

An Interview with
JOHN WACHTLER
and
LOUISE SEGROVES

Conducted by Marta Monti
On
August 6, 2015
Barr Engineering, Minneapolis, Hennepin County, Minnesota

Humphrey School of Public Affairs
Center for Science, Technology, and Environmental Policy
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

Copyright, 2016

Interviewer: Today is August 6, 2015, and I'm speaking today with John Wachtler, president of Barr Engineering, and Louise Segroves. You brought a lot of stuff here. Maybe we could start with just you introducing me to how you became involved in working on the EIS, and how that process began kind of from the beginning.

Interviewee JW: You want me to do that?

Interviewer: Oh, also, could you both just state your names and your titles for what I put in the report?

Interviewee LS: Sure. I'm Louise Segroves. I'm an "Environmental Scientist," I think, is my title, official title, around here.

Interviewer: Can you spell your last name?

Interviewee LS: Sure. It's S-E-G-R-O-V-E-S.

Interviewer: L-O-U-I-S-E?

Interviewee LS: Yep, that's correct.

Interviewer: Okay.

Interviewee JW: I'm John Wachtler. The last name is W-A-C-H-T-L-E-R. I was the project manager on—I'm trying to remember now—we've done—how many EISs have we done? Just two?

Interviewee LS: Two.

Interviewee JW: Two. We did—we were the State's Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) contractor for two of the CapX projects, the Brookings to Hampton, and the Hampton to La Crosse. We didn't work for the utility. We worked for the State Department of Commerce, who was responsible for the EIS on the project. I was the project manager on the Brookings to Hampton line, and then I was a principal on the—

Interviewee LS: - Hampton to La Crosse.

Interviewee JW: - Hampton to La Crosse. I'm a Vice President here at Barr. I ended up—that was my role on the project.

Interviewee LS: Do you want to explain how things kinda started?

Interviewee JW: Well, I'll do the very beginning part, and then you can—

Interviewee LS: - yeah.

Interviewee JW: I was more involved in some of that early development and talking to the client about the project, and then Louise did a lot more of the actual details and the work [*laughs*].

Interviewer: Uh huh.

Interviewee LS: Yeah.

Interviewer: When you say “client,” do you mean the Department of Commerce?

Interviewee JW: I do, yeah.

Interviewee: Okay.

Interviewee JW: In this case, it was the Department of Commerce. We know all this, but I'll talk about it anyway. Minnesota has a somewhat odd, in my opinion, regulatory process, or, at least, somewhat unusual. I don't know if “odd,” maybe, is the right word. The Public Utilities Commission actually makes the route decision for the permit; but the agency that does the environmental review, the EIS for it, is at the Department of Commerce.

Then it all comes together at the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) when the PUC makes the route decisions. It was actually the Department of Commerce who had put out a Request for Proposals for a consultant to help do the EIS. The lead utility for the Brookings to Hampton line was Great River Energy, even though CapX was this consortium. They had divvied it up into lead utilities, and GRE did that one.

They had just applied for their permit, I think, when they put out the RFP. Then we were selected to do that EIS by Commerce, and then did it. The next one we got hired on was the, uh, La Crosse line, yeah, which crossed—yeah, I guess, they both crossed the state border. The La Crosse one I remember more because the border crossing was a bigger issue there, because it was crossing the scenic part of the Mississippi River.

Interviewee LS: - Mississippi.

Interviewer: Uh huh.

Interviewee JW: I guess that's how it started. Essentially, we did not work on the project for—even though we do work for both (Great River Energy) GRE and Exel Energy, we did not work on *these* specific projects for them at all. We were able to work for the State on the—we were sort of in the shoes of an agency, so we were doing what they—and under their direction—to review the information that the applicant had put in, and review their routes, and help them run the public meetings, and find out what other routes to include, based on what the other agencies were requesting, and other people along the routes.

Because we didn't work for the utilities on these projects, we were able to qualify as a contractor to do the independent review for the agency.

Interviewer: Uh huh. I see. Yeah.

Interviewee JW: We were lucky enough to get selected for two of 'em. That's kind of the beginning of the story. The Brookings line was first. Then Hampton. I think Brookings might even be close to being constructed now. I've actually lost track of 'em.

Interviewer: Um, you know, I really should have the dates a little more *[laughs]* nailed down; but I've been working on writing another section at the moment, so the dates are kind of escaping me. Yeah.

Interviewee JW: But I think they're—

Interviewer: Yeah, I mean, they're all, except for the Hampton to La Crosse line, they're all either energized or near completion.

Interviewee JW: Yeah. I think it's actually a great case study on—I've worked on lots of transmission lines; but these are big important ones to use as a case study, so I think it's a great idea *[laughs]*.

Interviewer: Oh, great.

Interviewee JW: Not that you asked me for my opinion about that; but I think it's an interesting—they are pretty valuable, I think, to think about how they played out.

Interviewer: What was different about those projects? Did you know that something was going to be different about working on these projects from the beginning? Or was it just another large project? Knowing that there really haven't been, prior to the CapX projects,

there really hadn't been something quite that large in the state in quite some time.

Interviewee JW: [To Interviewee LS] Do you have anyone—I don't want to—

Interviewee LS: - you know, I was thoroughly new at Barr when we started working on it, on these. I didn't have—I came right out of grad school to Barr, so I didn't have a lot of context for whether this was different than any other project.

I do think I got the sense that “this was a big deal.” I didn't have a good point of reference for that, necessarily.

Interviewee JW: I had, actually, worked at the State. I worked at the Environmental Quality Board, which is the agency that used to do the permits before the decision-making got moved to the Public Utilities Commission.

Interviewer: Uh huh, and that was, um, do you remember when that was?

Interviewee JW: Ah, I worked there from—boy, it was only for a couple of years. It was from—this transcript is not gonna benefit—I'm gonna have to be—I mean, I—

Interviewer: - oh, that's [voice trails off]

Interviewee JW: My ten-year anniversary is this month. That means that I was there the two years—what's this—this is 2015. I left in—

Interviewee LS: - 2005?

Interviewee JW: 2005. I was there from 2003 to 2005. At that time, I had very little transmission line background, but I had a background in dealing with controversial projects from various things. I was recruited by the State to work on what they called “the I-90 line,” which was actually going from Split Rock to a substation along I-90.

[Continually taps fingers on the table] It was Xcel's—it's a 345 kilowatt line that runs from Sioux Falls, South Dakota to—ah, boy, it's Split Rock substation in Sioux Falls, to Lakefield Junction. It's the substation at Lakefield Junction.

Interviewee LS: Oh, that's right.

Interviewee JW: I forget how long it was, but that was the first 345 line that this state had had to process a permit for in years, I think, since the lines at the Wellstone—the—yeah.

Interviewer: - in the 70's, the CU Project.

Interviewee JW: Yeah. At that time, people thought that they were going to be real controversial. That one was not terribly controversial. The thing that I actually—I guess, my overall impression was that, when we started the project, and we were hired on, I expected the CapX lines to be more controversial than they were.

There certainly were a lot of unhappy people about the line going across their property; but there was not mobs of people really upset, and with threatening, and lot of real nastiness like there was back in the 70's and early 80's on the CPA/UPA lines.

I knew they were certainly the biggest infrastructural projects that any of those utilities had been planning for ten years. I guess I expected more controversy.

Interviewer: But you did notice some people, in the beginning, in initial meetings—

Interviewee JW: - yeah, particularly, on the Brookings line, the initial scoping meetings, we'd go out and ask people what routes they want to have. "What other routes do you think we should look at? What's in the application that the utility has prepared that you think is either wrong, or something that's missing? Are there issues that you think are important that we need to know about that we don't know about now?" That kind of thing.

The scoping meetings for that project were pretty—there was a lot of people at them, and they were relatively controversial. There was a task force that the State set up. It's a task force that's actually in the statute, that the State has as an option to get local input, in more depth, local input, that the Commerce's project manager put together. I think he might have even had separate task forces. I'm sorry, my memory is fading on it already. [*To Interviewee LS*] Did they have different task forces?

Interviewee LS: He did. He did.

Interviewer: For different projects?

Interviewee LS: For different areas of the projects, because it was so long.

Interviewee JW: Yeah, because it was so long.

Interviewer: Oh, within each project.

Interviewee JW: The project was so long. It was all the way—it must have been a couple hundred miles, at least, from South Dakota to just that—Hampton is just south of the Twin Cities.

Interviewee LS: Uh huh.

Interviewee JW: I think he—we divided the project into three/four sections? I can't remember.

Interviewee LS: Uh huh. Three?

Interviewee JW: Then, I think, Scott Ek, was the fellow's name at Commerce. You might want to talk to him too. Scott Ek, E-K, his last name.

He was the project manager for the Brookings line when we was at Commerce. Now he's a staff person at the Public Utilities Commission. I believe he set up three separate task forces.

The idea was that the State routing permit preempts local land use control. Then, I think, one of the reasons they do the task force is so that local, county representatives, and other people—it doesn't have to be just made up of county representatives, or city representatives; but they tend to be that, the way that the State sets 'em up.

Interviewer: Uh huh.

Interviewee JW: They do have those. It looked in the beginning like it was gonna be a long fight for where the route was gonna go. Then, as it went on, as the process went on, it seemed like the utility had done a pretty good job of talking to people about—I mean, as it went on, I started to think that the utility realized, I think, that they had done a pretty good job of talking to people along the routes better than they had 30 years ago.

So they were talking to people. They were explaining to people why they were proposing where they were going. Then, when we started scoping, there was still a lot of interest and a lot of complaints about the route. A lot of people didn't like it. As it went forward, I don't think—and, honestly, this is a part of it that if—this is why I think it's interesting, actually, some of the research is

that, it isn't clear to me, particularly in the Brookings line, why some of the early controversy seemed to get diffused later.

That line ended up—there were some points along the line that ended up in lawsuits on clearing the dairy farm that got—there was a—

Interviewee LS: Cedars Summit

Interviewee JW: Cedars Summit, yeah. I remember, because I bought milk from them forever [*laughs*]. Then they went out of business. [*Everyone laughs*]

There were areas—there was a crossing near—where was that crossing, a pond?—there were some areas that ended up being contentious all the way through. But they were pretty small focused problems. A lot of the big opposition to the line, people eventually accepted that it was valuable. They seemed to accept that the route process had been done in enough of a thoughtful way that there weren't "mass protests" against it, or something like that.

Interviewer: Uh huh, yeah.

Interviewee JW: But how that happened and why, I'm not sure. I would almost, uh, I'm gonna really go off on a tangent, but talking—what I would be interested in is, talking to some of the farmers that were along the route.

Interviewer: Uh huh.

Interviewee JW: That is what I would be—like, "What were you thinking about? When did you hear about it? At what point did you just, sort of, give up? Was it just resignation? Or why did you—?"

Interviewer: Uh huh. Yeah. I have spoken—

Interviewee JW: - that's my story. [*Laughs*]

Interviewer: Yeah. I have spoken with a few landowners. I've spoken with a lawyer from Rinke Noonan and that represented—

Interviewee JW: - oh, yeah. He's a knowledgeable guy.

Interviewer: Igor Lenzner.

Interviewee JW: Oh, does Igor Lenzner work for Rinke Noonan? Really? I think I went to law school with him.

Interviewer: Uh huh. *[Laughs]*

Interviewee JW: Gosh! I didn't know that. There's another guy. There's a guy that's the head of the firm. *[To Interviewee LS]* What's the VP's last name?

Interviewer: Yeah, there's a few people from there.

Interviewee JW: I've met—I was on a task force with one of the partners of that firm, but anyway—

Interviewer: - uh huh. I also spoke with a landowner from Olmsted County that's the townsperson—he's the chairperson of the Township of Oronoco.

They were really against the line that was running through their section. They fought it. I think they ended up stopping, because the next step would have been the Supreme Court. They're like, "There's no way that we could have done that, but"—

Interviewee LS: - yeah.

Interviewee JW: - and that was on the La Crosse line. Yeah.

Interviewer: Right, yeah. I'm actually speaking with a woman who runs the "No CapX2020" group.

Interviewee JW: Yeah, for Overland, right.

Interviewer: Uh huh. I'm speaking with her tomorrow.

Interviewee JW: Yep.

Interviewer: I've gotten the split of responses from the landowners. Either, like you said, very, kind of, specific reasons, like localized reasons, like a farm, or "It goes right through our township and divides us right down the center." And other people were like, "Well, they came and they worked with us." But, anyway, so it kind of runs the gamut. I'm very interested in this as well.

Interviewee JW: It will be tough to capture.

Interviewer: I think they did a lot of things. They learned a lot from the 70's, from that project. What I've been hearing is that they really invested, even before they were starting to submit the proposals for lines, to start to contact—

Interviewee JW: - oh, yeah, way before that—yeah—

Interviewer: - municipalities, and get in, and start to build those relationships. I think that's what ultimately did it.

Interviewee JW: That's the state-of-the-art, now, for people, for the utilities, but—the La Crosse lin3 was even less—I mean, even the scoping meetings there. I don't mean to imply there weren't people that were very unhappy. There are people still, now, that are very unhappy with it.

Interviewer: Oh, sure.

Interviewee JW: But it wasn't hundreds and hundreds of people protesting the process, or its existence, or anything. I—

Interviewee LS: - there was something about the scoping process, though, and our ability to analyze lots of different routes, which, I would assume they—I mean—

Interviewee JW: - “helped,” you mean? Or—?

Interviewee LS: - they probably didn't have the capacity to do in the 70's that—I mean, we can do it now, in GIS.

Interviewee JW: Oh, I see.

Interviewee LS: We did bring in a lot of alternatives. I do remember talking to a lot of people at the scoping meetings, looking at the maps, looking at their property; and a “go-to” thing that you could say to the person is, “Well, let's look at—yes, the line goes right through your property. What alternatives do you think you see on this map here? Is there a better way to go?”

Interviewer: Uh huh.

Interviewee LS: We did bring in a lot of alternatives through the State process that got looked at and analyzed in a quantitative way. I do think that that helps—

Interviewer: — that they're going through landowner-by-landowner? Like, pole-by-pole, essentially? Was it that?

Interviewee JW: Not quite that level of detail, but close to it.

Interviewee LS: Right. Not quite that level of detail. But the ability for a landowner to say, "I don't like this. Here's my suggestion," and have that suggestion taken through the process, and quantitatively evaluate it, and they get something back. In the EIS, they can look, and there's their alternative. It was on the table, and it got considered.

Interviewee JW: Yeah, yeah. It's all—the analysis is almost entirely with Geographic Information System mapping and data tools now, so it is much faster than it was.

Interviewee LS: And easier to illustrate for someone, "Yeah, we're staying from homes, but here's the trade-off in terms of impacts to natural resources." Whether they buy into that as their set of values or not, it's something tangible that they can see.

Interviewer: Sure. Uh huh. Did you ever encounter people—so I know that sometimes they would maybe move the siting of a pole a little bit further away so it wasn't entirely on their property; or if it was just like just off of it, maybe. The easement falls just outside of a person's property. Was that ever an issue, that landowners did not like, um—did it kind of rub them the wrong way that, all of a sudden—

Interviewee LS: - "Oh, they're not getting any payment, but they have to look at it." Yes.

Interviewer: Uh huh, uh huh.

Interviewee LS: Yes, I definitely did hear that feedback.

Interviewer: Or, were there other—what were some of the things that you were hearing from the landowners about where the lines were going?

Interviewee LS: I think a common theme was, um, "Don't split my farm in half. Try to follow the section lines." People wanting to move it to the other side of the road to avoid their home. Or, behind their home, instead of in front of their home. Those are always things—but, one other thing that came up in terms of suggesting alternative routes, or whether it's on your property or somewhere nearby, is the tension of, "If I suggest an alternative, and I move it off of my

property, I'm moving it to my neighbor's property," which, some people have no qualms about doing that.

Interviewer: Uh huh.

Interviewee LS: There was feedback that, "This system pits neighbor against neighbor. If I don't want it on my property, I'm pushing it onto my neighbor's property." Frustration with that trade-off.

Interviewer: Yeah.

Interviewee JW: Yeah, so the typical fallback is that people will say, "Well, we don't need it at all."

Interviewee LS: Right.

Interviewee JW: Minnesota has this separate process for dealing with need. I think sometimes people were frustrated about that because they didn't necessarily know about it or participate in the Certificate of Need process. Then they'd find out that it was already—Scott would have to—or whoever the project manager was from the State—would have to say, "Sorry, the Commission already determined that it was needed. You can tell us it's not needed; but, from a legal perspective—

Interviewer: - sure. That makes sense.

Interviewee JW: - it's already decided."

Interviewer: It makes it much harder to oppose, to prove that—

Interviewee JW: - yeah.

Interviewer: - 'cuz then wouldn't they, essentially, have to prove that it's not needed to—?

Interviewee JW: Yeah, they would have had to do that earlier in the process. I can't remember if these were—I remember now. CapX lines had one big "Certificate of Need" process. Carol remembers it that way.

Interviewer: Yes.

Interviewee JW: She'll remember the details of that way better than me. I was not really involved in that at all. They were all—I think, all four of 'em—

Interviewer: -yeah, all the 345s, all the 345 lines, they did one—yeah.

Interviewee JW: Okay, so not the energy line. Okay, so there was one big—Energy line was a separate one. Sometimes they call that another CapX project too.

Interviewer: Yeah, they do. It isn't clear in there, and there's three.

Interviewee JW: Okay, so you have the 345 lines were all one big "Certificate of Need" process; so by the time the routing process started a couple of years later, you'd have—I don't know how you'd—

Interviewee LS: - the people along the line, or along the alternatives, didn't know at the time of the Certificate of Need, necessarily, that they were gonna be directly impacted.

That's frustrating for people. "The Certificate of Need process is over, so we can't talk about 'need'; but now that we're down to the routing, I know I should be involved. But I didn't know at that time."

Interviewer: Uh huh.

Interviewee JW: Yeah, it's a big picture dilemma that the government agencies are always in. People really don't engage until they see a map with the line going across their property. If they want to oppose the "need," they have to do it before they see—sometimes they don't see the map of the line going across their property until later, so the agencies are always trying to figure out, "Well, how do we engage people earlier in the 'need' process?"

People are busy. If somebody doesn't see that it's specifically affecting them, they don't pay attention to it because people have lives besides phone transmission lines *[laughs]*.

Interviewee LS: Some people do.

Interviewee JW: We don't, but other people do.

Interviewer: Well, and if you go to somebody and say, "This is coming in ten years." People focus on the "here and now," sometimes, I think.

Interviewee JW: Yeah. There was one that we did, ITC *[to Interviewee LS]*, what does ITC stand for?

Interviewee LS: Uh huh. "Independent Transmission Company."

Interviewee JW: “Independent Transmission Company.” They are building a line, maybe. I’m not sure where construction is on it. It was done in southern Minnesota, where Minnesota did the Certificate of—the environmental review process for the Certificate of Need, and the route permit was together in one document.

The people could, legitimately, comment on the need at that point.

Interviewer: Interesting.

Interviewee JW: That went okay too. It was a little confusing to people, but the—

Interviewee LS: - but less disappointing, maybe.

Interviewee JW: They did, at that point, when we were going out looking at routes, the people showing up at the routes, could also comment on whether the line was needed still. It wasn’t already decided for that project. I don’t know. I’d have to ask [*sighs*].

Interviewee LS: There was a fair amount of involvement at the public meetings that came, though, from that like “No CapX” perspective. Once the need has been determined, I mean, it’s not a question of “No CapX.” It’s where CapX—

Interviewer: Right, right.

Interviewee JW: Right. Yeah. Just to make our role more clear, it’s actually the agency staff who think about the “big picture” issues like this. We’re the contractor. We’re immersed in the details of counting the acres of wetlands along different options, and trying to get the document to be accurate, and out in time.

Interviewer; Yeah.

Interviewee LS: I think one of the challenges with these, too, was the idea that we wanted to not only produce that information, but present it in a way that was accessible, and fun to look at, and graphical.

Interviewee JW: Yeah, so that was a different approach, this one. I guess all of ‘em were really—Brookings—all of ‘em, we tried to be more graphics-based, and more maps, and things.

Interviewer: We’ll, there’s definitely a lot of maps, and very detailed. You can splay them out—you really can get down to the property level view. You can go and find your house, essentially.

Interviewee LS: Yeah, essentially.

Interviewee JW: That's what people consider pretty important.

Interviewer: Yep. I know that was important. I know it was used. The way that I found—the chairperson from Oronoco--was a Facebook group. I found this Facebook group that they formed to use to communicate. From the very beginning, they were posting the EIS finding. "Here you go. It's real easy to find your house. Find out if you're on the affected routes, or alternatives." It served a very useful purpose to landowners, as well as the utilities and the people who are building the projects.

Interviewee JW: Well, we hope it was—[voice trails off]

Interviewer: Let's talk about—what are some of the other agencies that you—how do you incorporate their feedback? We've got the DNR. We've got Fish & Wildlife for the—

Interviewee JW: - those are the two big ones. Yeah. MnDOT gets involved, too, because the lines tend to follow highways, or larger roads. MnDOT has a pretty—they can have kind of a protective attitude towards their roads, their highways, so we had to make sure that the—there was this kind of potential conflict, or actual conflict, sometimes, with the farmers, who would want the poles right up next to the highway. MnDOT didn't want the overhang. They didn't want one of the—so that means you'd have to move the pole, I don't know, I forget the distance, 30 feet, or something, into the farm field.

In some cases, when you're following a MnDOT right-of-way, it didn't really help the farmer much, because the pole is so far into their farmland anyway, that it didn't—

Interviewer: Uh huh.

Interviewee JW: You were following it; but you weren't really sharing right-of-way in any way, so that wasn't—[to Interviewee LS] but what other agencies? DNR was—

Interviewee LS: DNR is the major one.

Interviewee JW: - heavily involved in both of 'em. Fish & Wildlife was involved in the La Crosse line because it was crossing the—was there a national—is there a wildlife refuge there, a federal wildlife refuge?

Yeah, I think so. Fish & Wildlife Services was more involved in the La Crosse line.

Interviewer: Do you deal with both states? Did you deal with Minnesota and Wisconsin? Or—?

Interviewee LS: We did not. We worked exclusively with Minnesota.

Interviewer: Okay.

Interviewee JW: Yeah. The utility, I believe, Xcel, had spent quite a bit of time with Fish & Wildlife Service about their preferred crossing, where Fish & Wildlife would allow them to cross before we even started the permit process.

Interviewer: Uh huh.

Interviewee JW: By the time they applied for the route permit from Minnesota, they had already pretty much negotiated the river crossing with Fish & Wildlife Service. It didn't mean it was a "done deal," but it certainly made it—unless something came up during the process that made it look like it was really a bad idea for the State to approve that permit, it makes it more likely that the State will go with them, probably, if they've already lined it up.

Xcel did a—there was some people that thought, like, I don't know. They thought that was not really fair or the right way to do it, to have worked that out beforehand; but, I don't know. I think if you can document why it's a good crossing, and Fish & Wildlife Service documents that, it's seems like a good—I can't remember the details, actually, how that worked.

By the time we were looking at the river crossings, Fish & Wildlife had already pretty much picked their favorite one.

Interviewer: That's interesting. When you say that people might not have thought that process was fair. Who wouldn't—'cuz it's kinda like a "catch 22." It's like—one could say that they're doin' their due diligence, and putting in the frame beforehand—

Interviewee JW: - I think it is a big of a—the utilities are in a bit of a "catch 22," because they do try to do the homework ahead of time, and try to involve the right people. If you lived along the line—like the people that lived in houses along the route—so I'm doing something with my hands now—*[they all laugh]*. You have to come up there. The route was coming up to the river crossing, and

so the river crossing was set. But the people that lived along the path towards that river crossing—

Interviewer: - okay.

Interviewee JW: - were kind of upset, because they were saying, “Well, you know—

Interviewee LS: - “Where’s our role in this process?”

Interviewee JW: Yeah. “You’re doing a route permit process, but it’s already a ‘done deal.’ You’ve already determined that this—you guys already figured this out. Don’t pretend to me that there’s an option, because this railroad crossing is already decided.”

Interviewer: Uh huh. I see.

Interviewee JW: I don’t know that that’s completely—it’s not true. You could make a case that if there’s a better—there was some problem that was such a big issue that this wasn’t a good spot, that could still have come up in the hearing, and it did. But not enough to change the route at that point. Not enough to change the river crossing point anyway.

Interviewee LS: I think that’s a challenge with the whole process. That’s one example of something that happens fairly often because it’s a public process. You also have agencies weighing in that have, arguably, better information than your average person in the public.

Interviewer: Right.

Interviewee LS: There’s a sense of, “This is supposed to be democratic,” in some way. I think the public gets this feeling that it’s supposed to be this democratic process, that they’re involved in equally with everybody else. The reality is, the agencies have certain information and certain resources that they’re obligated to protect that, for the average person, it’s really difficult to reconcile those two things.

Interviewer: Yes, yes. Yeah. That’s a good point. It’s interesting.

Interviewee JW: [*Cell phone rings*] Sorry. I have a lunch meeting. I’m just gonna tell this guy to quit callin’ me.

Interviewer: Is there a certain time that you need to be out by, ‘cuz we can—?

Interviewee JW: I probably need to leave about 12:00 p.m. to go meet Curt, this guy from out of town, **Curt Stoppenhagen 00:32:45**. Did you ever meet him?

Interviewee LS: Nope.

Interviewee JW: Anyway. Yeah. You guys can—

Interviewer: *[To Interviewee LS]* Would you be able to talk for a little longer?

Interviewee LS: Sure.

Interviewee JW: I have to leave in 15 minutes, but—

Interviewer: - all right. Before you go, then, maybe, are there some other parts of the project that you think I should know about that, from your perspective—?

Interviewee JW: - that's a great question. It's fun to be asked about your project. Usually, we just get paid, and it's the last time we think about it. *[They all laugh]* Um, *[to himself]* aspects of it. *[Pause 00:33:20 - 00:33:29]*

Interviewee LS: What about the wind? Do you feel like the wind—the fact that it was helping—?

Interviewee JW: That's a great question, actually. *[Laughs]* It could be the interview. *[They all laugh]*

[Cross talk and laughter]

Well, it is true, that you could—you know, I didn't notice it as much on the CapX lines; but on the I-90 line, I think, it was, I could—

Interviewee LS: - I would say it was, maybe not so much, Hampton to La Crosse, but—

Interviewee JW: - right. But on the Brookings line, it was a very easy case to make for the utilities that, "If we want to do more wind energy, there's no magical way to get it outta here other than a transmission line." I do think that there was like a point in the public meetings where—it's kind of like, I can tell when a project is going okay, when, um, if you haven't convinced—even though there's a Certificate of Need, if you haven't convinced the people along the

line that there's a good reason you need to build this thing, they don't look at the maps. They're like, "I don't even want to look at this," because of the reason Louise was talking about.

"All you're doing is making me push it on my neighbor's land. You're just 'big money' screwin' off us. We don't want to do it." If the people along the route become convinced that there's a really good underlying need, that there's a social purpose for it. It's not just because the utility wants to make more money. If they feel like, like in this case, it's for wind energy development, most of the people were willing to kind of roll up their sleeves and start saying, "Okay, there's a pretty good reason for why we need this. Let's look at this map and figure it out."

The ones where there's big mobs of people, or where nobody believes you need it. Like, "I don't care what the Public Utility Commission says about 'need.' They can go fly a kite. We don't like it." I think the wind aspect, particularly for the Brookings line, definitely made it easier for the agencies to get people to work with 'em on where we should put this.

Nobody wants it. Who would want a transmission line on their property if they didn't have to have one? If you can convince 'em that there's a good reason for it and "let's figure out the least painful way to do this together," it changes the whole dynamic of the interaction.

Interviewer: Uh huh.

Interviewee JW: I think it did happen on this line, on the Brookings line, because of the wind issue. Yeah. We know people that would disagree with that. There were people that were anti-wind too. They just said, "I don't care." Or they didn't believe it. Like maybe the miners on the Cedar Summit. I don't know that they were ever convinced it was really for that.

Interviewer: Uh huh.

Interviewee JW: That's a good point. What else about it that I would want to think about it? Um, [*pause 00:36:29 - 00:36:37*] It actually went relatively smoothly. The Brookings line, in particular, I think it was the DNR that had a route that they wanted to get in there that was kind of late. It was after the scoping process was done.

Interviewee LS: Yeah, that was the thing.

Interviewee JW: They said, “There’s another way we can do this. I want to have a crossing point.” After the—we’re supposed to—in the State process, have all the potential routes on the table after scoping. The DNR wanted to put one in later. Then there was a number of headaches about noticing people on new routes that came up later in the process. Even the routes that were added during scoping, there was some, more than a little unhappiness about people listed—so the utilities go through all this work, and they’re doing a lot better work on their homework to develop the routes, and interacting with people, with open houses, and all kinds of techniques.

Interviewer: Uh huh.

Interviewer JW: Then they come up with a route or two, in Minnesota’s case, that they like. Then people kind of say, “Oh, whew! It’s not near me.” When the State comes back in again, and then says, “Okay, I know the utility looked at these. Everybody, give us more suggestions about where the route goes.” Then, there’s that one. Brookings had a whole bunch more. We had to look at a whole bunch of new routes. Then the State has to go back out and re-notice to everybody that was added and say, “Don’t breathe so easy yet, because you could, technically, have this route selected by the State.” The utility doesn’t—people get confused by whether the utility is picking the route, or the State’s is picking the route.

In Minnesota’s process, it’s the state that picks the route. People get confused by that. There was some problems with that confusion that dogged it the whole way through.

Interviewer: Sure. I can see that.

Interviewer JW: It didn’t end up being a fatal flaw in it, but it was a problem. What else about the agencies? There were some river crossings. There’s bird issues. The DNR and Fish & Wildlife Service were obviously worried about impacts to birds and endangered species, particularly about birds crossing some of the—I forget the what the river is—on the Brookings line.

That led to a lot of—the really only technical issue was avian impacts on the Brookings line. I can’t remember. “Magnetic fields” comes up all the time. Sometimes it comes up as a surrogate for, “I don’t want it on my property.” Sometimes people are actually really, really afraid of it.

Interviewer LS: “Property values” was a big one too. That was kind of an unresolved issue.

Interviewer: Uh huh.

Interviewer JW: Property values. Right, right. That comes up all the time. I don’t think, still, anybody has a definitive answer of how much it reduces property values. People’s natural common sense instinct is, “Well, it’s gotta reduce my property values.”

Interviewer LS: Look at all the people at this meeting who don’t want to—
[laughs]—

Interviewer JW: Why would you want to pay—people are gonna pay less when there’s a big transmission line that big, 345 line, in my backyard. “Nobody’s gonna want to buy my house now.” The real estate companies, or whoever does these studies, they do these big, fairly large studies of actual property values—

Interviewer: Uh huh.

Interviewee JW: - and then compare them with and without similar properties with lines. They pretty consistently don’t show much of an impact. There’s sort of a “disconnect” between people’s perception and what the study is showing. Why that is I—I’m not an expert in that area, so I don’t know.

Interviewer: Well, what I’ve been hearing is that these studies on some property values look at the easement corridor, so the right-of-way corridor where the line sits. If the farmer, how much does it impact their production and yields, and things like that? That’s a way to quantify what their losses are. But landowners say, “Well, that doesn’t take away from the fact that now I’ve got a pole in the middle of my field. I came to live out here because I didn’t want to see these things. They’re not calculating my whole property. They’re just calculating the right-of way.”

That was one thing that I’ve heard from—

Interviewee JW: Yeah, there are certainly a number of studies that look at the “bigger picture” issue, or they’ll look at—[to Interviewee LS]—I don’t know, you’re more familiar with them than I am, so I should shut up.

Interviewee LS: - but the resale value of the entire property with the transmission line on it, versus without and—

Interviewer: Uh huh.

Interviewee LS: - people saying, “Once the transmission lines are on my property; if I wanted to sell my farm, I couldn’t get what I could without them on it.”

Interviewer: Without it? Yeah.

Interviewee JW: In the studies, you know—so there are studies that look at that; not the just the easement, but the whole parcel in both rural and city areas, how much they seem to actually affect it. They’re kind of inconclusive on it.

Interviewee LS: So it’s an issue that just comes up over and over again—

Interviewee JW: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

Interviewer: Sure.

Interviewee LS: - without any really good answers.

Interviewer: Well, I don’t know if anybody actually—is it actually out there? Something like this hasn’t been done since the 70’s in Minnesota. Technologies have changed. Have you measured something that you haven’t measured before, really, in this way?

Interviewee JW: Yeah, no. I don’t know that there was any on these projects; but there were ones from other states that people had done, “before and after” studies of real estate values, and things like that. Otherwise, I can’t think of anything. Honestly, my main thing is, the first thing I said is, that I’m somewhat surprised by the, um—well, the utilities were pretty successful at interacting and getting the projects built in a schedule that was pretty close to what they intended. Maybe not perfectly, but not too far off.

Interviewer: Uh huh.

Interviewee JW: I think a lot of people thought when it started that there’s just no way they’ll ever get these things built by 30 years from now. These are gonna be really—a lot of people felt, “These are gonna be ‘hellatiously’ difficult to get permitted and it can be very difficult.” They were not. Maybe that’s the point of your study is “Why not?”

Interviewer: Uh huh.

Interviewee JW: But I don't know the answer. *[Laughs]* That was a surprise, yeah, to me, personally.

Interviewee LS: *[To Interviewer]* But you're gonna find it.

Interviewer: I'm looking.

Interviewee JW: Louise was working on all kinds of details that I wasn't. I have to go have lunch with a fellow who's in town for four hours. It's **Curt**.

Interviewee LS: All right.

Interviewer: Well, thank you. I appreciate it. Yeah.

Interviewee JW: Okay. All right. Well, nice to meet you.

Interviewer: Yeah, thank you.

Interviewee JW: Yeah. See you. Say hello to Elizabeth, if you see her.

Interviewer: I most certainly will.

Interviewee JW: Okay. *[Laughs]* Or if you can, all at once. *[Interviewee JW leaves the room]*

Interviewee LS: I've never met her. I might have talked with her on the phone. *[To Interviewer]* Anything else for me?

Interviewer: Well, could we look through these real quick—

Interviewee LS: - yeah, for sure.

Interviewer: - and just kind of see what's going on?

Interviewee LS: This is the draft. Not the final, but—

Interviewer: All right.

Interviewee LS: - it's what I have handy. This is the actual Environmental Impact Statement, and this was the Detailed Map Supplement, which, I think, was actually really great. 'Cuz, like you said, people want to be able to find *their* house, see *their* house, see their farm and where it is relative to the line.

This kind of gives you sense of—have you seen this?

Interviewer: Uh huh.

Interviewee LS: Oh.

Interviewer: Yeah, yeah.

Interviewee LS: All right.

Interviewer: Yeah, point out some good things.

Interviewee LS: I think one of the good things that we were able to do is split this up into segments, so that as people looked through the document, this was supposed to make it more accessible for people. Instead of taking all of this information and—you've got a wetland section that's an inch thick, and it covers the entire route, it's split up in such a way that people can actually focus in on the area where they live. We split up the whole document that way so that people could find their color, find the area where they lived.

We also did these “turn-by-turn” maps, which we haven't done them in an EIS since, just because it was unusually complicated [*laughs*] to hook this together in the first place.

Interviewer: Uh huh.

Interviewee LS: It did give people a very clear way to walk-through, “Okay, where, exactly, does this route go?”

Interviewer: Yeah. Are each of these numbers a pole then? Or—?

Interviewee LS: No, each of these numbers is just a point in this set of directions where the line makes it a change. It goes from—

Interviewer: - I see. Okay.

Interviewee LS: - where it makes a turn. That was—

Interviewer: That's pretty detailed. Was that something that had been done prior to the lines as well?

Interviewee LS: No.

Interviewer: Why did you guys—you said, because it's really detailed.

Interviewee LS: We really wanted people to have; not just the visual, but a written, you know, so that they could really walk through and—short of having to look through this detailed appendix supplement, and go from one page to the next, and see where it turned—

Interviewer: - I see.

Interviewee LS: - they had a big picture view of it that told them—they have a better sense of the local roads, and sort of read through it, and see it on the page right there. The idea was that that would be helpful to people.

Interviewer: Sure. Yeah.

Interviewee LS: The other thing we tried to do, and I've think we've actually gotten a little bit—this was our first run at some of this. But to do these maps where, at a glance, you could get a sense for—we've got the different factor areas in the “Minnesota Rules.” To get a sense, just with a picture of, “Okay, where are the impacts relative to this factor? If it's land use, what are we looking at here?”

Interviewer: Uh huh.

Interviewee LS: You can see this is pretty much all crops and grasslands. That's not the most exciting figure. But if you look at like [*turning pages*] this is “recreation.” You can kinda see, where is it crossing features that we actually—for this category of “recreation,” where is it crossing features that actually aren't gonna be a big deal? And you can kinda see—

Interviewer: - yeah.

Interviewee LS: These are showing “corridor sharing.” So trying to visually show, “Where are we sharing corridor? Or where are we not sharing corridor?”

Interviewer: Uh huh.

Interviewee LS: Just trying to make it a little bit more visual like that.

Interviewer: Yeah.

Interviewee LS: Not just in maps. We try to accommodate the fact that people really look at these in different ways, learn in different ways. We've got, visually, here it is on a map; but we've also got a chart that shows you what the right-of-way sharing looks like.

Interviewer: Uh huh.

Interviewee LS: And try to include pictures of, “All right, we’re actually out in the field. We’re taking some pictures of what’s going on. Let’s put them in the EIS so we can have some real context for—‘yeah, we were out there. We looked at these things.’”

Interviewer: Yeah. You said that this was kinda like one of the first projects that you started on when you came.

Interviewee LS: Yeah, it was.

Interviewer: Have you worked on any since that haven’t been CapX?

Interviewee LS: I have. I worked on the two CapX ones, and then I worked on the ITC one.

Interviewer: Okay.

Interviewee LS: I helped with the Great Northern EIS, the draft EIS.

Interviewer: Uh huh, okay.

Interviewee LS: In all of those projects, we were the third party contractor for the State. I worked on other—we were working with the project proponent, and we’re doing the route permit application.

Interviewer: How do those projects compare to the CapX ones? Are they pretty similar?

Interviewee LS: I would say thoroughly similar, particularly ITC had a lot of the same kind of agricultural-type issues.

Interviewer: Uh huh,

Interviewee LS: Great Northern is pretty different, because it’s very different land cover—

Interviewer: - right.

Interviewee LS: - and a lot of different challenges in terms of engineering. It’s a 500-kV, so it’s a different piece.

Interviewer: Uh huh. It’s a different animal, right?

Interviewee LS: I do think there are some themes in terms of “public involvement” and people trying to understand what the State process is. Just the way people feel about energy and how we use it, and how we move it, and how the public is involved in that process.

Interviewer: Uh huh.

Interviewee LS: I find all of that stuff really fascinating. It’s a huge driver for why I want to work on power and transmission projects, because those themes are the same in Brookings to Hampton, as they are in going from Roseau to Grand Rapids.

Interviewer: Uh huh, yeah.

Interviewee LS: There’s that same—I think you mentioned this—there’s that sentiment of like, “I chose this place to live, and I don’t want—it’s part of my ‘freedom’ not to have to see a transmission line. Or it’s part of what I identify as what’s important to me as a citizen in this country.”

Interviewer: Right, yeah.

Interviewee LS: Those issues are there, no matter where the line is, I think.

Interviewer: Uh huh, yeah. Did I hear this correctly? The ITC line, one application is submitted for the Certificate of Need and—?

Interviewee LS: - that’s right. Yeah, they combine the two processes.

Interviewer: It’s a Minnesota project?

Interviewee LS: It’s a Minnesota project, yeah.

Interviewer: That’s different.

Interviewee LS: Yup. Then, take Great Northern, for example. They were doing the Certificate of Need and their routing; not completely concurrently, but the need wasn’t decided until after the routing process had begun, so there are a variety of options.

Interviewer: Interesting how these things are kind of—well, it’s good to know because, um, I mean it was pretty unique at the time, and I think since. That was the first—when the CapX group submitted those Certificate of Needs for all the 345s, that hadn’t been done before.

Interviewee LS: Yeah.

Interviewer: So they had to work with the PUC to make that happen. However, it's good to know that they're not the only unique ones that have worked out some sort of deal to make this happen.

Interviewee LS: Yeah. Right. Yeah.

Interviewer: So, unique; but not completely unique, which is what I need to know. That's good.

Interviewee LS: Right. Yes. *[They both laugh]* I don't know that there's a lot else to show you with this. It was just this kind of—these documents, EISs, can be very long, and very boring; and especially for a process that's supposed to have this public involvement component, to produce this 800-page, really boring, technical document was like, "That's not what we want to do here. We want to make something that's actually—people will sit down at that public meeting with this, and use it as something to talk from."

Interviewer: Uh huh. Uh huh. Would it be distributed? How would people get their hands on it?

Interviewee LS: It's posted to eDoc online. But then it also goes out to all of the libraries. There's some rule about exactly how that's done, I think.

Interviewer: Okay.

Interviewee LS: It goes to, I think, one library in every county, or something. I don't know. There's some standard for how many libraries it's distributed to. That's the other option. You can sit at the library and read it.

Interviewer: Uh huh. Yeah. *[They both laugh]* Some good library reading, yeah. What about "time?" Like the timing that it takes to get this done. Years? You have your draft, and then you're write your "advised," and then, hopefully, your final—um *[laughs]*—

Interviewee LS: - right. Yeah. It starts with "scoping." You do the scoping. Then you put out the scope. Then you write the draft EIS. Then it goes out. Then there's comments. Then there's the final EIS. I sat down at one point and figured out how long these took. I compared it to the "Midge" one.

Interviewer: Oh, yeah?

Interviewee LS: Yeah. Part of it was trying to think through scheduling for the Great Northern one.

Interviewer: Okay.

Interviewee LS: Particularly with the federal involvement in that one. Trying to look at, “Okay, from Midge to Grand Rapids had a federal component. These were just state. Okay, so how long, about, do these things take?”

Interviewer: Uh huh, yeah.

Interviewee LS: I think we were about a year and a half?

Interviewer: Yeah.

Interviewee LS: Is that about—?

Interviewer: Uh huh, yeah.

Interviewee LS: Okay. My theory is correct. *[Laughs]*

Interviewer: I think the longest one was maybe a little over two, or two and a half.

Interviewee LS: That was probably from Midge to Grand Rapids.

Interviewer: Yeah, just because there were lots of—I think there’s one with quite a few revisions, and some—

Interviewee LS: - yeah. I think that that’s—and the State tried to do that together and then split ways part way through, so that probably didn’t help the situation.

Interviewer: Uh huh. Yeah, that was, um, I think they were called the “Rapid Response Task Force.” Are you familiar—?

Interviewee LS: - I am.

Interviewer: Or had you—? Yeah.

Interviewee LS: Yes.

Interviewer: The federal—so what do you think about that? The feds were piloting this idea of trying, the deal is trying to coordinate all the federal agencies to kind of make it easier.

Interviewee LS: Right. Great Northern Project is a Rapid Response project.

Interviewer: Okay.

Interviewee LS: So I have some direct experience with that. There are a lot of challenges to doing that.

Interviewer: To having the task force?

Interviewee LS: To getting everybody on board in a certain timeframe that they want to. *[Laughs]*

Interviewer: Oh, sure.

Interviewee LS: That Great Northern EIS, from scoping to the draft EIS being released, was just a year, which was pretty outstanding. It can be done. I think it takes the right federal agency—

Interviewer: - to organize?

Interviewee LS: - and the right person “leading the charge”—

Interviewer: Sure.

Interviewee LS: - and the right team to just power through and get everything done.

Interviewer: Would you say, in general, would you prefer to have a Rapid Response Task Force to help, as opposed to just working with each agency individually?

Interviewee LS: Uh huh. I guess it’s hard to say, ‘cuz I haven’t done a federal one with working with each agency individually. I do think from—I can see advantages from a public perspective of getting all of the agencies on board together, and avoid some of those issues we talked about where DNR comes in later, for example, and has some new routes, or something like that. On a federal level, to avoid having one story, and then another story kind of changing, and the public has to ride that roller coaster.

Interviewer: Right. Sure. Right, and figure out—I didn’t really think about the fact that some people would not really know who was “running the show.” It takes a lot to figure that out. It makes sense. It’s just something that hadn’t occurred to me. I can definitely see how—

Interviewee LS: - which, I think, is also a big advantage of the State and the feds working together, from a public point of view. This is feedback that we definitely heard at the meetings for the CapX project is, especially with the Certificate of Need separate from the route permit application. “You guys come out here, and we’re having meetings all the time. *[Laughs]* We’re meeting with—the utilities are having meetings. The State is having meetings. There are meetings for the Certificate of Need. There are meetings for the route permit, for scoping, then for the draft EIS, then for the public hearings. I’ve got other things to do in my life besides attend all these meetings.”

Sometimes this feeling that like—almost a “conspiracy theory,” like, “You’re doing this to confuse us all!”

Interviewer: *[Laughs]* Yeah, yeah. Uh huh, sure.

Interviewee LS: The more you can, I think, streamline the process for the public, the easier it is. Just logistically, for them to be involved.

Interviewer: Uh huh, yeah. That’s tricky.

Interviewee LS: This whole thing is quite tricky.

Interviewer: Yeah, I like to think about it. I’m kinda like you, it’s very interesting.

Interviewee LS: I read *Powerline* by Wellstone, while I was working on this project.

Interviewer: Did you know that the CapX group, like the vision team, a lot of the big organizers, the people that were bringing together, they all read that as well.

Interviewee LS: I didn’t know that.

Interviewer: I only just recently learned this as well, because I’ve been trying to—one of the things that the CapX group says is, “We built our relationship on trust.” They have a participation agreement, and that’s their contract. So, how were they able to do this, and how were they able to learn from the past?

Interviewee LS: Right.

Interviewer: Then someone was like, “Oh, yeah, everyone read that book!” I was like, “Wow! That’s huge!” *[They both laugh]* Right, it’s a

huge issue. Why don't we have people toppling—you know, it's harder to topple metal poles, but, um—

Interviewee LS: - right.

Interviewer: - there's that. It wasn't so much of entire communities being against it, so I think they learned.

Interviewee LS: Yeah.

Interviewer: One person even started out the interview with, "Transmission lines is doing violence to people's land." I was like, "Wow! That's really strong language to start with!"

Interviewee LS: Yeah. *[They both laugh]*

Interviewer: He's like, "Well, it is!" I don't think I was being fed lines. I think they truly realized the impacts and the work that they had to do. Then, here come all these "catches," like, "We're trying to do it right!" And there's—you know.

Interviewee LS: Yeah.

Interviewer: Interesting.

Interviewee LS: Yeah.

Interviewer: Well, now, I'm just talking instead of interviewing. *[They both laugh]* That's not the way it's supposed to go. Well, how about for you? We've been here for a little over an hour.

Interviewee LS: Yeah.

Interviewer: Any other—oh! Can we talk about wind a little bit more, just for—

Interviewee LS: - sure, yeah.

Interviewer: - especially on the Brooking. What I've heard with talking with landowners is that—so they're a lot more amenable to the lines because—they know it's windy. They live there, right?

Interviewee LS: Right, yeah.

Interviewer: They know the wind potential that the area has. "You get a couple of thousand dollars for a transmission pole, one time; but if, all of a sudden, a wind farm is developed here, then—you know what I

mean—me and my neighbors have the potential to benefit from this.”

I think that was one of the ways that made it a little bit easier, at least on those parts of the lines. When working on the routes, did you—I know that the utilities said that they worked with wind developers to find out—so, like, Gordon Peach, from GRE. I don’t know if you know that name. He’s one of the bigger, “higher-ups,” so his name is on a lot of things as well.

He, um, [*sighs*] what was I just about to say? Oh! They had worked with wind developers to—they asked, when they were trying to plan the lines, like, “Where do you think you’re gonna be building,” because that will kind of impact? Did anything like that happen with the EIS?

Interviewee LS: Not at a wind developer scale. We got a lot of questions from, or a fair amount of questions, I remember, about, “Well, if this line is coming through, if someone was to ask me if they could develop wind in my field over here, could we connect in?”

Interviewer: Uh huh.

Interviewee LS: The reality is you can’t just connect right into a 345.

Interviewer: There’s not a “plug.” [*They both laugh*]

Interviewee LS: That was not necessarily the answer that—it wasn’t locally as helpful as it was in more of like a “big picture” sense.

Interviewer: Okay, yeah. But the questions were raised.

Interviewee LS: Yeah. Yeah, for sure.

Interviewer: Interesting, yeah.

Interviewee LS: Yeah.

Interviewer: So it’s, “How do you figure out when”—? So when would that have happened. I guess, during their scoping phase? The utility— ‘cuz you don’t develop the entire line—

Interviewee LS: - yeah, prior to the Certificate of Need, probably. The utility is trying to figure out, “Okay, what kind of line do we need here? What substations do we need? How are we gonna do this line?”

Interviewer: Okay, so they take those considerations, and then you pick it up after.

Interviewee LS: Yeah.

Interviewer: Okay, that's clear. All right. Well, I'll ask you the same question that I asked John. Are there any big things that we haven't talked about that—?

Interviewee LS: Nothing that comes to mind. I'll let you know if I think of anything, but I think we've—I can only remember so much from 2008 [laughs].

Interviewer: Cool. Uh huh, yeah. Me too. [Laughs]

Interviewee LS: I actually left and went on maternity leave part way through the Hampton to La Crosse one. It's always the kind of thing you think, "I'm sure this will be done by the time I get back." [They both laugh] Then I came back and it was [voice trails off].

Interviewer: Then it happened to be one of the—

Interviewee LS: - but that's kind of how I mark my participation in these was like, "When did I have my first kid? When did I have my second kid?"

Interviewer: Surely. Uh huh. Yeah. You're not alone.

Interviewee LS: I was trying to think of how long it took to—I was trying to think, "Okay, well, when did I go on maternity leave? When did I come back?"

Interviewer: Uh huh, yeah.

Interviewee LS: Anyway, if I remember anything else that seems really important, I'll let you know.

Interviewer: Sure, yeah. You know me. Let me know. You wake up in the middle of the night. "I should have said that!" [They both laugh]

Interviewee LS: Okay, well great.

Interviewer: Well, thank you. This has really been very helpful.

Interviewee LS: Yeah, I'm excited to see what comes out of this. I think it's gonna be interesting.