

1 The third feasible option is the
2 retrenching option. Respondents who submitted
3 testimony in this proceeding believe that using
4 trenching practices and materials that are common
5 elsewhere in the U.S., that are near routine in
6 Europe, and that Dominion itself proposed to use in
7 its offshore wind installations would provide
8 considerable cost and operational benefits.

9 Indeed, the Norris Bridge portion of line
10 number 65 may be the ideal candidate for implementing
11 trenched armored XLPE multicore cable technology in
12 Dominion's system because of the unique circumstances
13 of this case. These techniques would be applied to a
14 substantial river crossing at a lower level
15 transmission or even subtransmission voltages, and
16 those techniques would be utilized for a line whose
17 need is driven by less urgent operational performance
18 issues rather than a more urgent need to meet demand
19 growth. And we maintain that the trenching option
20 offers such flexibility that additional capacity can
21 easily and cost effectively be delivered into the
22 system as and when the actual needs warranted.

23 Consequently, the Commission should
24 reject Dominion's proposed towers for the Norris
25 Bridge crossing because Dominion has not demonstrated

1 that this option reasonably minimizes adverse impacts
2 on the scenic assets and environment of the local
3 community. Instead, Dominion should be directed to
4 select from among the three feasible options that more
5 closely approximate the impact of the existing Norris
6 Bridge line on the local community: the bridge option
7 proposed by the county, the HDD option which Dominion
8 itself concedes is reasonable, and the trenching
9 options supported by Barnhardt's testimony.

10 Thank you.

11 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you.

12 MR. CORNWELL: Thank you, Mr. Hearing
13 Examiner. My name is Jim Cornwell. I'm with the law
14 firm of Sands Anderson. I am county attorney for
15 Lancaster County, and I have served in that position
16 for over 20 years. I'm also a native of Lancaster
17 County, of which I'm very proud.

18 Participating with me today is Chris
19 Mackenzie, an associate of mine at Sands Anderson.
20 And with me today is Jason Bellows, a member of the
21 board of supervisors of the County of Lancaster, who
22 is a witness and will testify in this proceeding.

23 The County of Lancaster is extremely
24 concerned about the request from Dominion Power to
25 construct large and substantial towers in the

1 Rappahannock River which will negatively impact on the
2 river and the scenic assets of Lancaster County. The
3 board of supervisors of the county has adopted a
4 resolution supporting in general the upgrade of
5 Line 65. However, as stated in that resolution, it
6 strongly supports the installation, operation, and
7 maintenance of the new transmission line under water
8 rather than be a new overhead transmission line with
9 the large towers as proposed by Dominion.

10 As this case progressed, the county also
11 became aware that it is feasible and appropriate to
12 utilize the Robert O. Norris Bridge to carry new power
13 lines across the Rappahannock River if the supporting
14 structure carrying those lines are properly designed
15 and constructed, and we now support that method of
16 crossing the river as another option in this matter.

17 Given the current state of public
18 finances and given the fact that Lancaster County only
19 has a population of less than 12,000 residents, I
20 believe it is extraordinary for the board of
21 supervisors of such a small county to participate in
22 this proceeding in the manner that it has.

23 I will note that I represent six other
24 localities in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and I'm
25 not aware of any of them participating and expending

1 funds to protect their scenic assets the way that the
2 board of supervisors of Lancaster County has. The
3 board has not only adopted the resolution spoke of a
4 minute ago, requesting the towers not be constructed,
5 but has authorized the expenditure of public funds for
6 myself and my firm to actively participate in this
7 matter and to employ an electrical engineer, Mr. Peter
8 Lanzalotta, whose offices are in South Carolina, and a
9 structural engineer, Mr. Michael Matthews, with The
10 Structures Group in Williamsburg, to participate in
11 this proceeding and offer testimony.

12 Such effort and outlay of public funds
13 should demonstrate to the Commission the strength of
14 Lancaster County's concerns about Dominion's proposal
15 to construct these unsightly towers across the
16 Rappahannock River.

17 Lancaster County considers the Robert O.
18 Norris Bridge its front door. The county is
19 financially dependent both upon tax revenue generated
20 from those who call Lancaster County home and the
21 revenue generated by those who visit to enjoy the
22 natural resources of the county, particularly those
23 who come down to the river for the entertainment and
24 for the weekends.

25 I am proud to state, as I said, that I'm

1 a native of the county, having been raised in
2 Irvington, Virginia, and my family has a rich history
3 in the county. I share that trait with Mr. Bellows
4 and with Mr. Bruce Sanders, a witness for the Save the
5 Rappahannock.

6 While those of us who were raised in the
7 county have always known of its unique beauty, it was
8 the construction of the Robert O. Norris Bridge that
9 opened up all of the activities and benefits of the
10 county to others.

11 I actually recall, as a boy of six and
12 seven, riding the ferry across the Rappahannock River
13 and watching the Robert O. Norris Bridge being
14 constructed. I know that for me and many others, when
15 you drive across the Robert O. Norris Bridge and look
16 at the unobstructed view of the Rappahannock River
17 from the bridge, we know that we're home.

18 This view would be forever changed if the
19 Commission approves the construction of Dominion's
20 towers. That is why the county has gone to such
21 extraordinary lengths in this case to provide the
22 Commission and Dominion with mutually beneficial
23 alternatives for the updating of the Line 65 system.

24 The county, working in conjunction with
25 Save the Rappahannock and William Barnhardt, will

1 produce evidence that there are at least three viable,
2 appropriate, and both ecological and environmentally
3 sound alternatives to Dominion's tower project. All
4 of these options are also fiscally responsible for the
5 ratepayers of Dominion Power and, too, may even
6 represent a potential savings as compared to the
7 proposed overhead towers, while at the same time
8 ensuring that the present concerns with Line 65 will
9 be addressed and the scenic assets of the county will
10 be protected.

11 First, we believe the option of
12 constructing a system using HPFF and HDD is the best
13 of all worlds. As pointed out by Dominion, that is
14 their second alternative to the present tower process.
15 Although Dominion estimates the cost of that process
16 is an expensive option, we will produce evidence to
17 you that Dominion's figures are excessive and that the
18 HPFF and HDD alternative can be constructed at a more
19 reasonable cost than estimated by Dominion.

20 Likewise, we believe that the current
21 technology used around the world, XLPE cable trenched
22 in the Rappahannock River, is a safe and
23 environmentally appropriate option at a cost at or
24 below the cost estimated by Dominion for the towers.

25 Finally, we believe that in an

1 appropriate fashion, supported by and to be explained
2 by Michael Matthews, our structural engineer, who has
3 discussed this option with the Virginia Department of
4 Transportation, the Robert O. Norris Bridge can
5 continue to serve as a successful conduit to carry the
6 necessary lines across the river without the use of
7 the towers, even the towers that are presently in
8 existence, and without any requirement that the power
9 lines be de-energized through normal VDOT maintenance
10 of the bridge.

11 This option is not the Barnhardt Option
12 1, which Dominion proposed an order to fail, but an
13 option whereby the lines are transitioned to the
14 bridge and then carried by the center trusses of the
15 bridge across the river channel.

16 Dominion classifies the line on the
17 Robert O. Norris Bridge as an overhead line, and we
18 don't disagree with that. We believe it would still
19 be very accessible for maintenance and improvement to
20 Dominion as well as not being required to be shut down
21 during normal VDOT maintenance activities. We believe
22 that Dominion's evidence will support that.

23 We ask that you and the Commission
24 consider our alternatives when applying the statutory
25 provisions of Section 56-46.1 of the Virginia Code,

1 which Ms. Robb discussed and which requirements
2 require as a condition of approval that, quote, the
3 corridor or route the line is to follow will
4 reasonably minimize adverse impact on the scenic
5 assets, historic district, and environment of the
6 area.

7 Dominion's tower proposal will certainly
8 have an adverse impact on the scenic assets and
9 environment of the river and Lancaster County. The
10 county respectfully requests that the Hearing Examiner
11 recommend to the Commission and the Commission so
12 direct that Dominion be allowed to reconstruct Line 65
13 in accordance with one of the options offered by the
14 respondents, but that Dominion specifically not be
15 authorized to construct the towers as put forth in its
16 proposal.

17 Thank you.

18 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you.

19 MR. ROUSSY: Good morning, again, Your
20 Honor. Matt Roussy along with Fred Ochsenhirt, we
21 represent the Commission staff.

22 Commission's order for notice and hearing
23 in this proceeding directed staff to investigate and
24 file testimony on Dominion's application to rebuild
25 transmission line number 65 for the segment that

1 you've heard about this morning that crosses the
2 Rappahannock River from Middlesex into Lancaster
3 County.

4 Today, as you've also heard, this line is
5 supported by a combination of structures in the river
6 and attachments to the Norris Bridge. Staff
7 previously evaluated Dominion's plans to rebuild this
8 part of Line 65 in 2015 when the question before the
9 Commission was whether or not the project was an
10 ordinary extension or improvement in the usual course
11 of business.

12 The Commission's resolution of that issue
13 simply determined that Dominion's project could not
14 proceed to construction without first seeking and
15 obtaining a certificate of public convenience and
16 necessity from the Commission. But the 2015 case did
17 not decide whether or not construction of the project
18 satisfies the requirements of Virginia law. That's
19 what this case is about.

20 Based on staff's evaluation of the
21 project, staff believes that Dominion has reasonably
22 established the need to rebuild the river crossing
23 portion of Line 65.

24 During this hearing, staff witness
25 Michael Cizenski of the Commission's Public Utility

1 Regulation division will sponsor portions of the staff
2 report filed in this case that address, among other
3 things, the need for a transmission rebuild. While
4 there are various aspects of the need case asserted by
5 the company, staff recognizes in particular that the
6 existing facilities that Dominion proposes to replace
7 are at or near the end of their useful life and that
8 the ability to operate the existing line is
9 complicated and, at times, limited by the fact that it
10 is attached to the Norris Bridge.

11 In looking at possible alternatives for
12 meeting the need identified by Dominion, portions of
13 the staff report, that will be sponsored by Neil
14 Joshipura, also of the Commission's Public Utility
15 Regulation division, recognize the company's proposal
16 for a 115 kV overhead construction approximately 100
17 feet east of the bridge can satisfy the identified
18 need as could constructing an overhead project along
19 the same route to 230 kV specifications.

20 However, to be clear, staff has not
21 implied that any alternative chosen by the Commission
22 must have capacity or amperage matching the 230 kV
23 overhead option. Indeed the staff report recognizes
24 that underground alternatives with the capacity
25 significantly less than what Dominion engineered the

1 overhead project to provide could also satisfy the
2 need identified by the company.

3 Now, in comparing overhead and
4 underground alternatives, staff recognizes that those
5 involve differing impacts that must be weighed and
6 balanced by the Hearing Examiner and the Commission.
7 Cost is obviously one important factor, and the staff
8 report's ultimate recommendation is that an
9 underground alternative would be reasonable in staff's
10 view if it could be constructed in a reliable manner
11 and at a cost comparable to the company's proposed
12 overhead project.

13 While many of us do look for guidance
14 from Commission orders like the Haymarket order and
15 the Skiffe's Creek order that were mentioned this
16 morning, the Commission considers each transmission
17 line project on a case-by-case basis based on each
18 individual record including the question of whether or
19 not a project should be constructed aboveground or
20 underground.

21 The staff report also examined the
22 on-bridge alternatives to the project as well as a
23 more extensive rebuild of existing transmission lines
24 but has recommended focusing on the overhead and
25 underground alternative's in the area of the existing

1 river crossing.

2 In addition to cost concerns associated
3 with on-bridge alternatives, some of the issues
4 identified in correspondence by VDOT filed in this
5 case appear to present challenges to an on-bridge
6 alternative which could only be constructed with
7 VDOT's approval. But VDOT is scheduled to testify
8 later in this hearing. So they can obviously provide
9 their perspective on such matters.

10 Finally, consistent with Commission
11 practice and the Code of Virginia, the Commission's
12 office of general counsel has coordinated with the
13 Department of Environmental Quality to request a
14 review by state agencies of the potential
15 environmental implications of the projects.

16 That request resulted in two DEQ reports
17 that have been filed in this case and also in request
18 for representatives of two agencies that contributed
19 to those reports to testify in this proceeding. And
20 those agencies are the Virginia Outdoors Foundation
21 and, as I mentioned before, the Virginia Department of
22 Transportation.

23 In addition to the staff report which
24 will be sponsored by staff witnesses Cizenski and
25 Joshipura, the office of general counsel will move for

1 admission of the two DEQ reports at the appropriate
2 time consistent with Commission practice.

3 Thank you, Your Honor.

4 THE HEARING EXAMINER: We'll take a
5 ten-minute break. And then we'll come back -- I
6 believe that we have the witness from the VOF, and
7 it's such that it's normally put on sort of as part of
8 the public testimony. We'll go ahead and do that, and
9 then the rest of the public witnesses, if that works
10 for everyone. So we'll take a ten-minute break.

11 Thank you.

12 (A brief recess was taken.)

13 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Martha Little.

14 MARTHA H. LITTLE, having been first duly
15 sworn, testified as follows:

16 THE HEARING EXAMINER: If you could
17 please state your name and address, please, for the
18 record and who you are with.

19 THE WITNESS: Sure. My name is Martha
20 Little. I'm with the Virginia Outdoors Foundation,
21 and our address is 600 East Main Street, Richmond,
22 Virginia.

23 MR. OCHSENHIRT: Your Honor, I just was
24 going to ask the witness to move the microphone a
25 little closer so she can be heard.

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

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Proceed.

THE WITNESS: I'm a witness with questions.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay. That's fine.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. ROBB:

Q. Ms. Little, Cliona Robb for Save the Rappahannock Coalition, Inc.

Can you tell us what is VOF and what is your mission statement?

A. Sure. VOF was created in 1966 under 10.1-1800 of the Virginia Code, and it reads as follows:

The Virginia Outdoors Foundation was established to promote the preservation of open-space lands and to encourage private gifts of money, securities, land or other property to preserve the natural, scenic, historic, scientific, open-space and recreational areas of the Commonwealth. The Virginia Outdoors Foundation is a body politic governed and administered by a board of trustees composed of seven trustees appointed by the Governor.

And VOF's primary tool for accomplishing its mission is through voluntary land conservation,

1 and that's typically open-space easements.

2 Q. Ms. Little, in Dominion's rebuttal
3 testimony from Ms. Mayhew, she states there is only
4 one VOF property in view of the Norris Bridge, which
5 is located approximately 7,000 feet south of the
6 bridge, and that the proposed towers associated with
7 the proposed 115 kV overhead route are barely visible
8 from that single VOF property.

9 Do you agree with her statement?

10 A. I do not.

11 Q. Can you explain why not?

12 A. Sure. There are at least two VOF
13 easements within view of the Norris Bridge, but more
14 importantly, the scenic view that's protected is from
15 the traveling public on the bridge of the VOF
16 easement, not from the easement of the bridge, which
17 is what was mentioned in her testimony.

18 And VOF believes that the proposed
19 aboveground structures would actually impede that
20 currently unimpeded view of Parrot's Island, which is
21 an easement with VOF.

22 Q. Have you put something up on the screen?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Can you explain what that is?

25 A. Sure. Parrot's Island is labeled. Those

1 are the islands 1 and 2 in the Rappahannock River
2 under easement with VOF. All of the other yellow
3 blobs are also VOF easements. And the radius of 1.5
4 miles is the dotted -- first dotted red line, and then
5 the 5-mile radius is the exterior line.

6 So you can see there's several easements
7 in the area, but it's really just that Parrot's Island
8 easement that would be affected by the proposed
9 aboveground structures.

10 Q. And has VOF adopted any policies related
11 to infrastructure development and its impacts on
12 conserved lands?

13 A. Yes. The VOF board of trustees
14 in September -- September 29th, I think, of 2016 --
15 adopted a new policy that was specifically to address
16 the impacts of infrastructure on conserved lands.

17 In particular, the board has concerns
18 about large-scale utility projects impairing
19 conservation values of protected resources. And they
20 are also concerned about the loss of confidence by the
21 public in the effectiveness of the easement program
22 through the degradation of these protected resources.

23 And I'd like to read two statements from
24 the policy.

25 The first one is, "The VOF easements

1 contribute to the scenic integrity of the Virginia
2 landscape, and therefore, VOF encourages the
3 protection of the scenic integrity by minimizing
4 incongruent man-made structures in areas of the
5 greatest scenic value where VOF easement interests
6 exist."

7 And then the second point is, "The citing
8 of utility transmission lines, transportation
9 improvements, and other infrastructure projects on or
10 near VOF easements should take into consideration the
11 protection of scenic and cultural resources and
12 decrease the fragmentation of existing natural and
13 landscape features."

14 Q. Ms. Little, earlier you mentioned the
15 Parrot's Island VOF easement. Why did you mention
16 that particular easement?

17 A. That easement is unique. I believe it's
18 the only VOF easement located within a large water
19 body that's visible from a public road. And it's also
20 the context within which it lies. It's part of the
21 broad view scape of the Rappahannock River to the
22 Chesapeake Bay, which is a relatively pristine view
23 and you have these pristine islands which are
24 protected within that context. I would say the value
25 'of that easement is really its scenic' value.

1 Q. All right. Do you have any general
2 comments concerning the Rappahannock River itself?

3 A. We -- enormous resources have been spent,
4 from both state and federal level, to protect this
5 river. It's unique in many ways. There's a lot of
6 agriculture but very little industry along the river.

7 VOF has -- just on the lower portion of
8 the Rappahannock River, we have 22 easements on the
9 shores, on both sides. We have 600 easements
10 completely within the watershed of the lower
11 Rappahannock, 160,000 acres which is -- and 40 miles
12 on both sides that are permanently protected. And the
13 Rappahannock River is also a central feature of the
14 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Rappahannock River
15 Valley National Wildlife Refuge.

16 So there's been, like I said, a lot of
17 resources spent to try to protect this river. And I
18 notice that it was listed as the fifth-most threatened
19 river in the recent report from American Rivers.

20 MS. ROBB: Your Honor, at this point, I'd
21 like to pass out copies of the report that Ms. Little
22 just mentioned and have it marked just for
23 identification purposes at this time.

24 MS. CRABTREE: And, Your Honor, could we
25 also get copies of the two documents that Ms. Little

1 is sharing on the overhead, if possible?

2 THE HEARING EXAMINER: If they're
3 available and especially if they're going to be
4 offered.

5 BY MS. ROBB:

6 Q. Ms. Little, is this the report you
7 referenced just now?

8 A. Yes.

9 MS. ROBB: Okay. And just to explain
10 what we have before us, it's -- what's been passed out
11 is an excerpt from the report. It's not the full
12 report. It's the cover page, the opening page, and
13 then there's a page that references the Rappahannock
14 River.

15 BY MS. ROBB:

16 Q. So are you familiar with this report?

17 A. Yes, I've seen it.

18 Q. Okay. Were you aware -- I know that --
19 can you explain what -- you mentioned that
20 Rappahannock was described in the report. Why was
21 it -- how did it get into this report? What was
22 the --

23 A. This endangered rivers report?

24 Q. Uh-huh.

25 A. I don't know a lot 'about it, but my

1 understanding is that these are typically somewhat
2 pristine rivers that have a new threat, and they come
3 out with a report every year and that this year the
4 Rappahannock River is listed as number five under the
5 threats.

6 Q. And is that five in Virginia or five out
7 of --

8 A. The country.

9 Q. -- in the country?

10 Okay. I know VOF did not sponsor this
11 report, and so you can't address the fracking issue
12 that was the subject of the report's assessment
13 concerning the Rappahannock, but I'd like to ask you a
14 more general question.

15 Does it make sense to you that the
16 Rappahannock would be selected to be featured in a
17 report like this based on -- and I'm quoting from the
18 language on the page that was excerpted -- based on it
19 being "the longest free-flowing river in Virginia" and
20 based on "thousands of residents and visitors taking
21 advantage of Rappahannock basin rivers and streams for
22 a wide range of recreational activities"?

23 A. So --

24 Q. So I'm saying obviously the Rappahannock
25 was one of ten out of the country that was featured,

1 and it was included in the summary for those reasons.
2 Does it make sense that those features of the
3 Rappahannock were put in a report like this?

4 A. I think so. I mean, as I said, the state
5 and federal government have spent a lot of resources
6 in protecting this river. And from what it sounds
7 like, this is related to the acreage which has been
8 leased as potential fracking sites and the impacts to
9 water quality. But the river is unique as a
10 recreational use and in its -- I think the fact that
11 it has very little heavy industry along the river.

12 Q. All right.

13 MS. ROBB: Your Honor, I move the
14 excerpts from this report's admission into the record.

15 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Well, I guess I've
16 neglected to actually mark it.

17 MS. ROBB: Sorry.

18 THE HEARING EXAMINER: I'll mark it as
19 Exhibit 1 and we'll --

20 MS. CRABTREE: Your Honor, it just seems
21 that the witness did not have any firsthand knowledge
22 of this document whatsoever.

23 MS. ROBB: She stated she was aware of
24 the report.

25 BY MS. ROBB:

1 Q. Are you familiar with the report,
2 Ms. Little?

3 A. Yes.

4 THE HEARING EXAMINER: I'm going to admit
5 it as Exhibit 1.

6 (Exhibit 1 admitted.)

7 MS. ROBB: No further questions from Save
8 the Rappahannock.

9 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Cornwell, any
10 questions?

11 MR. CORNWELL: Yes, just a few.

12 CROSS-EXAMINATION

13 BY MR. CORNWELL:

14 Q. To be clear, Ms. Little, are we talking
15 about two viewsheds here, one from Parrot Island,
16 looking both toward the bridge and toward the
17 Chesapeake, and the other from the bridge looking
18 toward Parrot Island and the Chesapeake?

19 A. No. The view that is protected by the
20 easement is of the traveling public. So it's the view
21 from the bridge, if you're driving along the bridge of
22 the easement property within that viewshed.

23 Q. And that's both sides of the bridge,
24 looking toward the Chesapeake as well as looking up
25 the river?

1 A. Right.

2 Q. That's the viewshed that the Outdoor
3 Foundation is most concerned about in this
4 application?

5 A. Yes.

6 MR. CORNWELL: I don't know that it was
7 done, Mr. Hearing Examiner. The projections that she
8 referenced, I would move -- I would ask them to be
9 identified.

10 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Do we have copies
11 of those to pass around?

12 MR. CORNWELL: She's not my witness.

13 THE HEARING EXAMINER: I know. But --

14 BY MR. CORNWELL:

15 Q. Do you have any copies, Ms. Little?

16 A. Yes. I just gave them.

17 THE HEARING EXAMINER: We'll reserve
18 exhibits for those. The first one was the map? I
19 want to make sure. The map that was shown for the VOF
20 easements, I'll mark that as -- we'll reserve
21 Exhibit Number 2 for that. And on the Energy and
22 Infrastructure Committee charter, which is a two-page
23 document dated September 29th of 2016 will be -- I'll
24 reserve Exhibit Number 3 for that, and they'll be
25 copied and admitted.

1 MR. CORNWELL: We would certainly proffer
2 that we would copy them at lunch break.

3 THE HEARING EXAMINER: And I would
4 request color for the map.

5 MR. CORNWELL: We'll do our best, Your
6 Honor.

7 (Exhibit 2 was admitted.)

8 (Exhibit 3 was admitted.)

9 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Is that it?

10 MR. CORNWELL: That's all the questions I
11 have.

12 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. York?

13 MR. YORK: Very briefly, Your Honor.

14 CROSS-EXAMINATION

15 BY MR. YORK:

16 Q. Thank you for coming. I thought I was
17 familiar with the Outdoor Foundation, but I looked at
18 your website in preparation for your coming, and I
19 realized that you are very active, and I was
20 particularly interested in your opposition to various
21 projects. Your most recent one, I think, was in
22 Roanoke County, which is where I grew up. So I saw
23 that.

24 My question is this: With respect to
25 your comments in opposition to projects such as this

1 one that could affect scenic assets, have you ever
2 been successful in rerouting, changing, or --

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. -- defeating?

5 Can you discuss that?

6 A. I know we've worked with AEP on a number
7 of occasions to reroute power lines around VOF
8 easements, and they've also worked with us on changes
9 to the materials and height and various attributes
10 that would have affected scenic views. So I know
11 we've been successful in that area.

12 I'm trying to think of any other
13 examples.

14 We are working on some projects right now
15 where we may be successful in reducing the height of
16 some power lines that are going through easements.

17 Q. With respect to this particular case,
18 have you gotten any indication that Dominion was in
19 any way receptive to discussing your concerns and
20 doing -- seeing if there's some way they could meet
21 them?

22 A. We've not met with them on this case, no.
23 We have had meetings on several other proposed power
24 line projects.

25 MR. YORK: Thank you. That's all I have.

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

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Pirko?

MR. PIRKO: Thank you.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. PIRKO:

Q. I'd just like to clarify. You said, now, the easement protects the view from the bridge of Parrot Island; is that correct?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. So that's the view that is protected by it. Okay. There seemed to be some confusion about -- or to me, anyway, about what view was being protected.

Is the island marked at all? Is there any signage on it that says this is an easement or VOF property or anything like that?

A. We do have VOF easement signs on the majority of our easements, but I'm not sure if there is one on this property.

Q. Okay. Would it be viewable from the bridge if it were? Would it be a large sign?

A. It's possible it could be viewable. And people kayak and canoe there all the time. So they would see it.

Q. But they're not on the bridge obviously.

A. No.

MR. PIRKO: I think that's it.' Thank

1 you.

2 MR. YORK: Your Honor, Mr. Pirko just had
3 an excellent question. Could I have one follow-up to
4 his question, or maybe at the end? It just raised a
5 very important point.

6 THE HEARING EXAMINER: You only get a
7 couple of these. Are you sure you want to burn it
8 now? But go ahead.

9 MR. YORK: Your Honor, I was watching a
10 Nationals game two nights ago, and I think the
11 Phillies manager in the second inning contested a very
12 close play at second, and the announcer said, "They'll
13 burn them any time they think they can win it." So,
14 yes. This is an important point.

15 RECROSS-EXAMINATION

16 BY MR. YORK:

17 Q. Is it possible to put the view that
18 Mr. Pirko just mentioned, the one that shows Parrot
19 Island there on the lower right-hand corner?

20 And I'm asking you -- his question was
21 what else you may be able to see from the bridge
22 looking toward Parrot Island. I know you are probably
23 familiar with this, but if you look toward Parrot
24 Island -- and you obviously can see past Parrot
25 Island -- that's the northern bank of the river in

1 Middlesex County; is that right?

2 A. Right.

3 Q. And if you look down the bank, you can
4 see Deltaville. It's just at the end of this
5 photograph. And I presume you can still see all the
6 way, really, to Stingray Point -- named Stingray
7 because that's where John Smith allegedly got stung by
8 a stingray -- and the whole area off to the right is
9 the Chesapeake Bay; is that right?

10 A. Right.

11 Q. So using this easement, looking from the
12 bridge, one can see, really, quite a vista; is that
13 right?

14 A. That's true, yes.

15 MR. YORK: Nothing further.

16 MR. OCHSENHIRT: No questions from staff,
17 Your Honor.

18 MS. CRABTREE: I do have some questions,
19 Your Honor, but I would like to use the podium. I
20 don't mean to force the witness to take the stand, but
21 I do want to put some documents up on the overhead.

22 THE HEARING EXAMINER: That's fine.

23 CROSS-EXAMINATION

24 BY MS. CRABTREE:

25 Q. Good morning, Ms. Little.' My name is

1 Lisa Crabtree on behalf of Dominion Virginia Power.

2 A. Good morning.

3 Q. The VOF submitted two letters to the
4 Department of Environmental Quality that were included
5 within their reports; correct?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. And those were dated January 10 -- or
8 March 31, 2016 and January 10, 2017; is that correct?

9 A. March 28 and -- what did you say?
10 January -- yeah. That should be right. Yeah.

11 Q. I can put them on the screen.

12 MS. CRABTREE: And, Your Honor, I believe
13 staff will offer these later as part of the DEQ
14 report.

15 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay.

16 MR. OCHSENHIRT: Your Honor, maybe this
17 would be an appropriate time to just mark the DEQ
18 reports if we're going to refer to something that's in
19 them. I mean, I don't care, but it may make the
20 record clearer.

21 THE HEARING EXAMINER: It might make it
22 clearer. So let's go ahead and mark the two DEQ
23 reports.

24 MR. OCHSENHIRT: So there are two
25 reports, and the first is dated May '6, 2016. It was

1 filed with the clerk's office on May 9th. The
2 document itself is dated May 6th.

3 THE HEARING EXAMINER: We'll mark the
4 first DEQ report as Exhibit Number 4.

5 (Exhibit 4 admitted.)

6 MR. OCHSENHIRT: And the second report is
7 dated and filed on January 12, 2017.

8 THE HEARING EXAMINER: And we'll mark
9 that admitted as Exhibit Number 5.

10 (Exhibit 5 admitted.)

11 MS. ROBB: And the first report is
12 admitted as well?

13 THE HEARING EXAMINER: And it is admitted
14 as well, yes.

15 MR. ROUSSY: And, Your Honor, if I might,
16 just one last thing. I did speak with DEQ about the
17 two reports and the recommendations. Each report has
18 a different recommendation section, and I did get
19 clarification that DEQ has intended for all of its
20 recommendations to have been rolled up into the second
21 report.

22 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay.

23 MR. ROUSSY: For clarification.

24 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you.

25 Go ahead.

1 BY MS. CRABTREE:

2 Q. So, Ms. Little, the letter I have on the
3 screen will be a part or is a part of what has now
4 been admitted as Exhibit 4. And this is VOF's
5 position as filed in this proceeding; correct? And
6 here on the screen we see you mention the two VOF
7 easements within a mile and a half of the proposed
8 project; correct?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And I'm putting on the screen what was
11 included in the company's application as
12 Attachment 2-A-2. It's Page 111 of the appendix. And
13 you can see here the proposed project area as well as
14 shaded in yellow the VOF easements in the area.

15 Are you familiar with all of those?

16 A. Those -- oh, yes. Okay. I thought --
17 yes, I am.

18 Q. And the one we've been talking about
19 today is the one I'm pointing to now that has been
20 referred to as the Parrot Island easement; correct?

21 A. Correct.

22 Q. And it was your testimony that what VOF
23 is concerned with is the view from the public way or
24 the Norris Bridge of the VOF easement; correct?

25 A. Correct.

1 Q. What is the speed limit on the Norris
2 Bridge?

3 A. 45.

4 Q. So 45 miles per hour. Are there any
5 scenic pull-offs that you can stop at and look at
6 Parrot Island?

7 A. There aren't currently because they're
8 painting the bridge. So you're spending a lot of time
9 sitting there. But no.

10 Q. Does this bridge even have a shoulder
11 that you can pull off into?

12 A. No shoulders.

13 Q. And Parrot Island -- this is
14 approximately 7,000 feet away from the bridge, or a
15 mile and a half?

16 A. Right.

17 Q. Have you done any studies of how much of
18 the easement can be seen from the Norris Bridge a mile
19 and a half away?

20 A. We've done some visual simulations, drone
21 flyovers, but I didn't bring anything with me today.
22 But you can see most of the island if you're driving
23 towards Middlesex. And there's no impediments along
24 that bottom -- or part of that bottom half.

25 Q. So there's no impediments -- and when you

1 say there's no impediments, that's in the middle
2 portion of the bridge; correct?

3 A. Right. After you come out of the middle,
4 before you get to any of the newer -- the old
5 structures.

6 Q. And in fact, there are four transmission
7 structures in the water currently on the Lancaster
8 side of the bridge; correct?

9 A. Right.

10 Q. And there are three transmission
11 structures in the water currently on the Middlesex
12 side of the bridge. And those can be seen from the
13 bridge?

14 A. The structures?

15 Q. The current transmission structures.

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. I want to ask you about what has been
18 marked as Exhibit 3, the Energy and Infrastructure
19 Committee charter. What is the status of this
20 document?

21 A. It was adopted by the board in September
22 as a policy document for the Energy and Infrastructure
23 Committee, which is made up of a smaller group of our
24 board members.

25 Q. And that's September of 2016?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. So it's now a policy document that will
3 guide the VOF?

4 A. Uh-huh.

5 Q. Here on Page 2 of Exhibit 3, the General
6 VOF Energy/Infrastructure Policy Statements, you
7 discussed earlier what is bullet number 3, the siting
8 of utility transmission lines; correct?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And I see here that VOF encourages the
11 co-location or paralleling of transmission lines and
12 linear infrastructure to reduce the impact on visual
13 character of the landscape. Is that correct?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. The Norris Bridge is linear
16 infrastructure; correct?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And turning your attention now to what
19 was admitted as Exhibit 1, the endangered river
20 excerpt, is it your understanding that the threat to
21 the Rappahannock River had to do with fracking?

22 A. That's what this report says, yes.

23 Q. And the development of natural gas in
24 this area?

25 A. Uh-huh.

1 Q. It does not mention a threat of
2 transmission lines or any kind of construction of this
3 project?

4 A. No.

5 MS. CRABTREE: Thank you. Nothing
6 further, Ms. Little.

7 THE HEARING EXAMINER: I'll give you a
8 chance to -- if there's anything else you would like
9 to state at this time, you may. And if not, I can
10 excuse you.

11 THE WITNESS: I would just say that -- to
12 repeat some of what I had said earlier in that the --
13 this VOF easement is unique and is visible from a
14 highly traveled public byway and that the view within
15 which it's located is special in many, many ways. And
16 you really -- you really will have new impediments
17 that will block that view. So that's really all I
18 have to say.

19 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you. You
20 may be excused.

21 Frank Timmons?

22 Ralph Higgins?

23 RALPH HIGGINS, having been first duly
24 sworn, testified as follows:

25 DIRECT TESTIMONY'

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

THE HEARING EXAMINER: If you could please state your name and address for the record, please.

THE WITNESS: Ralph Higgins, 908 South Gaskins Road, Richmond.

I'm here today to talk about stewardship. My name is Ralph Higgins. I'm a second-generation landscape architect. I live in Richmond. I began my professional practice in 1972. As I began to manage the firm, I made an effort to incorporate the concept of land planning into our scope of services. So I have quite a bit of experience with that.

The firm itself dates to 1952 when my father left Charles Gillette's landscape architectural practice. We have been lucky enough to work on a number of projects that have importance to the Commonwealth of Virginia, including Jamestown Festival Park, the Yorktown Victory Center, Crim Dell at the College of William & Mary, the John Marshall House, the visitor center at Monticello, and Lewis Ginter Botanical Gardens.

We've also been involved in master planning of Capital Square and site planning of the executive mansion at Capital Square. We've been instrumental -- I'm trying to -- just to give you what

1 my qualifications are since I'm not an attorney and
2 I'm not actively involved in this.

3 We've been instrumental in the master
4 planning of major private development projects in the
5 Commonwealth, including Wyndham and Innsbrook in
6 Henrico County, Port Warwick and City Center in
7 Newport News, if anybody is familiar with those. For
8 over 20 years, we've been involved also in master
9 planning and landscape architecture design for the
10 University of Richmond.

11 Having said all of this, I've been asked
12 to focus here on the aesthetics of this particular
13 situation. In most of the cases I've mentioned,
14 aesthetics and economics go hand in hand with each
15 other. As we know, the Rappahannock crossing is a
16 gateway to both the Northern Neck and Middle
17 Peninsula, Virginia. This is one of the most
18 attractive settings on the East Coast.

19 While the tower proposal has created a
20 lot of local controversy, its impact is regional.
21 Central Virginia is within a day's drive of 40 percent
22 of the population of the U.S. The very history of the
23 United States in many respects began in the Northern
24 Neck with Captain John Smith's exploration of these
25 tributaries.

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

As a design and planning professional having literally thousands of acres of residential, commercial, and institutional development planning experience, I've always argued that it's what is inside that counts as far as value versus just the entrance.

In this case, the crossing of the Rappahannock River is both a dramatic gateway and an incredible illustration of what is important inside the region. The substantial boating activity makes this crossing an active three-dimensional entry.

The construction cost differences between the tower construction and the non-tower construction of the transmission lines should be certainly evaluated based on the tremendous aesthetic and cultural value of the non-tower alternative to the region and to the Commonwealth of Virginia. The best developers and economic consultants would agree with this value-added alternative.

Since the term "aesthetics" is almost impossible to define, in this case, I would suggest that we might apply the important concept of sustainability. We should think this concept of sustainability should apply to all projects undertaken by the Commonwealth of Virginia which affect the

1 welfare of its citizens.

2 The importance of the location of this
3 crossing suggests that it affects citizens of the
4 Commonwealth comprehensively. It is an historic water
5 way that has, to date, uniquely escaped the
6 industrialization of all other Virginia waterways.

7 The term "sustainability," as I used to
8 teach, is a three-legged stool. The three legs are
9 cultural, environmental, and economic. If any of
10 these three legs are missing, the project fails the
11 sustainability test.

12 In this case, and in my professional
13 opinion, the high-voltage transmission lines located
14 on the elevated towers beside the Robert O. Norris
15 Bridge represent a substantial failure of the
16 Commonwealth of Virginia's obligation to its citizens
17 for cultural sustainability and, to a larger extent,
18 all of our responsibility for good stewardship.

19 Thank you.

20 (A video was played.)

21 THE HEARING EXAMINER: If you could sit
22 there and speak into the mic and point.

23 THE WITNESS: We're looking to the west.
24 The bridge center in the middle is unpainted at this
25 point. The two ends of the bridge are painted. When

1 the center is finished being painted, it's going to be
2 a very attractive configuration.

3 Looking at this shot, you can see
4 approximately where the transmission lines would be
5 situated to the right of the bridge. You can see
6 Carters Creek up to the left. You can see the
7 Corrotoman River over to the left of that.

8 You can see Windmill Point to the left of
9 the bridge here. You can see Stingray Point straight
10 ahead there. You're looking out into the Chesapeake
11 Bay.

12 You can see the island that was just
13 discussed by the Virginia Outdoors Foundation right
14 directly ahead. Merroir, which is a wonderful oyster
15 restaurant, is directly behind that, if anyone is
16 interested in oysters in here.

17 Thank you.

18 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Ms. Robb?

19 MS. ROBB: No questions, Your Honor.

20 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Cornwell?

21 MR. CORNWELL: I'm not sure how we move
22 that into the record. I propose to do so if there's a
23 way of doing so.

24 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Do we have a --

25 THE WITNESS: It's on a DVD.

1 MR. CORNWELL: But I have no questions of
2 the witness.

3 MS. LINK: I just have a quick question,
4 but no objection to --

5 THE HEARING EXAMINER: We'll mark the DVD
6 as Exhibit Number 6 and enter it.

7 (Exhibit 6 admitted.)

8 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. York?

9 MR. YORK: Very briefly, Your Honor.

10 CROSS-EXAMINATION

11 BY MR. YORK:

12 Q. Is it possible to put that back on the
13 screen just for a second? One of the very first
14 scenes, you made a comment I need to ask you about.
15 And we can maybe freeze it where the plane is right at
16 the southern end of the bridge. Just that last thing
17 you saw, is it possible to turn that on and pause it
18 there?

19 A. We'll see.

20 Q. Now, you are a landscape architect?

21 A. Yes, sir.

22 Q. So you are pretty familiar with
23 perspective and measurements and distances, and that's
24 what you do; right?

25 A. Yes, sir.

1 Q. I'd like to ask you just to take a look
2 at the bridge and assume, if you would, that the
3 bridge roadbed is approximately 20 to 22 feet wide.

4 A. Yes, sir.

5 Q. And the proposed towers would be 100
6 feet -- the centerline, I should say, of the proposed
7 towers will be 100 feet to the east, which is --
8 actually, I believe it's to the leading edge of the
9 wing. You will see the existing towers in the water.

10 A. Right.

11 Q. And if you could just, using the
12 perspective of the bridge deck being approximately 20
13 to 22 feet wide, would the proposed towers on this
14 scene be to the left or to the right of the towers
15 that are existing?

16 A. I believe it's to the right. I think
17 we're looking to the north in this shot. Looking
18 south. Okay. It would be to the left.

19 Q. So it would be just outside the existing
20 towers?

21 A. Yes, sir.

22 Q. And they would extend the entire length
23 of the bridge. Is that your understanding?

24 A. Yes, sir, that's what I understand.

25 Q. All right. And just by perspective

1 again, the actual leading edge of the wing tip there
2 on the left, that would be more than 100 feet, if you
3 had an extended line into the water. So the actual
4 line of the proposed towers would be somewhere closer
5 to the existing towers?

6 A. Yes, sir.

7 MR. YORK: Okay. Nothing further, Your
8 Honor.

9 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Pirko?

10 MR. PIRKO: No questions.

11 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Staff?

12 MR. OCHSENHIRT: No questions.

13 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Company?

14 MS. LINK: Yes. Just briefly, Your
15 Honor.

16 CROSS-EXAMINATION

17 BY MS. LINK:

18 Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Higgins. Vishwa Link
19 on behalf of the company.

20 A. How are you?

21 Q. I believe I heard you say that you were
22 asked to focus on aesthetics as the main thrust of
23 your testimony?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Who asked you to testify, and who asked

1 you to focus on aesthetics?

2 A. The group of -- the Rappahannock River
3 group from White Stone.

4 Q. Is that the Save the Rappahannock
5 Coalition?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. So the Save the Rappahannock Coalition,
8 who is an intervenor in this case, asked you to
9 prepare testimony?

10 A. Yes.

11 MS. LINK: Your Honor, I'm not going to
12 object because we are in a legislative forum, but we
13 have a respondent that has now sought to have an
14 additional piece of testimony that was not pre-filed.
15 I don't raise an objection, but I don't believe it's
16 entirely appropriate to have an intervening witness
17 ask for a public witness to come and testify.

18 MR. YORK: Your Honor, I was almost
19 hoping that Ms. Link was going to object because I can
20 state to Your Honor -- I can make this absolute
21 statement -- that I followed up with Mr. Hall of Omega
22 Protein. And you may recall he testified at the last
23 public hearing. Very informative gentleman. Very
24 much appreciate his testimony.

25 But there was no question in my mind from

1 his conversation -- and he's just a wonderful person.
2 No question in my mind that his testimony was not only
3 sponsored by Dominion, but he told me that the speech
4 he gave, the statements, the message points were
5 authored by McGuireWoods.

6 I have no objection to his testimony.
7 Like I said, I was just wishing Ms. Link would make an
8 objection so we could have on the record exactly what
9 the ruling should be because this is just an
10 invitation to this --

11 MS. LINK: Your Honor, that's entirely
12 hearsay.

13 MS. ROBB: If I may, as counsel to the
14 coalition, I was not aware of this witness appearing,
15 and so -- they didn't go through counsel to have this
16 witness appear. I was not aware of -- so I can't
17 speak to what the coalition knew or didn't know.
18 Their counsel didn't know about it.

19 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay. Well, since
20 we don't have an objection, you won't get a ruling,
21 and I will -- do you have any other questions?

22 MS. LINK: No, Your Honor.

23 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Then I will -- you
24 may be dismissed at this point, and I thank you for
25 your testimony.

1 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
2 Appreciate it.

3 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Peter Mansfield?
4 PETE MANSFIELD, having been first duly
5 sworn, testified as follows:

6 DIRECT TESTIMONY

7 THE HEARING EXAMINER: If you could
8 please state your name and address for the record,
9 please.

10 THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir. My name is
11 Pete Mansfield. I'm a supervisor with Middlesex
12 County.

13 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Present your
14 testimony.

15 THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.
16 I wish to make sure that this Court
17 understands that Middlesex is arm in arm with
18 Lancaster County. We appreciate the efforts that they
19 have put into it to protect a vista that Lancaster
20 considers fantastic but Middlesex County considers it
21 just as important.

22 It is important for us economically in
23 the future. It's important for us just when we go out
24 and really are to enjoy ourselves, being able to see
25 the beautiful vista without these ugly towers. And I

1 hope -- I really hope that this Court will consider
2 the nonaggressive different ways of not putting the
3 towers in.

4 The underground seems, to us, to be the
5 most logical, and we -- and I'm speaking, again, for
6 Middlesex County and our board -- we would appreciate
7 very much your consideration.

8 Thank you very much.

9 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you. Just
10 wait.

11 Are there any questions?

12 MR. CORNWELL: For Lancaster County, we
13 appreciate the comments from Middlesex. I have no
14 questions. Thank you.

15 Thank you.

16 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Any other?

17 Thank you very much. You may be excused.

18 THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.

19 THE HEARING EXAMINER: I'm seeing the
20 time at 12:20. Before we break for lunch, I do want
21 to say, tomorrow morning, I'd like to start at 9:30,
22 if we can keep that, and we'll see how things progress
23 from there whether we need to start earlier or however
24 we're making progress.

25 And we will be back at 1:30 for this

1 afternoon. Thank you.

2 (Luncheon recess.)

3 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Good afternoon.

4 Just to check before we begin the company's direct
5 case and supplemental case, are there any other public
6 witnesses that wish to present testimony?

7 Seeing none, we'll proceed with the
8 company's case.

9 MS. LINK: Thank you, Your Honor. And
10 before we call our first witness, could we mark a few
11 exhibits?

12 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Yes.

13 MS. LINK: We'd first ask that the Proof
14 of Notice filed by the company on April 22, 2016, be
15 marked for identification and admitted into the
16 record.

17 THE HEARING EXAMINER: The Proof of
18 Notice will be marked as Exhibit Number 7 and entered
19 into the record.

20 (Exhibit 7 admitted.)

21 MS. LINK: Thank you. Next, the
22 company's application, consisting of six typed pages
23 and an accompanying appendix, DEQ supplement,
24 alternatives analysis and related attachments, which
' 25 was filed in this proceeding on February 29, 2016, and

1 it has a public version only.

2 And it does have a correction. Would you
3 like the correction marked with the application?

4 THE HEARING EXAMINER: Let me go ahead
5 and mark the correction separate. But the application
6 itself as well as the appendix and the attachments
7 will be marked as Exhibit Number 8 and admitted into
8 the record.

9 (Exhibit 8 admitted.)

10 MS. LINK: Thank you. The company filed
11 corrections to pages 4 and 7 of the appendix on
12 September 21, 2016, and a corrected Page 138 on
13 November 22, 2016. May we have that marked and
14 admitted?

15 THE HEARING EXAMINER: I'll mark that as
16 Exhibit 9.

17 (Exhibit 9 admitted.)

18 MS. LINK: Thank you. The company filed
19 a supplemental DEQ, supplement and supplemental
20 alternatives analysis on October 31, 2016, in public
21 version only.

22 THE HEARING EXAMINER: I'll mark the
23 supplemental -- the DEQ supplement as Exhibit 10, and
24 it's admitted.

25 (Exhibit 10 admitted.)

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. LINK: Thank you, Your Honor.

The company calls Wesley Keck.

MR. CORNWELL: Your Honor, if I might, while Mr. Keck is taking the stand, you've had two exhibits, the map and the chapter that you've marked as R2 and R3. I think copies have now been made. So I would move those to be admitted.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: All counsel have those. So they are now admitted.

MS. LINK: Just to be clear, when we marked Exhibit 10, it also included the supplemental alternatives analysis and the DEQ supplement.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you.

MS. LINK: Thank you.

WESLEY D. KECK, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. LINK:

Q. What is your name, position of employment, and business address?

A. My name is Wesley Keck, and I work at 701 East Cary Street in Richmond.

Q. And what is your position of employment?

A. I work in the transmission group. I am a strategic project adviser.'

1 Q. Thank you, Mr. Keck. Could you lean a
2 little bit closer to the microphone?

3 A. Certainly.

4 Q. Do you have with you a document entitled,
5 "The supplemental direct testimony of Wesley D. Keck,"
6 consisting of a summary, 12 typed pages of questions
7 and answers, and one schedule which was filed in
8 public version only in this proceeding on October 31,
9 2016?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Do you also have a letter from the
12 Virginia Department of Transportation dated
13 November 29, 2016, which was filed on November 30,
14 2016, as your supplemental direct schedule 2?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. And do you also have with you a corrected
17 Page 7 of your supplemental direct testimony which was
18 filed on January 10, 2017?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Were those documents prepared by you or
21 under your supervision?

22 A. They were.

23 Q. And do you have any corrections or
24 additions at this time?

25 A. I do. I have one additional correction.