

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

BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

GUARDIAN EXPANSION EXTENSION PROJECT
PUBLIC COMMENT MEETING

TIME: 7:00 p.m.
DATE: May 15, 2007.
PLACE: Olympia Resort and Conference Center,
Oconomowoc, Wisconsin
REPORTED BY: Amy K. Wallow

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

APPEARANCES:

MR. ROBERT KOPKA
SOIL CONSERVATIONIST
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
OFFICE OF ENERGY PROJECTS
888 First Street, NE PJ-11.1

Washington DC, 20426

MR. STEVEN M. UGORETZ
ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYST
ENERGY BUREAU OF INTEGRATED SCIENCE SERVICES
101 South Webster Street,
Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7921

1 (Meeting commenced at 7:10 p.m.)

2 MR. KOPKA: Good evening everyone. This is a
3 public meeting to take comments. My name is Bob Kopka.
4 I work for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,
5 also referred to as FERC, or the Commission, which is
6 located in Washington, DC. I am the environmental
7 project manager for the Guardian Expansion and Extension
8 Project. I would like to get started. This is a
9 public meeting to take comments on the environmental
10 draft impact statement, or DEIS, issued and written by
11 the FERC as the lead federal agency for Guardian's
12 Proposed Project with input from other cooperating
13 agencies. The comments received tonight and any filed
14 written comments received will be addressed in the Final
15 EIS for the proposed project. Let the record reflect
16 that this public meeting began at 7:10 p.m. on Tuesday,
17 May 15th, 2007 at the Olympia Resort and Conference
18 Center in Oconomowoc, Wisconsin.

19 Also with me tonight is a representative from
20 our third party environmental contractor, Tetra Tech,
21 EC, or Tetra Tech, Jennifer Ghiloni who is at the sign
22 in table. From our cooperating agencies we have Steven
23 Ugoretz from the Wisconsin Department of Natural
24 Resources up front with me.

25 On October 13, 2006, Guardian Pipeline, LLC,

1 filed an application under Section 7 of the Natural Gas
2 Act in Docket No. CP07-8 to construct natural gas
3 facilities, including two new compressor stations, one
4 in Dekalb County, Illinois, and one in Walworth County,
5 Wisconsin and 109.5 miles of new pipeline consisting on
6 83.6 miles of 30-inch diameter and 25.9 miles of 20-inch
7 diameter of pipeline in Wisconsin. Also Guardian would
8 modify its existing Ixonia Meter Station and would
9 construct seven new meter stations along the new
10 pipeline to deliver gas to WE Energies and the Wisconsin
11 Public Service Corporation. The project as originally
12 proposed is covered in more detail in the DEIS.

13 On April 25, 2007, Guardian filed an amendment
14 for a 230-mile long reroute at the northern end of the
15 project in Brown and Outagamie Counties beginning at
16 milepost 95.3 which would bring the new pipeline total
17 length to 118.4 miles. Guardian also proposed to
18 relocate the Sycamore Compressor Station in DeKalb
19 County, Illinois and relocate the Rubicon and Sheboygan
20 Meter Stations in Dodge and Fond du Lac Counties,
21 respectively.

22 The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission will
23 decide if authorization of the Guardian Expansion and
24 Extension Project is in the public convenience and
25 necessity. The Commission itself is composed of five

1 commissioners who are appointed by the President and
2 confirmed by the Senate. One of the commissioners is
3 designated as Chairman, currently Joseph Kelliher.

4 As part of the decision-making process, the
5 Commission must consider the environmental impacts of
6 the project and comply with the National Environmental
7 Policy Act of 1969 as amended, or NEPA. In order to
8 comply with NEPA, we produced the draft EIS, so that the
9 public has an opportunity to review the proposed
10 project.

11 Pursuant to NEPA, a cooperating agency has
12 jurisdiction by law or special expertise related to
13 project-specific environmental impacts, and those
14 agencies that choose to cooperate may adopt the EIS to
15 meet their own obligations for compliance with NEPA if
16 applicable.

17 We issued the DEIS on April 13, 2007, with a
18 closing comment date of May 29, 2007. I do encourage
19 you, if you are not speaking tonight and would like to
20 make a comment, to send in your comments early so that
21 we receive them by May 29th, 2007, or provide your
22 comments on the form that you can give to us this
23 evening or which you can also mail in. You may also
24 file comments electronically and those directions are in
25 the first few pages of the DEIS. We also have a few

1 brochures available at the sign in table entitled, "Your
2 Guide to Electronic Information at FERC", that may be
3 useful.

4 At this time I would like ask Steve to discuss
5 the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources role for a
6 few minutes. Steve?

7 MR. UGORETZ: Thank you, Bob. Well, the
8 Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources are one of the
9 cooperating agencies that Bob referred to. Our
10 jurisdiction is primarily related to wetlands and stream
11 crossings and storm water management and the various
12 fish and wildlife and vegetation and so on.

13 The DNR has to issue permits under Chapter 30 of
14 the Wisconsin Statutes relating to streams and wetlands
15 crossings and those will be issued independently based
16 upon our own review of the applications filed by
17 Guardian the other related actions that the Department
18 get involved in are the -- what FERC refers to as the
19 nonjurisdictional facility. The lateral pipelines that
20 are being proposed that take natural gas to Wisconsin
21 distribution companies and the Department has the same
22 kind of authority and responsibility in regards to those
23 state pipelines and therefore, we have the process of
24 preparing our own assessment that covers the main line
25 project and the lateral projects that will be released

1 probably within a few weeks before the end of May, which
2 we are expecting to have a public hearing on that
3 environmental assessment probably in the Fond du Lac
4 area in mid-June so that's another stage of review that
5 we will be covering on that process for state purposes
6 and the department has also adopted the FERC DEIS and
7 the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin which is the
8 primary regulator for the Wisconsin utility proposed
9 lateral connecting project. We are also working with
10 the PSC to help them prepare their own environmental
11 assessment on the lateral project that we are involved
12 in both the Federal and State related actions as well as
13 having our own.

14 MR. KOPKA: Thanks, Steve. Because the
15 Commission has the responsibility to treat all parties
16 to a proceeding equally, we must make certain that our
17 process is open and in the public. For this reason we
18 at FERC are constrained by what are known as ex parte
19 rules. This means there can be no off-the-record
20 discussions or correspondence between FERC staff and
21 interested parties regarding the merits of this case;
22 therefore, I either urge you to speak tonight on the
23 record or put your comments in writing and file them
24 with the Secretary of the Commission by mail or
25 electronically filed. Again, the directions to do so,

1 are in the first few pages of the DEIS.

2 You may have noticed that we have a court
3 reporter who is transcribing this meeting. This is so
4 we can have an accurate record of tonight's comments.
5 If you would wish to get a copy of the transcript, you
6 can make arrangements with the court reporter after the
7 meeting. The transcript will be available to the public
8 at FERC's public reference room and as part of the
9 record on the FERC website under the project docket
10 number.

11 Let me emphasize that this meeting is not a
12 hearing on the merits of this proposal. It is, as I
13 said earlier, a meeting to give you, the public, an
14 opportunity to comment on our draft EIS. We will
15 address comments on the draft in a final environmental
16 impact statement, which we expect to issue later this
17 year.

18 I will call up individuals to speak in the order
19 listed on the sign up sheet. When you come up to speak
20 at the microphone, please spell your last name for the
21 court reporter and speak slowly and clearly and identify
22 any organization that you may be representing. Let's
23 get started. The first speaker I have is Ruth and Brent
24 Boyd.

25 SPEAKER BOYD: Brent Boyd, BOYD, from the Town

1 of Lebanon and I am Highway Superintendent there and one
2 question I have is if Guardian plans on obtaining all
3 the permits they need for crossing our town highways
4 system.

5 MR. KOPKA: Guardian will have to get permits
6 and you need to talk to them and they will be available
7 after the meeting across the hall, if you want to talk
8 to Guardian. They will have to get permits.

9 SPEAKER BOYD: The second question is when the
10 work is completed, is any of the damage that is done to
11 any of our roads, are they responsible for the damage
12 and how do we -- I guess what do we do at that point to
13 get our money back or if they don't fix the roads with
14 damage that is done by equipment or trucks or at any
15 point or any settling of pipe crosses the road, let's
16 say, two, three, five years from now? What kind of
17 resources do we have for us to make sure that our roads
18 are protected?.

19 MR. KOPKA: Well, I mean some of this issues
20 will be covered with the issuance of permits and that
21 process. I assume you can also be expecting them to
22 repair things that are damaged to good or even a better
23 condition from when they started.

24 SPEAKER BOYD: We do have a highway ordinance
25 that pertains to road work and restoration in the right

1 of ways and I guess I want to make sure you're aware of
2 that and we will be expecting you to fix anything that
3 is damaged.

4 And also just a question not dealing with
5 regards to roads. The public Sanitation District 1 is
6 one area where you are going to cross less than a
7 quarter mile from that area, if there is future
8 expansion of the sewer system can the Sanitation
9 District cross your line with a lateral --

10 MR. KOPKA: Typically, other pipelines like
11 sanitation can cross the pipeline and you would have to
12 contact them so they are better aware of it, contact
13 Guardian.

14 SPEAKER BOYD: Okay. I guess that's all the
15 questions I have for now. I will talk to some of your
16 folks later on in the back.

17 MR. KOPKA: I am with the Federal Energy
18 regulatory commission and I work for them. I'm not with
19 Guardian. That's how things are typically done with
20 other pipelines crossing other pipelines and visa versa.
21 I'm sure Guardian would work with you if that happens.

22 SPEAKER BOYD: Okay.

23 MR. UGORETZ: It's become a disclaimer now but,
24 please, put you cell phones on silence mode.

25 MR. KOPKA: The next speaker is David Bridgham.

1 SPEAKER BRIDGHAM: My name is David Bridgham and
2 I'm representing myself, BRIDGHAM, and these are
3 probably all pretty much comments that were made.

4 I understand you don't work for Guardian which
5 we hear that from a lot of people that we all approach.
6 There is not a lot of people that work for them. I just
7 have a couple questions and concerns, things you
8 probably can't answer things that I do want on the
9 record so FERC can at least look at this and at least
10 realize that there are people that don't want this to
11 happen. I guess that I'm a little concerned of the turn
12 out tonight.

13 Again, and in the paper, The Watertown Times on
14 April 19th the date was misprinted. Apparently, they
15 got the date wrong from Guardian so in the paper and
16 that may be that is one of the reasons why there is not
17 many people here tonight and we might want to look at
18 that because the date was the 17th in a couple of
19 different, you know, media and whether people are going
20 to show up on the 17th and not tonight and there may be
21 comments that are missed that should be heard.

22 I guess I have the -- My first question would be
23 have the permits been issued yet from FERC for this? Is
24 this just a formality that we are here tonight for the
25 permit process?

1 MR. KOPKA: We are here to take comments on the
2 draft. We still have to do a complete final
3 environmental impact statement mailed out to the public
4 and then the Commission would act.

5 SPEAKER BRIDGHAM: Okay. So this isn't a done
6 deal yet?

7 MR. KOPKA: No, this is a process. In addition,
8 there are other permits that will need to be obtained as
9 well.

10 SPEAKER BRIDGHAM: Sure. Okay. I understand
11 that and then you talked about the reroute that was done
12 up in the Indian Reservation and the reason being from
13 my understanding and from things I heard is because the
14 -- They weren't given enough money to go through the
15 Indian Reservation. Is that statement true and if so,
16 if so, this is probably a question you can't answer but
17 if so, then there should be no reason why Guardian
18 pipeline should not have to have a fair compensation as
19 in of there because my land is no different than Indian
20 land. They own theirs and I own mine and, you know, it
21 bothers me that one group of people can say no when
22 another group can't. And I guess that is something that
23 I would be interested in knowing why and what is the
24 reasoning is behind that? I know you don't have that
25 answer and that answer --

1 MR. KOPKA: Guardian has said they did could not
2 come to an agreement.

3 SPEAKER BRIDGHAM: Right, right. So not coming
4 to a agreement that those land owners and not coming to
5 an agreement allowed them to go around and now that
6 means that Guardian Pipeline is willing to -- maybe not
7 willing to, but they pretty much were forced to change
8 the course. There are certainly better courses than for
9 myself and a lot of other land owners that we would
10 like, you know, this same -- the same -- I guess view
11 that they had north of here as, you know, as -- We are
12 all wanting to see fair and just compensation and we all
13 want to see our own. I understand they can't go around
14 everybody but apparently they can go around so --

15 MR. KOPKA: Right, and FERC doesn't get
16 involved.

17 SPEAKER BRIDGHAM: I know this and this is the
18 only place I can go on record.

19 MR. KOPKA: That's fine.

20 SPEAKER BRIDGHAM: People are going to hear this
21 and whether those are people that can do anything about
22 this or people that are listening because standing in my
23 shoes, people don't listen. We are bullied and pushed
24 around and I made the statement earlier tonight and it's
25 true. We are floundering out here. We don't have

1 anybody protecting us. They get to do what they want to
2 do and somebody needs to hear these things that I am up
3 here saying so --

4 MR. KOPKA: That's fine.

5 SPEAKER BRIDGHAM: I know and this is the only
6 stage I have so and -- then fair compensation we will
7 get back to that. There is a lot of -- There is a lot
8 of power companies, whether it is wind, phone, what have
9 you. They compensate on a yearly basis as far residual
10 payments for crossing someone's land and I guess in --
11 You could look at what this company is going to make by
12 running a pipeline across my land and they are going to
13 make a whole ton of money every day that it runs across
14 my land and we should get a piece of that. We should
15 get fair compensation on a yearly basis.

16 There is no reason why, you know, I've heard
17 well, we don't do that. Maybe it is time they look at
18 doing that because again, if -- if we are going to feel
19 okay about this and we understand -- all of us
20 understand it's going to happen and it would be a lot
21 easier to swallow if they start to step up to the plate
22 and do what most other power companies are doing and
23 that is paying people for basically telling us what we
24 can do on our property. So that's another thing I
25 would like to get on the record.

1 Fair compensation for land values now and in the
2 future. I understand and we talked about this a little
3 earlier when Guardian probably set out to look at this,
4 they look at a corridor that has mostly farmers, mostly
5 agricultural land, has -- doesn't have they growth say
6 that Waukesha county does or, you know, or in Oconomowoc
7 or what and look for place to cross which is
8 understandable but I think that we need also look at the
9 fact a hundred years from now the pipeline is still
10 going to be there and a hundred years from now our land
11 is where the neighborhoods and this is where the growth
12 is going. It's not only today but 25, 30, 40, 50, a
13 hundred years from now and we need to look at the effect
14 of that pipeline on all of the land owners that are
15 effected by this.

16 And then lastly, I guess this is what my wife
17 told me tonight to voice her opinion and I have a brand
18 new son, four and a half months old and his bedroom sits
19 200 feet from where this pipeline is and I just want to
20 know if all the fathers and mothers or whoever if they
21 would be comfortable with that? Okay. That's it.
22 Thank you.

23 MR. KOPKA: Thank you. The next speaker is
24 James Kulkee.

25 SPEAKER KULKEE: My name is James Kulkee and it

1 is spelled, KULKEE, and I guess they said it was
2 supposed -- They were going to talk about environment
3 tonight and, you know, sticking a pipeline through a
4 guy's farm, family farm for 52 years and just to see
5 that pipeline go through it, it is something that
6 doesn't seem right. It has just taken something away
7 that I worked for my whole life and, you know, I got
8 tile lines in there that are old, hand-dug clay tiles
9 yet and they work. What is going to happen to them?
10 You are going to run a bulldozer across them. Well, we
11 know what is going to happen and it is not just going to
12 break up that 50 feet that they dig up, it's going to be
13 110 feet, you know, I've asked Guardian about this. And
14 another thing is water will follow this pipeline and
15 it's going to follow it. We live in a drum land area
16 and it's going to follow that pipe down these hills
17 wherever it ends up, lowest part we are going to have a
18 mess. That's what has to be taken care of and I asked
19 Guardian a couple times and one guy says, we will fix
20 that right away -- pipeline are tile and another one
21 says, we have a company that comes in after we close it
22 up, they come in and fix it.

23 Like I said, I don't know where these tile lines
24 are. I bought this land and it was all tiled and one
25 place they figured they were going to cross between six

1 and eight tile lines.

2 I'm going to have a mess and who is going to pay
3 me for that? I'm going to have to spend my time fixing
4 this. They just finished fixing a tile in there last
5 month. It was a relative of mine so that's why I know
6 who it was and if this is going to take four years, that
7 isn't right. I shouldn't have to work with that for
8 four years and I says why don't you lay this pipeline
9 down in the lower ground? They say that the DNR says we
10 can't work with them because they are too hard to work
11 for. I mean, that lower ground will heal itself a lot
12 faster than farm fields will.

13 I mean, with the technology now a days as far as
14 laying pipe, it should be no problem, two years time you
15 shouldn't even know that the pipelines are in that --
16 that wetlands and I think my farm is worth more than a
17 bunch of frogs or something. They might damage some
18 frog area or something so and then what is I guess -- I
19 don't know starting time. It would help if there would
20 be a specific starting time and a specific start date,
21 like say, next week we are going to be in your area to
22 dig and we have, I guess, other ground -- and other
23 ground I could take the crop off before they got there
24 and the reason I'm saying this stuff now is so it gets
25 on the record and well, help to know what end they are

1 going to start on or if they are going to start on both
2 ends or you know, some of these things. And like I
3 said, farming is part of the environment so I think that
4 should be considered. That's all I got.

5 MR. KOPKA: Thank you. The next speaker is
6 Harold Pemble.

7 SPEAKER PEMBLE: My name is Harold Pemble,
8 PEMBLE. I would like to say on the record that I object
9 to the distance that they going from my house. I picked
10 up that it must be common to go approximately 200 feet
11 from my personal residence and I don't think that's
12 right. I didn't request them to come put it 200 feet
13 from my house and I requested that they move it farther
14 away. I told them I didn't want to stop their pipeline,
15 but I requested that they move it farther to the west
16 and they refused because of the gentleman up there on
17 the -- my left, the DNR, had put the fear of God into
18 Guardian. They don't want it anywhere near wetlands but
19 closer to my house and I don't feel that's right. I am
20 not personally not that afraid of dying that I can't
21 live there but I think it's going to effect the resale
22 on that property to have that high-pressured gas line to
23 that close to the bedroom and it's not right.

24 And the other thing is that I'm not even sure of
25 if I have any drain tile to my field and if there are, I

1 don't know where they are. That's all I have. Thank
2 you.

3 MR. KOPKA: Thank you. Our next speaker is Ray
4 Werth.

5 SPEAKER WERTH: My name is Ray Werth, WERTH.
6 And they brought up some points about Guardian, who is
7 responsible for regulating what Guardian does as far as,
8 you know, where they go and what they all do and follow
9 up on that is also the compensation that we get. There
10 seems to be different compensations for what they are
11 offering people so who does regulate Guardian?

12 MR. KOPKA: FERC regulates Guardian along with
13 several other agencies and, you know, with depending on
14 what the laws are and the agencies they are applying to
15 the project when it comes to compensation is up to the
16 individuals to negotiate with Guardian so you can come
17 to an agreement.

18 SPEAKER WERTH: I was made an offer on it and I
19 did call our county and what they pay for right of way
20 when they go across people's land and they pay out a
21 whole lot more than what Guardian is even offering and
22 they don't take Guardian -- the fellow said they don't
23 take into consideration future use of the land. My land
24 adjoins the sewer district in the Village of Lebanon and
25 it's not in the Village right now but in the future it

1 could be and they say that doesn't make any difference
2 so how can I go about working with someone like that
3 with Guardian without any recourse?

4 MR. KOPKA: That's up to you to negotiate an
5 agreement or if it goes to condemnation then the courts
6 would decide. We don't have the authority to do that.

7 SPEAKER PEMBLE: Thank you.

8 MR. KOPKA: Ray was our last speaker. Is there
9 anyone else who would like to speak this evening?
10 Ma'am, please state your name and spell your last name
11 for the court reporter.

12 SPEAKER ULATOWSKI: Carol Ulatowski, ULATOWSKI.
13 Now, my question is probably for the DNR, for Steve.
14 They are coming east across the Rock River is that
15 right? And then they are going through wetlands and
16 Guardian wouldn't move the pipeline because -- 200 feet
17 from that man's house because of the wetlands. Well,
18 when they come east across the Rock River that is
19 hundreds and hundreds of acres of wetland. I can see it
20 from my kitchen and it looks like Lake Erie in the
21 spring and it's just now first dissipating, also right
22 next to us is our neighbor's land and it is the same
23 thing, coming right -- right there and down through our
24 land and then they with a question is, how can you tell
25 them that can't go through all that wetland and not go

1 away from that -- 200 feet from that man's house. If he
2 has wetland next to his house or further away from his
3 house, Guardian could go through that too. I don't
4 think it's because of frogs or anything like that. I
5 don't think we have anything real rare around our area.
6 Who can answer that?

7 MR. UGORETZ: Probably the best way I can answer
8 that is that Guardian and just about anybody else who
9 wants to cross streams and wetlands has to go through
10 the permitting process with the DNR and has to meet the
11 standards to protect the water bodies, the vegetation,
12 the wildlife, and so on and that's a fairly rigorous
13 review process and they have to meet standards and when
14 you talk about crossing a river, obviously at some point
15 or another if you are drawing a straight line across the
16 state, you hit river and have to cross it at one point
17 or another and generally, what they have to determine
18 is that basically no practical alternative to
19 crossing it and so basically that method that they are
20 proposing is least likely to be environmentally
21 damaging.

22 Again, those are standards that are set in place
23 by state law and also in accordance with Federal Water
24 Quality Laws to protect those resources of the state so
25 they have to meet those standards in order to do those

1 things and if they are boring under a stream as I
2 understand they are proposing for the Rock River, they
3 are not physically altering the stream. They are going
4 underneath it and permits are not required for that.
5 Obviously, when they emerge on the other side if they
6 are crossing wetlands or putting their drilling
7 operations within the wetlands, they still need to have
8 permits and again, those would not be granted unless
9 they met the standards that apply and they have provided
10 convincing evidence that there wouldn't be long term
11 harm. We cannot balance those potential impacts on --
12 against the impact of putting the pipeline in another
13 area. That's not our job.

14 It's more have to say it's FERC and the PSC and
15 the state has that broader public interest and balancing
16 test of being able to measure out the environmental harm
17 to natural resource elements versus potential harm to
18 the human aspects of the environment but, you know, in
19 the case of the Department, our authorities are limited
20 to those particular standards to effect wetlands, water
21 bodies and other natural resource.

22 SPEAKER ULATOWSKI: The Rock River, I'm telling
23 you is hundreds of acres that looks like a lake. What
24 happens when that pipe is wrapped with that electricity,
25 whatever they do to keep it electrified, to keep it from

1 rusting, I was under the assumption water is a conductor
2 so what happens to all that area is that all
3 electrified?

4 MR. UGORETZ: I'm not an engineer and I can't
5 speak to that aspect of it. I don't know if one of the
6 people from the company can answer that.

7 MR. KOPKA: I'm not a total expert but the pipe
8 has a coating that protects it from contact from soil.

9 SPEAKER ULATOWSKI: How come we don't get a
10 shock?

11 MR. KOPKA: It's not that great of a charge.
12 It's a very small charge and it's the same process of
13 causing rust on any iron.

14 SPEAKER ULATOWSKI: Okay. Thank you.

15 MR. KOPKA: Are there any other folks who would
16 like to speak tonight?

17 SPEAKER BRIDGHAM: David Bridgham up again. You
18 mentioned, the DNR mentioned the process was very
19 rigorous crossing wetlands or having anything to do with
20 wetlands, frogs, turtles, snails. How much more
21 rigorous is that? I mean, I keep on hearing the DNR
22 wins battles when it comes to wetlands but what about
23 human life? You know, it is running across my life and
24 it doesn't seem like it's as rigorous. Do you know what
25 I'm saying? Maybe you need -- We need you on our side.

1 you seem to get a lot further than we do.

2 MR. KOPKA: Well, the DNR doesn't regulate the
3 pipeline safety. The US Department of Transportation
4 regulates the pipeline. Guardian will have to meet
5 safety standards related to the pipeline.

6 SPEAKER BRIDGHAM: But as far as where the
7 pipeline gets to go. The DNR seems to have a pretty
8 good -- I mean, they can say yes or not a lot easier
9 than I can and I -- I can't say no. I just stand up
10 here pleading my case with you and I just heard him say
11 that they have a reason that it ends up being directed
12 in certain areas is because of the rigorous process
13 involved in getting to go through those wetlands and
14 crossing some of these areas that the DNR has
15 jurisdiction over that. I guess I'm looking if it
16 wasn't for us, we wouldn't have the DNR so they should
17 protects us I guess what I'm saying is, you know, when
18 come us done to do my life I'm a hell of a more
19 important than a damn frog in my pond so the rigorous
20 process should be on our side more than it is for the
21 frogs or turtles and the raccoons or whatever that is I
22 guess that's what I'm saying. It doesn't make sense to
23 me.

24 MR. UGORETZ: That's really, obviously not the
25 kind of question you can answer in --

1 SPEAKER BRIDGHAM: It's more of a statement and
2 I am not getting an answer. It's just, you know, I hear
3 your side and I understand your side I hear Guardian's
4 side and it doesn't make sense to me that they can just
5 do whatever. It actually comes down to we need the type
6 of government that watches out for the birds and the
7 wildlife and -- I have a pond on my land I do that
8 because I hunt for ducks and want to attract ducks and I
9 like stuff like that, you know, I do that but it sounds
10 to me like the DNR is a lot more protective of those
11 species than they are of myself and Jim and Dean and all
12 these guys that stood up this microphone because we are
13 being effected also I guess that it's more of the same.

14 MR. UGORETZ: I understand your concern and the
15 only -- I think the best response to that is that the
16 government is divided up into a whole series of
17 different agencies with whole different responsibilities
18 and the DNR has the responsibility of looking at the
19 natural resource elements and we also have a regulatory
20 side where we regulate air pollution and water pollution
21 and so on and if you are talking about waste and water
22 treatment plants or, you know, power plants or something
23 like that. I don't think anybody would want the DNR to
24 be the managing agency telling every other agency in the
25 state what to do. We have a balance. That's just kind

1 of America 101.

2 SPEAKER BRIDGHAM: I understand that. The DNR
3 protects the wetlands throughout the state and you have
4 one agency that does that. When it comes down to my
5 land or anybody else's land, we have FERC and we have
6 all of these other agencies and what I hear and what I
7 heard at all of these meetings seems like -- Even
8 tonight, I heard this and it is nothing against what you
9 are doing up here but, you know, a question is asked
10 well, we don't involved in that. We are not the agency
11 that controls that. There is somebody else and somebody
12 else and somebody else and, you know, we are all sitting
13 here with this thing rolling through our land it is
14 bulldozed over and that is what it feels like and all we
15 hear is well that's, you know, that's this particular
16 group or that particular group and we, you know, even
17 our -- our -- our State Senator, his office called one
18 us on the phone and said, they are powerful and they are
19 this, and this pipeline, and FERC and they are powerful
20 and that is the answer we got.

21 All we can do is come here and just reiterate
22 how unhappy we are and how we are feeling like we are
23 taken advantage of and this is all we have so I guess
24 what I don't want to hear is that's somebody else's
25 division to take care of that. I want to hear, you know

1 what, you are making sense and we will work at solving
2 some issues.

3 I mean, that's what everybody in the room wants
4 to hear, not that that it is someone else or well, it's
5 in the book. This group, that group get the best deal
6 that you can. That's what we live with. I mean, this
7 is what we are being told and I know I'm going back
8 over, over, over these things all I want to hear is, we
9 -- We are hearing you and we are going to go back and
10 fight for you because the people across the way here are
11 good people. I know. I talked to a lot of them and
12 they are nice people, you know, but they work for
13 guardian. I want the government, the people that I
14 elected and that make those choices are really looking
15 at these things and are really saying what makes sense
16 for these people their land values, things that make
17 sense. We are just the -- just -- It's not feeling
18 right and we need to hear that we are represented -- We
19 are being represented. Okay. Thank you.

20 MR. KOPKA: One more.

21 SPEAKER ULAKOWSKI: Who does regulate them? Who
22 can we you call if they don't do something right?

23 MR. KOPKA: Well, that depends on what your
24 issues are.

25 SPEAKER ULAKOWSKI: No. No. If they are coming

1 through my land and they are doing something wrong that
2 they aren't supposed to do, who can I call?

3 MR. KOPKA: You can call FERC, that's fine. I
4 think as it gets closer to construction Guardian will
5 have to give you a hot line number so that if something
6 is going wrong you can call that hot line and there is a
7 FERC hot line number and we can look into the issue also
8 during construction I will be there.

9 SPEAKER ULAKOWSKI: In a timely manner?

10 MR. KOPKA: Well, depends on what the problem
11 is. Typically right on and we want to take care of it
12 as quickly as possible.

13 SPEAKER ULAKOWSKI: Okay.

14 MR. KOPKA: During construction I will be out
15 there during construction and doing inspections and I
16 will also have contractors out there during construction
17 for me as well plus we will also have our own
18 environmental people trying to keep the folks building
19 the pipeline keep them make sure they are doing
20 everything exactly how they are supposed to be building
21 the pipeline keep own right of way that sort of thing
22 restores wetlands property.

23 SPEAKER ULAKOWSKI: Is there anyone we can call
24 and tell them we don't want the pipeline?

25 MR. KOPKA: You just did it.

1 SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you.

2 MR. KOPKA: You're welcome. Anyone else? Thank
3 you all for coming tonight. Let the record show this
4 meeting is now concluded at 8:02 p.m.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF WISCONSIN)
2) ss.
3 COUNTY OF MILWAUKEE)
4

5 I, Amy K. Wallow, a Notary Public in and
6 for the County of Milwaukee, do hereby certify that the
7 above meeting was recorded stenographically by me and
8 was reduced to typewriting under my personal direction;
9 and that the foregoing transcript of the said meeting is
10 a true and correct transcript of the testimony given by
11 the said witnesses at the time and place previously
12 specified.

13 I further certify that I am not of
14 counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties in
15 the foregoing proceeding and caption named, or in any
16 way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said
17 caption.

18 In witness whereof, I have hereunto set
19 my hand and affixed my seal this 20th Day of May, 2007.

20 _____
21 Amy K. Wallow

22
23
24
25