes.6Q9A Yes.10Q11A12Yes, the presence of the this log indicates that12there's three feet of silty sand with gravel, trace13organic brown fill, that was encountered from the14ground surface to a depth of three feet.15Q16that you would, as a geotechnical engineer practicing17in this locale, you would recommend additional18borings to be conducted19MS. CORRELL: All of this has been covered.10I object to duplicity.21ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, what are we rebutting22right now?23MS. CORRELL: Right now these were24our he did in his direct. I recall the same25testimony.
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 345	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 347
<pre>1 boring? 2 A Yes, I am. 3 Q Can you describe that location? 4 A Sure. That boring, from the testimony, is that it 5 was performed on the access road between Station 20 6 and 25, the east/west portion of the existing access 7 road that extends towards North Lake. 8 MS. KAVANAUGH: And, I'm sorry, whose 9 testimony? You said that was from the 10 testimony? 11 Q I'm sorry, do you know 12 A From Kurt's testimony earlier today. 13 MS. KAVANAUGH: That it was on the road? 14 THE WITNESS: That it was on the roadway. 15 Q Can you let's look at one of the figures here, 16 Exhibit 143. Can you locate Boring 4? 17 A Yes, Boring 4 was 18 Q And can you confirm that it was performed on the 19 existing road? 20 A According to this, it has it that it was located just 21 within the existing roadway. 22 Q Okay. And let's look at Boring 4, Exhibit 23 Page 7-017. 24 MR. GLEISNER: Counsel, may I just, 25 Judge, may I approach that for a moment?</pre>	1MR. GLEISNER: May it please the court, may2it please the court, may it please the Judge. I3just think that if we can just get through this4we can all5ALJ BOLDT: What are we rebutting right6now? I mean7MR. GALLO: The adequacy of the existing8boring which was brought into contention today9in Mr. Farrenkopf's testimony.10MS. KAVANAUGH: But he's already offered11his testimony on that.12ALJ BOLDT: He already offered his direct13testimony.14MS. CORRELL: And we rebutted that.15ALJ BOLDT: Anything you know, if you16asked him what's his response to what he heard17today or something like that, that's rebuttal.18MR. GALLO: Okay. Thank you.19Q19Q Mr. Giese, do you have an opinion as to what you20heard today with regard to the location and validity21of Test Boring B4?22ASure. I mean I don't dispute the validity of23Test Boring B4 and the conditions that are24encountered, that are portrayed, on this test boring.25I guess my opinion as a geotechnical engineer is that
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 346	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 348

Shee	ET 88		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 A 11 0 A 11 0 12 13 A 14 0 11 13 A 14 0 11 13 A 14 0 12 12 13 14 0 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	once that roadway veered to the north into that existing wetlands area, that that would absolutely, definitely require additional borings to determine the existing conditions of those soils because, in my opinion, those soils are going to act much differently than the peat soils and the organic soils that were encountered in Test Boring B4. Okay. You work for a geotechnical firm by the name of Giles Engineering. And that geotechnical firm has a number of soil boring rigs, is that correct? Yes, we do. Do you have a soil boring rig that could go into the wetlands and take those soil borings? Yes, we do. MR. GALLO: No further questions. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. MR. GLEISNER: Briefly, Your Honor. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GLEISNER: Is there a difference between a paved highway and the type of road they propose to put in here? Well, the short answer is yes. And can you describe what that is in terms of the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 A 10 0 11 12 A 13 14 15 16 0 17 18 A 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	<pre>the exact terms, but the two types of geotech material that is going to be used for the snow Snowshoe?</pre>
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 349		LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 351
1		1	י ניוי איז החומר דו אין
2 A 3 4 5 6 6 7 7 1 8 9 10 1 11 1 12 Q 13 1 14 1 15 1 16 1 17 1 18 9 20 2 21 2 22 Q 23 A 24 Q	type of composition and the depth of the composition? Sure. You know, again, as Kurt had testified to, it's all it's dependent upon the traffic loading that that particular roadway or pavement is subjected to. A highway surface would be would have a much thicker base course and a surface course, whether it be hot mix asphalt or Portland cement, just because of the number of loads that that pavement the number of traffic loads that that pavement is subjected to, whereas I mean there wouldn't be as much traffic loading on this particular project. Now, we've heard testimony today and I'd like to ask your opinion of it to a reasonable degree of professional certainty. We heard testimony today that it was not necessary to do any other borings on the road from Station 20 to Station 25, the east/west portion of the access road, because a boring had been done on B4. Do you have an opinion? My opinion is that B4 does not represent the conditions that will most likely be encountered to the north of that existing roadway. Are you familiar with the concept of a land bridge? Yes. You heard testimony today from Mr. Farrenkopf that it was unlikely that the geotech and I can't remember	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Q 10 11 12 A 13 14 15 16 17 18 A 19 Q 20 A 21 22 23 24 25 Q	ALJ BOLDT: It seems like cross, but it's MR. GLEISNER: It does seem like cross, Your Honor. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Yeah, so the objection is sustained. See if you can ask it another way. MR. GLEISNER: Okay. Do you have an opinion as to whether or not what they propose doing from Station 20 to Station 25 is being done without proper analysis? Yes, I do. MS. CORRELL: Leading. MS. KAVANAUGH: Yeah, and characterizing ALJ BOLDT: He said do you have an opinion. I think that's allowed. Yes, I do have an opinion. And what's that opinion? My opinion is that I believe the GESTRA report underestimates the construction difficulties that are going to be encountered between Station 20 and 25. MR. GLEISNER: Just give me one second, Your Honor. I would direct your attention
2 A 3 4 5 6 6 7 7 1 8 9 10 1 12 Q 11 1 12 Q 11 1 13 1 14 1 15 6 16 7 17 1 18 0 19 A 19 A 20 21 22 Q 23 A 24 Q	Sure. You know, again, as Kurt had testified to, it's all it's dependent upon the traffic loading that that particular roadway or pavement is subjected to. A highway surface would be would have a much thicker base course and a surface course, whether it be hot mix asphalt or Portland cement, just because of the number of loads that that pavement the number of traffic loads that that pavement is subjected to, whereas I mean there wouldn't be as much traffic loading on this particular project. Now, we've heard testimony today and I'd like to ask your opinion of it to a reasonable degree of professional certainty. We heard testimony today that it was not necessary to do any other borings on the road from Station 20 to Station 25, the east/west portion of the access road, because a boring had been done on B4. Do you have an opinion? My opinion is that B4 does not represent the conditions that will most likely be encountered to the north of that existing roadway. Are you familiar with the concept of a land bridge? Yes. You heard testimony today from Mr. Farrenkopf that it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Q 10 11 12 A 13 14 15 16 17 18 A 19 Q 20 A 21 22 23 24	<pre>it's MR. GLEISNER: It does seem like cross, Your Honor. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Yeah, so the objection is sustained. See if you can ask it another way. MR. GLEISNER: Okay. Do you have an opinion as to whether or not what they propose doing from Station 20 to Station 25 is being done without proper analysis? Yes, I do. MS. CORRELL: Leading. MS. KAVANAUGH: Yeah, and characterizing ALJ BOLDT: He said do you have an opinion. I think that's allowed. Yes, I do have an opinion. And what's that opinion? My opinion is that I believe the GESTRA report underestimates the construction difficulties that are going to be encountered between Station 20 and 25. MR. GLEISNER: Just give me one second, Your Honor.</pre>

SHEET 89	
1MR. GLEISNER: And I'm just about done,2Your Honor.3Q to 7-007.4AOkay.5QDo you have that?6AYes, I do.7QActually, that is not the that is not8AOh, 007, I'm sorry.9QYeah, right. That is not where you want to be. I10can see from here.11AOkay.12QIt says and I direct your attention specifically13to the last paragraph, and I'm referring to the14sentence one, two, I think three, four in. "If the15roadway is raised two feet it is likely the resulting16settlement would be on the order of two to four17inches." Do you agree with that?18A19Q14Just because there has not been enough analysis of15the organic soils to determine that amount of16settlement.17MR. GLEISNER: No further questions, Your18Honor.	 asked is, isn't it true that you just testified that you can't say if there would or would not be failure of the access road because you don't have enough data or information? A I guess that is what I answered to. Q Okay. And were you a party to additional conversations between Doug Bath and Kurt Farrenkopf subsequent to preparation of the GESTRA report? A No. Q And isn't it true that Mr. Farrenkopf's testimony indicated multiple steps that are not specific recommendations in 3.3.1 at Exhibit 7-006? A I guess can you restate the question? Well, you can turn to 7-006 and identify Okay. Q if each and every step that Mr. Farrenkopf identified would take place on our design plans are specific written recommendations in that section. A Would they take place? MR. GLEISNER: Counsel, I don't think your question is clear. Q I'll ask you to take a couple minutes to review Section 3.3.1 A Okay. Q on Exhibit 7-006 and let me know when you're
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 353	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 355
1ALJ BOLDT: I think these guys get a chance2first.3MR. GALLO: I'm just going to ask him if4his opinions were to a reasonable degree of5scientific certainty?6THE WITNESS: Yes.7CROSS-EXAMINATION8BY MS. CORRELL:9Q9Thank you for waiting to the end here10A8Sure.11Q9 Mr. Giese. I heard you testify just now that you12can't provide an opinion of whether or not the access13road would or would not fail, is that an accurate14characterization of your testimony just a couple15minutes ago?16A I would say no.17Q17Q18precisely because I wrote down that you couldn't say19it would or would not fail based on not knowing the10information that was available if another boring site18was taken in the wetland?19A11What I would say is that to clarify that is that13another test boring would need to be done to14determine if the proposed fix is adequate.15QI didn't ask that question though. The question I	<pre>1 ready. 2 A Okay. 3 MR. GLEISNER: He's done, Counsel. 4 Q What are the recommendations that are specifically 5 provided in this section by the GESTRA report? 6 A Sure. They say that, "There's a significant 7 thickness, a very soft, very loose, soil that raises 8 special concerns about the potential for poor 9 pavement performance and settlement." They 10 say estimate that three "A minimum of three 11 feet of compacted granular soil is needed to provide 12 suitable subgrade for pavement. In some places, 13 three feet of fill may also already exist, though the 14 type of fill material and level of compaction applied 15 in the past will vary. In other areas, an additional 16 one foot may be needed. If excavation exposes the 17 very soft, very loose soil, a separator fabric should 18 be used to prevent contamination of the new fill from 19 the underlying soils." 20 Q And it continues, alternatively? 21 A "Uni-axial geograde could be used to reduce the 22 required granular fill from three feet to one foot, 23 does not include sub-base gravel. This type of grid 24 has been shown to provide a snowshoe effect at 25 spreading out the loading from tires. This method </pre>

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
<pre>1 things going on. 2 A That's different than the recommendations 3 Q One is a that's exactly what I'm pointing out. 4 These recommendations were done at a particular point 5 in time in the project, correct? 6 A Right. 7 Q There have been subsequent conversations that you 8 were not privy to? 9 MR. GLEISNER: Counsel, I'm going to 10 object. I mean you're testifying and 11 MS. CORRELL: I'm not testifying. 12 MR. GLEISNER: I don't recall that 13 MS. CORRELL: This testimony was 14 ALJ BOLDT: She specifically asked him if 15 he was if he had been involved in those 16 conversations so I think she 17 MR. GLEISNER: Oh, okay. 18 MS. CORRELL: Yes, I asked these questions. 19 ALJ BOLDT: She laid the groundwork for 20 that statement so go ahead. 21 Q So you don't have a very precise recollection of 22 Mr. Farrenkopf's testimony in that regard? 23 A Well, I don't remember hearing breaker run. I don't 24 remember him saying that that would be I don't. 25 Q Okay. So you just don't recall it?</pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 359
<pre>1 A Yeah. 2 Q Well, how about this 3 A I do have an opinion on that method. 4 Q if all six layers that the DNR 5 MS. CORRELL: Strike that. 6 Q And worst case scenario, if there is movement when 7 the proof roll test is conducted, aren't there 8 engineering tools available to address any movement? 9 A The engineering tube, yes. 10 MS. CORRELL: I don't have any further 11 questions. Thank you. 12 MR. GLEISNER: Short redirect? 13 ALJ BOLDT: Sure. 14 MR. GLEISNER: Thank you, Your Honor. 15 MR. MEYER: No question. 16 ALJ BOLDT: Apologies from 17 MR. MEYER: No, not needed. 18 RECROSS-EXAMINATION 19 BY MR. GLEISNER: 20 Q With regard, first of all, to 3.3.1, I heard that you 14 had an opinion concerning a matter that Counsel had 27 raised. Would you please share that with us? 28 A The opinion of the method of stabilization? 29 Yes, yes. 20 A My opinion is that there's no basis for that to tell 20 Yes, yes. 21 A State of the method of stabilization? 22 Yes, yes. 23 A My opinion is that there's no basis for that to tell 24 Yes, yes. 25 A My opinion is that there's no basis for that to tell 24 Yes, yes. 25 A My opinion is that there's no basis for that to tell 24 Yes, yes. 25 A My opinion is that there's no basis for that to tell 24 Yes, yes. 25 A My opinion is that there's no basis for that to tell 24 Yes, yes. 25 A My opinion is that there's no basis for that to tell 25 A My opinion is that there's no basis for that to tell 26 Yes, Yes. 27 A The opinion of the method of stabilization? 27 Yes, Yes. 28 A The opinion is that there's no basis for that to tell 29 Yes, Yes. 20 Yes, Yes. 20 Yes, Yes. 20 Yes, Yes. 20 Yes, Yes. 21 A The opinion Yes Yes Yes. 22 A The opinion Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes</pre>
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

SHEET 91	
<pre>1 whether that method of stabilization would work or 2 not. 3 Q And why is that, sir? 4 A Because there is no subsurface information about the 5 in-place characteristics of the soils in the wetlands 6 area. 7 Q I'm going to are you through? I'm sorry. 8 A Yes. 9 Q I'm going to direct your attention to 7-004 and there 10 has been I'm sorry, I know it's muck, but I can't 11 remember what it is. 12 A Houghton. 13 Q Houghton muck? 14 A Houghton. 15 Q And that Roland muck? 16 A Roland. 17 Q Roland muck? 18 A Right. 19 Q That table just above Section 2.3 on 7-004, it says 20 that the soil support value for those two types of 21 muck is none, is that correct? 22 A Yes. 23 MS. CORRELL: This has all been done in 24 direct. 25 MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'm 27 MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'm</pre>	1 A That's correct. 2 Q It was muck all the way? 3 A Basically. It's the organic silt down to a depth of 4 12 feet and then at 12 feet it turns into silty clay, 5 but those soils still have very low strength 6 characteristics and high moisture contents. 7 Q So that begs the question, how far would you have to 8 excavate to get to a point where you could get a 9 supporting road or a support for a road? 10 A Well, it depends upon the conditions that are in that 11 roadway. I mean on the basis of this boring? 12 Q Yes, on the basis of 13 A I mean if they were if the roadway was going into 14 the you've got that layer of better materials up 15 in the top three to four feet and, you know, it's 16 reasonable to say that that could be saved in place 17 and build the roadway above that. 18 Q I understand, but your testimony, as I understood it, 19 and the testimony of Mr. Farrenkopf was that B4 was 20 done on or close to the existing roadway, is that 21 correct? 22 A That's correct. 23 A That's correct. 24 And your testimony from a few moments ago was that 25 that right, alteration?
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 361	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 363
1MS. KAVANAUGH: Laying a foundation.2MR. GLEISNER: I'm laying a foundation.3That's exactly right. Thank you, Edwina.4QThat means there is no soil support value, is that5correct?6AThat's correct.7QOkay. Now, I'd like you to go to 7 first of all,8I'd like you to stop on the way at 7-010 and this is9all foundational. Soil Boring 4 was done between the10borderline between Houghton muck and the Roland muck,11is that correct?12A13Q14Yes.13Q15looked at. To a reasonable degree of professional16certainty were the soil borings or the soil boring17done at B4 in either 2007 or 2008 done deep enough?18A19And why?20A just to find the bottom, to find a layer of competent21bearing soil.22Q23So is it your am I understanding your testimony24correctly to a reasonable degree of professional25identified in B4?	1 A The realignment? 2 Q Realignment of the roadway, that this road will actually go into the wetlands, is that correct? 4 A That's correct. 5 Q So I would like to ask you to assume something and then I'm going to ask your opinion. I'd like you to assume that in the wetland to the north of where B4 was done that you do not have the overlaying three feet of fill, silty sand with gravel, etcetera, that we find in Boring 4 and then I would like to ask your opinion if that would have an effect on your ability to dig down and excavate down 13 A Absolutely. 14 Q for support? 15 A Absolutely. 16 Q To a reasonable degree of professional certainty, what is that opinion? 18 A My opinion is that it's going to be extremely difficult to even get equipment in there to place to remove any fill that's being proposed. 20 Would that have an impact on the cost of the project? 21 MS. CORRELL: Objection to relevance. 22 MS. CORRELL: Objection to talk about
LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 362	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 364

1 creating the targegres. I think we could be here all right. approval. 2 M. BOLISIBE: No further questions, four terms. approval. 3 M. BOLISIBE: No further questions of the terms better us. Care. The could have to one and start were. I mean it's degender. 3 M. BOLISIBE: No further questions of the terms better us. Care. The could have to one and start were. I mean it's degender. 4 M. BOLISIBE: No further questions of this start to be taken on and start were. I mean it's degender. approval. 5 M. BOLISIBE: No further questions of this operations of this start to be taken on and start were. The could have to one and start were. 5 M. BOLISIBE: Care. The could have to one and start were word have tone and have tone and have tone and have to one and have to one an	SHEET 92	
(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 365 10 Wat's to a reasonable degree of scientific 2 Generating the process of repair for this system using the multiple layers of fabrics to in effect bridge over the 6 MS. CORRELL: Objection, relevance. A Will BoulDT: Yeah, I'm not sure 8 MS. CORRELL: How is that impacting a Figure 1's How long have you lived there, sir? 7 ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, I'm not sure 8 MR. GALLO: Well it's 10 MR. CALLO: Well it's 10 MR. GALLO: Well it's 11 MS. CORRELL: It may be a tedious process 11 MS. CORRELL: It may be a tedious process 13 MR. GALLO: Well it's 10 A dare you familiar with the area that has come to 14 out. MS. CORRELL: Is that relevant? 10 A dare you familiar with the area where the proposed is site since the '70s. I noved out on the lake on River Road which is right next to Redland Road in 1973. 15 MS. CORRELL: Is that relevant? 16 A Yes, I 16 MR. GALLO: Yeah, okay. 14 1973. 16 MS. CARLO: Yeah, okay. 16 17	 all night. MR. GLEISNER: No further questions, Your Honor. ALJ BOLDT: Yeah. No, there's a case that's specifically part of Chapter 30 or the issues before us. Okay. Any other questions of this witness? MR. GALLO: Yes. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GALLO: Q Mr. Giese, you heard the testimony of Kurt Farrenkopf earlier today? A Yes. Q And he explained a system that was discussed with the GESTRA folks that's outside of this report. It consisted of layers and use of geo-fabrics and a proof roll test. Do you have an opinion as to MS. CORRELL: Asked and answered. ALJ BOLDT: It's not asked yet. MS. CORRELL: Go ahead. Q Do you have an opinion as to how that proof roll test will go and the spot repairs of soft spots? A I think my opinion is that that proof roll would 	2QDo you have an opinion?3MR. GLEISNER: Your Honor, I guess oh,4I'm sorry.5AIf it doesn't work, then typically it would have to6be taken out and start over. I mean it's dependent7upon why it's failing the proof roll.8Q9ALJ BOLDT: Any other questions of this10witness? Okay. You're excused. Thank you very11much, sir. Ready for your next one?12MR. GALLO: I don't have another one.13ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Good.14MR. GLEISNER: I'll call Mr. Rob Moevius.15MR. MEYER: Is this the last witness?16MS. CORRELL: Except for we're going to17have to call now sur-surrebuttal because18already provided today so we'll have to clarify20the record.21ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Do you swear to tell the22truth, the whole truth and nothing but the23truth, so help you God?24MR. MOEVIUS: Yes, I do.
2 certainty I'm going to ask you if you have an opinion of the process of repair for this system using the multiple layers of fabrics to in effect bridge over the 2 Briefly, the hour is late, what's your address? 3 M2 207492 Rediand Road. 4 W322 W1492 Rediand Road. 6 MS. CORRELL: Objection, relevance. 4 4 W32 W1492 Rediand Road. 7 ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, I'm not sure 8 Since the early '80s. 8 MS. CORRELL: How is that impacting a 6 ALJ BOLDT: Could you get the spelling of 9 regulatory matter? 7 his last name? 8 10 MR. GALLO: Well it's 10 Q And are you familiar with the area that has come to 11 MS. CORRELL: Is that relevant? 16 Q And are you familiar with the area where the proposed 13 MR. GALLO: But it if it doesn't work, 15 1973. 16 Yes. 14 out. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. If it has impacts on 1973. 16 Yes. 15 MS. GALLO: Yeah, okay. 16 A res. 9 I'm ot sure where eyo 16 MR. GALLO: Yeah, okay. 16 Yes. 16 Yes.	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI
(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI	<pre>2 certainty I'm going to ask you if you have an opinion 3 of the process of repair for this system using the 4 multiple layers of fabrics to in effect bridge over 5 the 6 MS. CORRELL: Objection, relevance. 7 ALJ BOLDT: Yeah, I'm not sure 8 MS. CORRELL: How is that impacting a 9 regulatory matter? 10 MR. GALLO: Well it's 11 MS. CORRELL: It may be a tedious process 12 if it in fact does happen. 13 MR. GALLO: That's what I'm trying to find 14 out. 15 MS. CORRELL: Is that relevant? 16 MS. CORRELL: Is that relevant? 17 then we're going to have to excavate and go 18 considerably wider. 19 ALJ BOLDT: Okay. If it has impacts on 20 something if you're saying it has some 21 environmental impacts, then let's tie that in 22 MR. GALLO: Yeah, okay. 24 MS. KAVANAUGH: If it doesn't work then</pre>	2 Q Briefly, the hour is late, what's your address? 3 A W322 N7492 Redland Road. 4 Q How long have you lived there, sir? 5 A Since the early '80s. 6 ALJ BOLDT: Could you get the spelling of 7 his last name? 8 MR. GLEISNER: Sure, M-O-E-V-I-U-S. 9 THE WITNESS: U-S, correct. 10 Q And are you familiar with the area that has come to 11 be known as the Krause site? 12 A Yes, I am. Just to clarify, I've known the Krause 13 site since the '70s. I moved out on the lake on 14 River Road which is right next to Redland Road in 15 1973. 16 Q And are you familiar with the area where the proposed 17 boat launch is going to go? 18 A Yes. 19 Q I'm going to direct your attention to a series of 10 exhibits beginning with, and you can look at the 11 white book in front of you, Exhibit 34-001. 12 MS. CORRELL: I guess I'm not sure where 13 you're going. Is that rebuttal testimony? 14 MR. GLEISNER: It sure is. It sure is.
366 368	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI	

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

	SHEET 93			
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. MEYER: Can I just ask clarification of what's being rebutted? MR. GLEISNER: What is being rebutted is the opinions of several witnesses that this does not flood very often here and that this is an area that only infrequently, perhaps every 100 years or so, floods. That's what's being rebutted. MS. CORRELL: I don't think that's a fair characterization of what the testimony was. ALJ BOLDT: It's in a flood plain. MR. GLEISNER: Well, I'd just like to get the photographs in, Your Honor. It's going to take about three minutes. MS. KAVANAUGH: Aren't the photographs in already? MR. GLEISNER: No, they're not. I'm calling up Exhibit 34-001. Did you take that photograph, sir? A Yes, I did. Q And when did you take that photograph? I took it this year, 2011, I'd say it was in March. Q An I'm going to show you what has been marked as Exhibit 34-002. Did you take that photograph?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	<pre>Well, usually several times a year there is water in that area. And is that true of Exhibits 34-002 and 003 as well? Oh, yes, that's the same area. MR. GLEISNER: Move the admission of these exhibits, Your Honor. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Any objection to 34? MS. CORRELL: No objection. ALJ BOLDT: 34-001, 2 and 3 are received. MR. GLEISNER: Oh, and I forgot one, 004 as well, Your Honor. This real quickly. Did you take this Photograph 004? Yes, and this is on the grove of trees, but closer to where we walked into the grove of trees when we were on our public, you know ALJ BOLDT: Site visit? Site visit? Yeah, when we were on our site visit we walked in this way so the rest of the grove of trees stands out farther and I see Andy Hudak's cabbage what was it, a skunk cabbage, and it was located back a little bit farther where (inaudible) in our walkthrough. Toward the southeast corner of Exhibit 34-004, correct? Correct.</pre>
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 369			LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 371
2 3 4 5 6 7 0 8 9 10 0 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	ALJ BOLDT: I'm sorry, and when was that? THE WITNESS: That's 2011 March. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Q I'm going to go back to Exhibit 34-001. Can you tell me which direction you are facing and where you took that photograph from? A I took it from the Hanson side, that little white here is about where the marker is for the Hanson property and I was looking north toward Peters and you can see northeast through the grove of trees. Q And how often does it get that wet in the area where the proposed boat launch is going to be placed, if you know? A Well, you mean how many times a year?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q A Q Q	And that is also a photograph that you took in March of this year? Yes, you can see a little bit of water stain on the lens there. MR. GLEISNER: Move the admission of this. ALJ BOLDT: I assume there's no objection? 34-004 is received. MR. GLEISNER: That's it, Your Honor. ALJ BOLDT: Mr. Gallo, any questions? MR. GALLO: No. ALJ BOLDT: Mr. Meyer, so we don't forget you, any questions? CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. MEYER: Where do you live, Mr. Moevius, in relationship to the boat launch area? Just about five houses south. South. MR. MEYER: Can you put the map or that picture back up you just had up, Counselor? I forget what number that was. MR. GLEISNER: I know. Just a second, Counsel. MS. KAVANAUGH: The last one? MR. MEYER: Yeah, or any of them. LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI
	(000) 279-3233 Flatile du Sac Wi 370			(000) 275-5255 FTATLLE du Sac WI 372

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

	SHEET 94	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	<pre>MR. GLEISNER: I will be very happy to do that. Just a minute. Now, when the water is like that, what is the water like on the properties on your property? Not like that, it's dry. It's dry. Or if it would have been, you know, let's say a month-and-a-half earlier, it would have been full of snow. What about other properties between you and the boat launch, is there similar water or standing water present? On the Hanson property adjacent to the DNR property. So the Hanson property would also be flooded? Yes. That first photograph showed the lot line and I was standing on the Hanson property. MR. MEYER: Can we go back to that, please? MR. GLEISNER: Of course, Counsel. MR. MEYER: That would be helpful. MR. MEYER: You bet, just give me a second here. And that is 34-001, Counsel. MR. MEYER: 34-001. Now, where were you standing again on this one, please, if you could just maybe</pre>	1 could I have a canoe, a kayak, and a paddle boat, 2 but I would think that at least two of those boats 3 would be able to navigate or float, you know, in that 4 area. 5 Q 6 A 7 Q 7 Q 8 much, Mr. Moevius, I appreciate your answers. 9 MS. CORRELL: I don't have any questions 10 for you, Mr. Moevius. 11 ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Thank you very much. 12 MR. GLEISNER: I think we're done, Your 13 Honor. 14 much. MS. CORRELL: I think we just need to put 15 up our 16 MS. CORRELL: witness as a rebuttal for 18 a very brief clarification. I think it's two 19 questions. 20 ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Let's do it. 21 MS. CORRELL: Sur-surrebuttal, Kurt. 22 MR. GLEISNER: We almost were done. 23 MS. CORRELL: I know, sorry. There just 24 seems to be a little bit of confusion. I just 25 want to clarify the record. </td
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 373	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 375
1	the line going	1 ALJ BOLDT: I think just surrebuttal at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GLEISNER: The Judge can't see. ALJ BOLDT: No, I can see. That's fine, sir. A Okay. So this would be the Hanson's property on this side of this marker. ALJ BOLDT: Meaning the left side? The left side, sir? THE WITNESS: Yeah, to the A I'm looking north toward the Peters the Peters' house is here and this is east a little bit and so all of this area is the Hanson property. Q Okay. A To the this would be south so all this area south would be the Hanson property. MS. KAVANAUGH: So the foreground in the picture is what you're saying THE WITNESS: Yeah. MS. KAVANAUGH: is the Hanson property? A And this area going straight through would be the where we saw some, you know, navigation in fact in this area. Q So on that date could you have navigated the Hanson property based on what you've seen out there?	 ALS BOLDI: I think just suffebutial at this point. MS. CORRELL: Oh, is it just one sur? Thank you. MR. GLEISNER: I think it is. MR. MEYER: Can I ask leading questions or not at this stage? MS. CORRELL: Yeah, where am I? ALJ BOLDT: Okay. You're still under oath and there's two questions for you. MS. CORRELL: Thank you. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CORRELL: Mr. Farrenkopf, could you clarify for the record each of the steps that will be included in the design conditions with respect to the partial excavation for the DNR access road, please? A Okay. I'll to recollect this as best I can based on my conversations with Mr. Bath. Outside of the existing roadway core, I guess I'm talking specifically in the widening area, (inaudible) the wetland three two to three to four feet in depth because it was a Mr. Bath indicated he was concerned about the layer of peat that shows up in Boring Number 4. He wants to get through that to
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 374	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 376

Legal Video Services - 608-279-5295

	SHEET 95	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	that layer, excavate that out, place geotextile fabric down at the bottom of that excavation, and then bring in, and this might be where some of the confusion might have been, either granular backfill or breaker run up to a point and then on top of that layer I and I can't I think the variation was between one and three feet according to his report in depth. And then on top of that layer of biaxial or uni-axial reinforcement grid, on top of that, and that's the grid that he talked about would be the kind of that create the snowshoe effect. And then on top of that would be, similar to any roadway embankment, suitable material, whether it be something from onsite or something if there's no suitable material onsite, something borrowed from a borrow pit off location up to the elevation of the bottom of the roadway gravel. And then on top of that would be eight inches of gravel. And then after that, once, as he indicated, recommends waiting two to four months or a season to see what kind of settlement takes place. And then after that we could come back in, redress the gravel where settlement may have occurred and bring it back to the proper design elevations and then at that point overlay that with the I believe it's four inches of asphalt I think	1You're excused. Any other witnesses? Any2other surrebuttal or sur-sur now where we would3be at? Okay. Hearing none, let's go off the4record and get ready for tomorrow.5MR. MEYER: Before we do that, I made a6couple motions7(Recess taken)8ALJ BOLDT: Okay. We're back on the record9and we've agreed off the record to have a10conference call Friday at 11:00 just the11attorneys. Everybody else, you're welcome to12leave. It's been a long five days here on the13record. I appreciate everybody working late14tonight to get this done. And then there's a15stipulation that why don't you go ahead and16state it again.17MR. MEYER: Yes, that the Wisconsin18Wildlife Federation and the Waukesha County19Conservation Alliance, which is part of our20organization, are parties to this matter.21ALJ BOLDT: Okay. And you also referenced22off the record that your earlier motion you23wanted to24MR. MEYER: I made two motions and the25second one was whether or not this the
	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 377	LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 379
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<pre>is what we're showing in the plans. Thank you for that clarification. Now I've forgotten my second question so I think you're off the hook. MR. MEYER: I have one more question. ALJ BOLDT: Sure. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. MEYER: Would you have to do all those things if this was constructed on the existing grade which crosses the Hanson property? We probably it depends on I guess if the existing grade were wide enough no, we wouldn't have to go through all of that, but because the existing grade is narrower than you know, even if the new roadway was centered on the existing roadway, we have widening, so we still would have to do some work on the outsides of that existing grade. But it'd be less than on what the proposed A Right, yeah, if it was on the existing roadway. MR. MEYER: No further questions of this witness. ALJ BOLDT: Okay. Mr. Gallo, any questions? MR. GALLO: No questions. ALJ BOLDT: Sir, okay, thank you very much. LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES</pre>	1decisions or the actions that are the subject of2this hearing were subject to the Section 227.423hearing process and we withdraw that motion. We4have the other motion which we can't I5don't believe we can withdraw, at least not from6our perspective, because the theory of the case7of the petitioners is whether or not DNR is8subject to Chapter 30 and Wisconsin Wetlands9regulation and we are still maintaining that10position.11ALJ BOLDT: Sure, and you can address that12in a brief too as well.13MR. MEYER: We will do that.14ALJ BOLDT: So we'll include all Counsel on15the record. With that, the hearing record is16closed and we will reconvene for our scheduling17conference Friday at 11:00.18LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES(608) 279-5295Prairie du Sac WI380
	(608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 378	

SHEET 96 . 1 STATE OF WISCONSIN 2 DIVISION OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS 3 4 5 6 7 In the Matter of Manual Code 3565.1 for the Approval Authorizing the Department of Natural Resources to Grade 8 More Than 10,000 Square Feet on the Bank of North Lake, Install a Boat Ramp Structure and Two Outpost Structures on the Bed of North Lake, Install Four Culvert Crossings 9 10 11 12 Over Wetlands, Fill Up To .16 Acres of Wetlands for Construction of a Public Boat Launch on North Lake and 13 Adjacent Property Located in the Town of 14 15 Merton, Waukesha County 16 17 Case Nos. IP-SE-2009-68-05745 through 05750 18 19 20 21 22 I, KRISTINE K. McCARVILLE, do hereby certify that as 23 24 25 the duly-appointed transcriptionist, I transcribed the proceedings held in the above-entitled matter on the 1st day of November, 2011, and that the attached is a true and 23 26 27 28 29 correct transcription of the proceedings so taken. Dated this 9th day of January, 2012. 30 31 Kristine K. McCarville Notary Public, State of Wisconsin My Commission Expires: 11/22/15 32 33 LEGAL VIDEO SERVICES (608) 279-5295 Prairie du Sac WI 381