## In The Matter Of:

# LIVINGSTON COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

January 26, 2015

Area Wide Reporting and Video Conferencing www.areawide.net scheduling@areawide.net 301 W. White Street Champaign, IL 61820

> Original File 0126HRG2.txt Min-U-Script® with Word Index

			January 26, 2015
L*47	47*L* Page 1552		Page 1554
1	LIVINGSTON COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS	1	(Commencing at 6:48 p.m.)
2	CASE SU-7-14 PLEASANT RIDGE WIND ENERGY PROJECT		
3	January 26, 2015	2	<b>MR. SCHOPP:</b> I'm going to go ahead and
4	6:30 PM Pontiac Township High School		call roll call. Our acting chairman was involved in
5	Pontiac, Illinois		a little bit of an accident on the way over here
6	BOARD MEMBERS Michael Cornale, Acting Chair		this evening, so he's running late. And other
-	John Vitzthum		members may be running a little late too, so we're
7	Joan Huisman Diana Iverson	7	going to kind of work this out as we go along.
8	Tom Blakeman, Attorney for Zoning Board of Appeals	8	So this is the January 26, 2015,
9	Charles T. Schopp, Administrator Livingston County Regional Planning Commission	9	continuation hearing of the Livingston County Zoning
10	112 W. Madison Street Pontiac, IL 61764	10	Board of Appeals review of Livingston County Zoning
11	James R. Griffin	11	Case SU-7-14, Pleasant Ridge Energy, LLC, Pleasant
12	Attorney for Livingston County Schain, Banks, Kenny & Schwartz	12	Ridge Wind Energy project.
13	70 W. Madison Street, Suite 5300 Chicago, IL 60602	13	Our roll call is Michael Cornale. John
14	312.345.5700	14	Vitzthum.
15	Appearing For Applicant/Invenergy:	15	MR. VITZTHUM: Here.
16	Michael S. Blazer Attorney_at Law	16	<b>MR. SCHOPP:</b> Rich Kiefer. Diana Iverson.
17	Jeep & Blazer, LLC 24 North Hillside Avenue, Suite A	17	MS. IVERSON: Here.
18	Hillside, IL 60162 708.236.0830	18	<b>MR. SCHOPP:</b> Howard Zimmerman. Joan
19	mblazer@enviroatty.com	_	Huisman. And Gibs Nielsen.
20	Appearing for United Citizens of Livingston County: Phillip A. Luetkehans	20	<b>MR. BLAKEMAN:</b> Okay, I want to make a
21	Attorney at Law Schirott, Luetkehans & Garner, LLC		brief announcement just so we're clear. The ZBA may
	105 E. Irving Park Road		conduct public hearings without a quorum being
22	Itasca, IL 60143 630.760.4601		
23	pluetkehans@slg-atty.com		present. Holding a public meeting such as what
24		24	we're doing tonight does not constitute action by
	Page 1553		Page 1555
1	Page 1553 INDEX OF EXAMINATION		Page 1555
1	•		the board, so that's one reason we're going to go
	INDEX OF EXAMINATION	2	the board, so that's one reason we're going to go forward. And we have a witness who has come from
2 3	INDEX OF EXAMINATION Page MR. AARON GRUEN PRESENTATION	2 3	the board, so that's one reason we're going to go forward. And we have a witness who has come from some distance. Mr. Luetkehans, are you ready to
2 3 4	INDEX OF EXAMINATION Page MR. AARON GRUEN PRESENTATION	2 3	the board, so that's one reason we're going to go forward. And we have a witness who has come from some distance. Mr. Luetkehans, are you ready to proceed?
2 3 4 5	INDEX OF EXAMINATION Page MR. AARON GRUEN PRESENTATION	2 3 4 5	the board, so that's one reason we're going to go forward. And we have a witness who has come from some distance. Mr. Luetkehans, are you ready to proceed? MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6	INDEX OF EXAMINATION Page MR. AARON GRUEN PRESENTATION	2 3 4 5 6	the board, so that's one reason we're going to go forward. And we have a witness who has come from some distance. Mr. Luetkehans, are you ready to proceed? MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes. MR. BLAKEMAN: Do you want to call your
2 3 4 5 6 7	INDEX OF EXAMINATION Page MR. AARON GRUEN PRESENTATION	2 3 4 5 6	the board, so that's one reason we're going to go forward. And we have a witness who has come from some distance. Mr. Luetkehans, are you ready to proceed? MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes. MR. BLAKEMAN: Do you want to call your witness?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	INDEX OF EXAMINATION Page MR. AARON GRUEN PRESENTATION	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the board, so that's one reason we're going to go forward. And we have a witness who has come from some distance. Mr. Luetkehans, are you ready to proceed? MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes. MR. BLAKEMAN: Do you want to call your witness? MR. LUETKEHANS: We would call Aaron,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	INDEX OF EXAMINATION Page MR. AARON GRUEN PRESENTATION	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the board, so that's one reason we're going to go forward. And we have a witness who has come from some distance. Mr. Luetkehans, are you ready to proceed? MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes. MR. BLAKEMAN: Do you want to call your witness? MR. LUETKEHANS: We would call Aaron, Gruen, G-R-U-E-N, to the stand. At this time, we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	INDEX OF EXAMINATION Page MR. AARON GRUEN PRESENTATION	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the board, so that's one reason we're going to go forward. And we have a witness who has come from some distance. Mr. Luetkehans, are you ready to proceed? MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes. MR. BLAKEMAN: Do you want to call your witness? MR. LUETKEHANS: We would call Aaron, Gruen, G-R-U-E-N, to the stand. At this time, we also have UCLC Exhibit 60, 61 and 62 to hand out.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	INDEX OF EXAMINATION Page MR. AARON GRUEN PRESENTATION	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the board, so that's one reason we're going to go forward. And we have a witness who has come from some distance. Mr. Luetkehans, are you ready to proceed? MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes. MR. BLAKEMAN: Do you want to call your witness? MR. LUETKEHANS: We would call Aaron, Gruen, G-R-U-E-N, to the stand. At this time, we also have UCLC Exhibit 60, 61 and 62 to hand out. (Mr. Aaron Gruen was duly sworn.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	INDEX OF EXAMINATION Page MR. AARON GRUEN PRESENTATION	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the board, so that's one reason we're going to go forward. And we have a witness who has come from some distance. Mr. Luetkehans, are you ready to proceed? MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes. MR. BLAKEMAN: Do you want to call your witness? MR. LUETKEHANS: We would call Aaron, Gruen, G-R-U-E-N, to the stand. At this time, we also have UCLC Exhibit 60, 61 and 62 to hand out.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	INDEX OF EXAMINATION Page MR. AARON GRUEN PRESENTATION	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the board, so that's one reason we're going to go forward. And we have a witness who has come from some distance. Mr. Luetkehans, are you ready to proceed? MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes. MR. BLAKEMAN: Do you want to call your witness? MR. LUETKEHANS: We would call Aaron, Gruen, G-R-U-E-N, to the stand. At this time, we also have UCLC Exhibit 60, 61 and 62 to hand out. (Mr. Aaron Gruen was duly sworn.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	INDEX OF EXAMINATION Page MR. AARON GRUEN PRESENTATION	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the board, so that's one reason we're going to go forward. And we have a witness who has come from some distance. Mr. Luetkehans, are you ready to proceed? MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes. MR. BLAKEMAN: Do you want to call your witness? MR. LUETKEHANS: We would call Aaron, Gruen, G-R-U-E-N, to the stand. At this time, we also have UCLC Exhibit 60, 61 and 62 to hand out. (Mr. Aaron Gruen was duly sworn.) MR. LUETKEHANS: Mr. Gruen, you may
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	INDEX OF EXAMINATION Page MR. AARON GRUEN PRESENTATION	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the board, so that's one reason we're going to go forward. And we have a witness who has come from some distance. Mr. Luetkehans, are you ready to proceed? MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes. MR. BLAKEMAN: Do you want to call your witness? MR. LUETKEHANS: We would call Aaron, Gruen, G-R-U-E-N, to the stand. At this time, we also have UCLC Exhibit 60, 61 and 62 to hand out. (Mr. Aaron Gruen was duly sworn.) MR. LUETKEHANS: Mr. Gruen, you may proceed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	INDEX OF EXAMINATION Page MR. AARON GRUEN PRESENTATION	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the board, so that's one reason we're going to go forward. And we have a witness who has come from some distance. Mr. Luetkehans, are you ready to proceed? MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes. MR. BLAKEMAN: Do you want to call your witness? MR. LUETKEHANS: We would call Aaron, Gruen, G-R-U-E-N, to the stand. At this time, we also have UCLC Exhibit 60, 61 and 62 to hand out. (Mr. Aaron Gruen was duly sworn.) MR. LUETKEHANS: Mr. Gruen, you may proceed. MR. GRUEN: Thank you. My name is Aaron Gruen. Since 1991, I've been a principal with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	INDEX OF EXAMINATION Page MR. AARON GRUEN PRESENTATION	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the board, so that's one reason we're going to go forward. And we have a witness who has come from some distance. Mr. Luetkehans, are you ready to proceed? MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes. MR. BLAKEMAN: Do you want to call your witness? MR. LUETKEHANS: We would call Aaron, Gruen, G-R-U-E-N, to the stand. At this time, we also have UCLC Exhibit 60, 61 and 62 to hand out. (Mr. Aaron Gruen was duly sworn.) MR. LUETKEHANS: Mr. Gruen, you may proceed. MR. GRUEN: Thank you. My name is Aaron Gruen. Since 1991, I've been a principal with the urban economics, market research and land use policy
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	INDEX OF EXAMINATION Page MR. AARON GRUEN PRESENTATION	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the board, so that's one reason we're going to go forward. And we have a witness who has come from some distance. Mr. Luetkehans, are you ready to proceed? MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes. MR. BLAKEMAN: Do you want to call your witness? MR. LUETKEHANS: We would call Aaron, Gruen, G-R-U-E-N, to the stand. At this time, we also have UCLC Exhibit 60, 61 and 62 to hand out. (Mr. Aaron Gruen was duly sworn.) MR. LUETKEHANS: Mr. Gruen, you may proceed. MR. GRUEN: Thank you. My name is Aaron Gruen. Since 1991, I've been a principal with the urban economics, market research and land use policy research and consulting firm Gruen Gruen +
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	INDEX OF EXAMINATION Page MR. AARON GRUEN PRESENTATION	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the board, so that's one reason we're going to go forward. And we have a witness who has come from some distance. Mr. Luetkehans, are you ready to proceed? MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes. MR. BLAKEMAN: Do you want to call your witness? MR. LUETKEHANS: We would call Aaron, Gruen, G-R-U-E-N, to the stand. At this time, we also have UCLC Exhibit 60, 61 and 62 to hand out. (Mr. Aaron Gruen was duly sworn.) MR. LUETKEHANS: Mr. Gruen, you may proceed. MR. GRUEN: Thank you. My name is Aaron Gruen. Since 1991, I've been a principal with the urban economics, market research and land use policy research and consulting firm Gruen Gruen + Associates. The firm was founded in 1970
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	INDEX OF EXAMINATION Page MR. AARON GRUEN PRESENTATION	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the board, so that's one reason we're going to go forward. And we have a witness who has come from some distance. Mr. Luetkehans, are you ready to proceed? MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes. MR. BLAKEMAN: Do you want to call your witness? MR. LUETKEHANS: We would call Aaron, Gruen, G-R-U-E-N, to the stand. At this time, we also have UCLC Exhibit 60, 61 and 62 to hand out. (Mr. Aaron Gruen was duly sworn.) MR. LUETKEHANS: Mr. Gruen, you may proceed. MR. GRUEN: Thank you. My name is Aaron Gruen. Since 1991, I've been a principal with the urban economics, market research and land use policy research and consulting firm Gruen Gruen + Associates. The firm was founded in 1970 MR. LUETKEHANS: You have to get a little
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	INDEX OF EXAMINATION Page MR. AARON GRUEN PRESENTATION	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the board, so that's one reason we're going to go forward. And we have a witness who has come from some distance. Mr. Luetkehans, are you ready to proceed? MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes. MR. BLAKEMAN: Do you want to call your witness? MR. LUETKEHANS: We would call Aaron, Gruen, G-R-U-E-N, to the stand. At this time, we also have UCLC Exhibit 60, 61 and 62 to hand out. (Mr. Aaron Gruen was duly sworn.) MR. LUETKEHANS: Mr. Gruen, you may proceed. MR. GRUEN: Thank you. My name is Aaron Gruen. Since 1991, I've been a principal with the urban economics, market research and land use policy research and consulting firm Gruen Gruen + Associates. The firm was founded in 1970 MR. LUETKEHANS: You have to get a little closer.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	INDEX OF EXAMINATION Page MR. AARON GRUEN PRESENTATION	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the board, so that's one reason we're going to go forward. And we have a witness who has come from some distance. Mr. Luetkehans, are you ready to proceed? MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes. MR. BLAKEMAN: Do you want to call your witness? MR. LUETKEHANS: We would call Aaron, Gruen, G-R-U-E-N, to the stand. At this time, we also have UCLC Exhibit 60, 61 and 62 to hand out. (Mr. Aaron Gruen was duly sworn.) MR. LUETKEHANS: Mr. Gruen, you may proceed. MR. GRUEN: Thank you. My name is Aaron Gruen. Since 1991, I've been a principal with the urban economics, market research and land use policy research and consulting firm Gruen Gruen + Associates. The firm was founded in 1970 MR. LUETKEHANS: You have to get a little closer. MR. GRUEN: and has offices in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	INDEX OF EXAMINATION Page MR. AARON GRUEN PRESENTATION	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the board, so that's one reason we're going to go forward. And we have a witness who has come from some distance. Mr. Luetkehans, are you ready to proceed? MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes. MR. BLAKEMAN: Do you want to call your witness? MR. LUETKEHANS: We would call Aaron, Gruen, G-R-U-E-N, to the stand. At this time, we also have UCLC Exhibit 60, 61 and 62 to hand out. (Mr. Aaron Gruen was duly sworn.) MR. LUETKEHANS: Mr. Gruen, you may proceed. MR. GRUEN: Thank you. My name is Aaron Gruen. Since 1991, I've been a principal with the urban economics, market research and land use policy research and consulting firm Gruen Gruen + Associates. The firm was founded in 1970 MR. LUETKEHANS: You have to get a little closer. MR. GRUEN: and has offices in Deerfield and San Francisco. For public sector and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	INDEX OF EXAMINATION Page MR. AARON GRUEN PRESENTATION	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the board, so that's one reason we're going to go forward. And we have a witness who has come from some distance. Mr. Luetkehans, are you ready to proceed? MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes. MR. BLAKEMAN: Do you want to call your witness? MR. LUETKEHANS: We would call Aaron, Gruen, G-R-U-E-N, to the stand. At this time, we also have UCLC Exhibit 60, 61 and 62 to hand out. (Mr. Aaron Gruen was duly sworn.) MR. LUETKEHANS: Mr. Gruen, you may proceed. MR. GRUEN: Thank you. My name is Aaron Gruen. Since 1991, I've been a principal with the urban economics, market research and land use policy research and consulting firm Gruen Gruen + Associates. The firm was founded in 1970 MR. LUETKEHANS: You have to get a little closer. MR. GRUEN: and has offices in Deerfield and San Francisco. For public sector and private sector clients, the firm conducts market,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	INDEX OF EXAMINATION Page MR. AARON GRUEN PRESENTATION	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the board, so that's one reason we're going to go forward. And we have a witness who has come from some distance. Mr. Luetkehans, are you ready to proceed? MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes. MR. BLAKEMAN: Do you want to call your witness? MR. LUETKEHANS: We would call Aaron, Gruen, G-R-U-E-N, to the stand. At this time, we also have UCLC Exhibit 60, 61 and 62 to hand out. (Mr. Aaron Gruen was duly sworn.) MR. LUETKEHANS: Mr. Gruen, you may proceed. MR. GRUEN: Thank you. My name is Aaron Gruen. Since 1991, I've been a principal with the urban economics, market research and land use policy research and consulting firm Gruen Gruen + Associates. The firm was founded in 1970 MR. LUETKEHANS: You have to get a little closer. MR. GRUEN: and has offices in Deerfield and San Francisco. For public sector and

		January 26, 20
	Page 1556	Page 155
2 cli 3 in 4 an 5 cc 6 re 7 D 8 ph 9 hi 0 of 1 ev 2 ac 3 an 4 ho 5 te 6 ur 7 n 8 as 9 n 9 hi 9 ac 1 ev 1 ev 2 ac 3 an 4 ho 5 te 6 re 9 hi 9 hi 1 ev 1 ev 1 ev 1 ev 1 ev 2 ac 3 an 4 ho 6 re 9 hi 1 ev 1 ev 2 ac 3 an 4 ho 8 as 9 hi 9 hi 1 ev 1	esearch and analysis. Our work emphasizes helping lients make beneficial land use, real estate westment and development and economic development and public policy decisions. I have led or contributed to many economic impact studies and eviews of studies, including the impacts of the puPage Airport, the closing of the Motorola cell hone factory in Harvard, and the construction of ighway interchanges in Kane County. Other examples f studies the firm and/or I have conducted or valuated relate to the impacts of manufacturing ctivities, corporate headquarters, retail, office and industrial space developments, residential and otel developments, auto malls, science and echnology developments, hospitals, and colleges and niversities, power plants, and other afrastructure. As I hope the range of example past ssignments suggests, Gruen Gruen + Associates is ot dependent upon a single land use or beholden to single industry and has established a reputation	<ol> <li>industries or businesses. In addition to these</li> <li>indirect or spillover effects, indirect impacts also</li> <li>include what is sometimes referred to as induced</li> <li>impacts, or the impacts of increased household</li> <li>spending, that result from the creation of</li> <li>additional jobs and income.</li> <li>The wind energy model Loomis uses,</li> <li>however, to present the impacts does not follow</li> <li>standard, generally accepted convention for</li> <li>presentation of direct versus indirect impacts. It</li> <li>should be noted that the Loomis report on the</li> <li>postulated economic impacts of the proposed wind</li> <li>energy development does not comprehensively portray</li> <li>impacts that the proposed development may induce</li> <li>If the project is not feasible to develop and</li> <li>operate, none of the projected positive economic</li> <li>impacts will occur, and yet no showing of</li> <li>Keep in mind that economic impacts are</li> <li>effects on the level of economic activity in a given</li> </ol>
21 fo 22 23 In	or independent objective research and analysis. I believe the report entitled the Economic npact of the Pleasant Ridge Wind Energy Project by br. Loomis should not be relied upon because it does	<ul> <li>21 area. In this case, the relevant area is Livingston</li> <li>22 County and not the state of Illinois as a whole.</li> <li>23 Livingston County is the area in which the project</li> <li>24 would be sited and that would bear the burden of the</li> </ul>
	-	
	Page 1557	Page 155
2 an 3 pr 4 be 5 in 6 7 Di 8 th 9 in 10 ec 11 in 12 ec 13 en 14 wi 15 ec	Page 1557 ot disclose essential information, is misleading, nd overstates the potential economic impacts of the roposed development. The proposed development will e unlikely to generate significant ongoing economic npacts within Livingston County. In the very first paragraph of the report br. Loomis provided, Loomis states, "The basis of his analysis is the study of direct, indirect and nduced impacts on job creation, wages and total conomic output." This is a standard purpose of npact analysis. Direct and indirect and induced conomic impacts are widely presented in terms of mployment added, labor income or wages associated with the added jobs, and economic output, which is conomic jargon for the value of all goods and ervices produced or sold. Now, indirect impacts, sometimes referred	Page 155 1 use. And, according to the Loomis report, the labor 2 would be primarily drawn from within the county, 3 which, however, is not likely to be the case for 4 reasons I will explain. 5 Economic impacts do not measure the 6 valuation of changes in amenity or qualify-of-life 7 factors, such as health, safety, recreation, air and 8 noise quality, or view amenities, reductions in the 9 quality and quantity of which can work to reduce the 10 economic vitality of a place. The Loomis report 11 does not address changes in such factors that the 12 proposed wind energy development may induce. 13 Nor do economic impacts measure fiscal 14 impacts. For example, a proposed wind energy 15 development will increase the demand for public 16 services, but the cost to provide these services are 17 not considered in the Loomis analysis. Nor does th

			January 20, 2015
	Page 1560		Page 1562
	has not identified a power purchase agreement with a	1	induced effects or, in other words, the effects of
	2 creditworthy buyer for the power.		the personal consumption expenditures made by
			workers and their households. The direct and
	· · ·		indirect effects of construction activity, however,
	author refers to limited wind energy developments		•
	5 because of the, quote, uncertainty surrounding wind		are not separately presented. Multipliers are not
	5 energy policy, end quote. While the report does not	6	
	7 provide further information, I believe Dr. Loomis is		Loomis report, although, as I noted, that was the
	referring to certain federal tax credits and other	8	claimed purpose of the report.
	incentives that have expired or are in danger of not	9	5
	being renewed. In the absence of such federal		impacts associated with on-site construction
1:	L incentives, most alternative energy developments are	11	activity. The economic impacts from purchasing the
1:	2 not financially feasible at this time. In addition,	12	wind turbines and related equipment are reported in
1:	the economic impacts predicted by Dr. Loomis are	13	combination with other indirect supply chain
14	a not are likely to be misleading and overstated	14	impacts, and the sum of these is described in the
1!	5 for reasons I will explain next.	15	Loomis report as, quote, turbine supply chain
10	5 Key inputs of the impact model were not		impacts or, quote, indirect impacts. The impacts as
1			reported in the Loomis report do not allow for a
18			multiplier ratio of direct to indirect economic
	• that will be coming from within Livingston County,		impacts to be calculated.
	were apparently supplied by the developer, the	20	
	sponsor of the proposed project who commissioned the		obtained from GE, but GE does not manufacture
	2 report.		turbines in Livingston County, and therefore this
2:			large project development component input will not
	estimate from where direct construction and		generate any economic impacts within Livingston
2.	e estimate from where direct construction and	24	generate any economic impacts within Ervingston
	Doro 1561		Doro 1562
	Page 1561		Page 1563
	Page 1561 L operating expenditures will be sourced. An	1	Page 1563 County. The author states on page 6 of the report
:	operating expenditures will be sourced. An	2	County. The author states on page 6 of the report
	operating expenditures will be sourced. An assumption or estimate must be made by the analyst using the model. Accordingly, the results derived	2 3	County. The author states on page 6 of the report that improvements, quote, include graveled roads to access each turbine and above and below surface
	operating expenditures will be sourced. An assumption or estimate must be made by the analyst using the model. Accordingly, the results derived from impact models are sensitive to changes in	2 3 4	County. The author states on page 6 of the report that improvements, quote, include graveled roads to access each turbine and above and below surface electrical cabling to collect and transmit the
	operating expenditures will be sourced. An assumption or estimate must be made by the analyst using the model. Accordingly, the results derived from impact models are sensitive to changes in assumptions about the percentages and amounts of	2 3 4 5	County. The author states on page 6 of the report that improvements, quote, include graveled roads to access each turbine and above and below surface electrical cabling to collect and transmit the power, end quote. According to the JEDI model
	operating expenditures will be sourced. An assumption or estimate must be made by the analyst using the model. Accordingly, the results derived from impact models are sensitive to changes in assumptions about the percentages and amounts of direct materials and labor that will be supplied	2 3 4 5 6	County. The author states on page 6 of the report that improvements, quote, include graveled roads to access each turbine and above and below surface electrical cabling to collect and transmit the power, end quote. According to the JEDI model Loomis utilized, more than 90 percent of the capital
	<ul> <li>operating expenditures will be sourced. An</li> <li>assumption or estimate must be made by the analyst</li> <li>using the model. Accordingly, the results derived</li> <li>from impact models are sensitive to changes in</li> <li>assumptions about the percentages and amounts of</li> <li>direct materials and labor that will be supplied</li> <li>from within the geographic study area, in this case,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	County. The author states on page 6 of the report that improvements, quote, include graveled roads to access each turbine and above and below surface electrical cabling to collect and transmit the power, end quote. According to the JEDI model Loomis utilized, more than 90 percent of the capital expenditures for wind projects typically are for
	<ul> <li>operating expenditures will be sourced. An</li> <li>assumption or estimate must be made by the analyst</li> <li>using the model. Accordingly, the results derived</li> <li>from impact models are sensitive to changes in</li> <li>assumptions about the percentages and amounts of</li> <li>direct materials and labor that will be supplied</li> <li>from within the geographic study area, in this case,</li> <li>Livingston County.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	County. The author states on page 6 of the report that improvements, quote, include graveled roads to access each turbine and above and below surface electrical cabling to collect and transmit the power, end quote. According to the JEDI model Loomis utilized, more than 90 percent of the capital expenditures for wind projects typically are for equipment and materials. Neither in the report nor
	<ul> <li>operating expenditures will be sourced. An</li> <li>assumption or estimate must be made by the analyst</li> <li>using the model. Accordingly, the results derived</li> <li>from impact models are sensitive to changes in</li> <li>assumptions about the percentages and amounts of</li> <li>direct materials and labor that will be supplied</li> <li>from within the geographic study area, in this case,</li> <li>Livingston County.</li> <li>When the project proponent is the source</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	County. The author states on page 6 of the report that improvements, quote, include graveled roads to access each turbine and above and below surface electrical cabling to collect and transmit the power, end quote. According to the JEDI model Loomis utilized, more than 90 percent of the capital expenditures for wind projects typically are for equipment and materials. Neither in the report nor in his testimony does Loomis identify how much of
	<ul> <li>operating expenditures will be sourced. An</li> <li>assumption or estimate must be made by the analyst</li> <li>using the model. Accordingly, the results derived</li> <li>from impact models are sensitive to changes in</li> <li>assumptions about the percentages and amounts of</li> <li>direct materials and labor that will be supplied</li> <li>from within the geographic study area, in this case,</li> <li>Livingston County.</li> <li>When the project proponent is the source</li> <li>of these assumptions, it would be especially</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9	County. The author states on page 6 of the report that improvements, quote, include graveled roads to access each turbine and above and below surface electrical cabling to collect and transmit the power, end quote. According to the JEDI model Loomis utilized, more than 90 percent of the capital expenditures for wind projects typically are for equipment and materials. Neither in the report nor in his testimony does Loomis identify how much of these expenditures will occur locally, if any, nor
	<ul> <li>operating expenditures will be sourced. An</li> <li>assumption or estimate must be made by the analyst</li> <li>using the model. Accordingly, the results derived</li> <li>from impact models are sensitive to changes in</li> <li>assumptions about the percentages and amounts of</li> <li>direct materials and labor that will be supplied</li> <li>from within the geographic study area, in this case,</li> <li>Livingston County.</li> <li>When the project proponent is the source</li> <li>of these assumptions, it would be especially</li> <li>appropriate to reveal the key assumptions and back</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	County. The author states on page 6 of the report that improvements, quote, include graveled roads to access each turbine and above and below surface electrical cabling to collect and transmit the power, end quote. According to the JEDI model Loomis utilized, more than 90 percent of the capital expenditures for wind projects typically are for equipment and materials. Neither in the report nor in his testimony does Loomis identify how much of these expenditures will occur locally, if any, nor does he provide any examples of local suppliers for
	<ul> <li>operating expenditures will be sourced. An</li> <li>assumption or estimate must be made by the analyst</li> <li>using the model. Accordingly, the results derived</li> <li>from impact models are sensitive to changes in</li> <li>assumptions about the percentages and amounts of</li> <li>direct materials and labor that will be supplied</li> <li>from within the geographic study area, in this case,</li> <li>Livingston County.</li> <li>When the project proponent is the source</li> <li>of these assumptions, it would be especially</li> <li>appropriate to reveal the key assumptions and back</li> <li>them up. Because the basic inputs and assumptions</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	County. The author states on page 6 of the report that improvements, quote, include graveled roads to access each turbine and above and below surface electrical cabling to collect and transmit the power, end quote. According to the JEDI model Loomis utilized, more than 90 percent of the capital expenditures for wind projects typically are for equipment and materials. Neither in the report nor in his testimony does Loomis identify how much of these expenditures will occur locally, if any, nor does he provide any examples of local suppliers for such equipment or materials.
	<ul> <li>operating expenditures will be sourced. An</li> <li>assumption or estimate must be made by the analyst</li> <li>using the model. Accordingly, the results derived</li> <li>from impact models are sensitive to changes in</li> <li>assumptions about the percentages and amounts of</li> <li>direct materials and labor that will be supplied</li> <li>from within the geographic study area, in this case,</li> <li>Livingston County.</li> <li>When the project proponent is the source</li> <li>of these assumptions, it would be especially</li> <li>appropriate to reveal the key assumptions and back</li> <li>them up. Because the basic inputs and assumptions</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	County. The author states on page 6 of the report that improvements, quote, include graveled roads to access each turbine and above and below surface electrical cabling to collect and transmit the power, end quote. According to the JEDI model Loomis utilized, more than 90 percent of the capital expenditures for wind projects typically are for equipment and materials. Neither in the report nor in his testimony does Loomis identify how much of these expenditures will occur locally, if any, nor does he provide any examples of local suppliers for such equipment or materials. One important reason the construction
	<ul> <li>operating expenditures will be sourced. An</li> <li>assumption or estimate must be made by the analyst</li> <li>using the model. Accordingly, the results derived</li> <li>from impact models are sensitive to changes in</li> <li>assumptions about the percentages and amounts of</li> <li>direct materials and labor that will be supplied</li> <li>from within the geographic study area, in this case,</li> <li>Livingston County.</li> <li>When the project proponent is the source</li> <li>of these assumptions, it would be especially</li> <li>appropriate to reveal the key assumptions and back</li> <li>them up. Because the basic inputs and assumptions</li> <li>were not disclosed in neither the report or the</li> <li>testimony, we have no way of conducting our own</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	County. The author states on page 6 of the report that improvements, quote, include graveled roads to access each turbine and above and below surface electrical cabling to collect and transmit the power, end quote. According to the JEDI model Loomis utilized, more than 90 percent of the capital expenditures for wind projects typically are for equipment and materials. Neither in the report nor in his testimony does Loomis identify how much of these expenditures will occur locally, if any, nor does he provide any examples of local suppliers for such equipment or materials. One important reason the construction impacts are overstated and misleading is the
: : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :	<ul> <li>operating expenditures will be sourced. An</li> <li>assumption or estimate must be made by the analyst</li> <li>using the model. Accordingly, the results derived</li> <li>from impact models are sensitive to changes in</li> <li>assumptions about the percentages and amounts of</li> <li>direct materials and labor that will be supplied</li> <li>from within the geographic study area, in this case,</li> <li>Livingston County.</li> <li>When the project proponent is the source</li> <li>of these assumptions, it would be especially</li> <li>appropriate to reveal the key assumptions and back</li> <li>them up. Because the basic inputs and assumptions</li> <li>were not disclosed in neither the report or the</li> <li>testimony, we have no way of conducting our own</li> <li>impact analysis or validating the appropriateness of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	County. The author states on page 6 of the report that improvements, quote, include graveled roads to access each turbine and above and below surface electrical cabling to collect and transmit the power, end quote. According to the JEDI model Loomis utilized, more than 90 percent of the capital expenditures for wind projects typically are for equipment and materials. Neither in the report nor in his testimony does Loomis identify how much of these expenditures will occur locally, if any, nor does he provide any examples of local suppliers for such equipment or materials. One important reason the construction impacts are overstated and misleading is the construction impacts are reported as annual
	<ul> <li>operating expenditures will be sourced. An</li> <li>assumption or estimate must be made by the analyst</li> <li>using the model. Accordingly, the results derived</li> <li>from impact models are sensitive to changes in</li> <li>assumptions about the percentages and amounts of</li> <li>direct materials and labor that will be supplied</li> <li>from within the geographic study area, in this case,</li> <li>Livingston County.</li> <li>When the project proponent is the source</li> <li>of these assumptions, it would be especially</li> <li>appropriate to reveal the key assumptions and back</li> <li>them up. Because the basic inputs and assumptions</li> <li>were not disclosed in neither the report or the</li> <li>testimony, we have no way of conducting our own</li> <li>impact analysis or validating the appropriateness of</li> <li>individual inputs into the models or identifying the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	County. The author states on page 6 of the report that improvements, quote, include graveled roads to access each turbine and above and below surface electrical cabling to collect and transmit the power, end quote. According to the JEDI model Loomis utilized, more than 90 percent of the capital expenditures for wind projects typically are for equipment and materials. Neither in the report nor in his testimony does Loomis identify how much of these expenditures will occur locally, if any, nor does he provide any examples of local suppliers for such equipment or materials. One important reason the construction impacts are overstated and misleading is the construction impacts are reported as annual full-time equivalent jobs, but the bottom of page 11
	<ul> <li>operating expenditures will be sourced. An</li> <li>assumption or estimate must be made by the analyst</li> <li>using the model. Accordingly, the results derived</li> <li>from impact models are sensitive to changes in</li> <li>assumptions about the percentages and amounts of</li> <li>direct materials and labor that will be supplied</li> <li>from within the geographic study area, in this case,</li> <li>Livingston County.</li> <li>When the project proponent is the source</li> <li>of these assumptions, it would be especially</li> <li>appropriate to reveal the key assumptions and back</li> <li>them up. Because the basic inputs and assumptions</li> <li>were not disclosed in neither the report or the</li> <li>testimony, we have no way of conducting our own</li> <li>impact analysis or validating the appropriateness of</li> <li>individual inputs into the models or identifying the</li> <li>multipliers produced by direct impacts.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	County. The author states on page 6 of the report that improvements, quote, include graveled roads to access each turbine and above and below surface electrical cabling to collect and transmit the power, end quote. According to the JEDI model Loomis utilized, more than 90 percent of the capital expenditures for wind projects typically are for equipment and materials. Neither in the report nor in his testimony does Loomis identify how much of these expenditures will occur locally, if any, nor does he provide any examples of local suppliers for such equipment or materials. One important reason the construction impacts are overstated and misleading is the construction impacts are reported as annual full-time equivalent jobs, but the bottom of page 11 of the Loomis report indicates that, quote, the
	<ul> <li>operating expenditures will be sourced. An</li> <li>assumption or estimate must be made by the analyst</li> <li>using the model. Accordingly, the results derived</li> <li>from impact models are sensitive to changes in</li> <li>assumptions about the percentages and amounts of</li> <li>direct materials and labor that will be supplied</li> <li>from within the geographic study area, in this case,</li> <li>Livingston County.</li> <li>When the project proponent is the source</li> <li>of these assumptions, it would be especially</li> <li>appropriate to reveal the key assumptions and back</li> <li>them up. Because the basic inputs and assumptions</li> <li>were not disclosed in neither the report or the</li> <li>testimony, we have no way of conducting our own</li> <li>impact analysis or validating the appropriateness of</li> <li>individual inputs into the models or identifying the</li> <li>multipliers produced by direct impacts.</li> <li>Loomis estimates that during the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	County. The author states on page 6 of the report that improvements, quote, include graveled roads to access each turbine and above and below surface electrical cabling to collect and transmit the power, end quote. According to the JEDI model Loomis utilized, more than 90 percent of the capital expenditures for wind projects typically are for equipment and materials. Neither in the report nor in his testimony does Loomis identify how much of these expenditures will occur locally, if any, nor does he provide any examples of local suppliers for such equipment or materials. One important reason the construction impacts are overstated and misleading is the construction impacts are reported as annual full-time equivalent jobs, but the bottom of page 11 of the Loomis report indicates that, quote, the construction of the wind farms may actually involve
	<ul> <li>operating expenditures will be sourced. An</li> <li>assumption or estimate must be made by the analyst</li> <li>using the model. Accordingly, the results derived</li> <li>from impact models are sensitive to changes in</li> <li>assumptions about the percentages and amounts of</li> <li>direct materials and labor that will be supplied</li> <li>from within the geographic study area, in this case,</li> <li>Livingston County.</li> <li>When the project proponent is the source</li> <li>of these assumptions, it would be especially</li> <li>appropriate to reveal the key assumptions and back</li> <li>them up. Because the basic inputs and assumptions</li> <li>were not disclosed in neither the report or the</li> <li>testimony, we have no way of conducting our own</li> <li>impact analysis or validating the appropriateness of</li> <li>individual inputs into the models or identifying the</li> <li>multipliers produced by direct impacts.</li> <li>Loomis estimates that during the</li> <li>construction phase the equivalent of 384 full-time</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	County. The author states on page 6 of the report that improvements, quote, include graveled roads to access each turbine and above and below surface electrical cabling to collect and transmit the power, end quote. According to the JEDI model Loomis utilized, more than 90 percent of the capital expenditures for wind projects typically are for equipment and materials. Neither in the report nor in his testimony does Loomis identify how much of these expenditures will occur locally, if any, nor does he provide any examples of local suppliers for such equipment or materials. One important reason the construction impacts are overstated and misleading is the construction impacts are reported as annual full-time equivalent jobs, but the bottom of page 11 of the Loomis report indicates that, quote, the construction of the wind farms may actually involve hiring 768 workers for six months, end quote. Such
	<ul> <li>operating expenditures will be sourced. An</li> <li>assumption or estimate must be made by the analyst</li> <li>using the model. Accordingly, the results derived</li> <li>from impact models are sensitive to changes in</li> <li>assumptions about the percentages and amounts of</li> <li>direct materials and labor that will be supplied</li> <li>from within the geographic study area, in this case,</li> <li>Livingston County.</li> <li>When the project proponent is the source</li> <li>of these assumptions, it would be especially</li> <li>appropriate to reveal the key assumptions and back</li> <li>them up. Because the basic inputs and assumptions</li> <li>were not disclosed in neither the report or the</li> <li>testimony, we have no way of conducting our own</li> <li>impact analysis or validating the appropriateness of</li> <li>individual inputs into the models or identifying the</li> <li>multipliers produced by direct impacts.</li> <li>Loomis estimates that during the</li> <li>construction phase the equivalent of 384 full-time</li> <li>jobs will be created in Livingston County. The</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	County. The author states on page 6 of the report that improvements, quote, include graveled roads to access each turbine and above and below surface electrical cabling to collect and transmit the power, end quote. According to the JEDI model Loomis utilized, more than 90 percent of the capital expenditures for wind projects typically are for equipment and materials. Neither in the report nor in his testimony does Loomis identify how much of these expenditures will occur locally, if any, nor does he provide any examples of local suppliers for such equipment or materials. One important reason the construction impacts are overstated and misleading is the construction impacts are reported as annual full-time equivalent jobs, but the bottom of page 11 of the Loomis report indicates that, quote, the construction of the wind farms may actually involve hiring 768 workers for six months, end quote. Such a short period does not suggest a high quality,
20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	<ul> <li>operating expenditures will be sourced. An</li> <li>assumption or estimate must be made by the analyst</li> <li>using the model. Accordingly, the results derived</li> <li>from impact models are sensitive to changes in</li> <li>assumptions about the percentages and amounts of</li> <li>direct materials and labor that will be supplied</li> <li>from within the geographic study area, in this case,</li> <li>Livingston County.</li> <li>When the project proponent is the source</li> <li>of these assumptions, it would be especially</li> <li>appropriate to reveal the key assumptions and back</li> <li>them up. Because the basic inputs and assumptions</li> <li>were not disclosed in neither the report or the</li> <li>testimony, we have no way of conducting our own</li> <li>impact analysis or validating the appropriateness of</li> <li>individual inputs into the models or identifying the</li> <li>multipliers produced by direct impacts.</li> <li>Loomis estimates that during the</li> <li>construction phase the equivalent of 384 full-time</li> <li>jobs will be created in Livingston County. The</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	County. The author states on page 6 of the report that improvements, quote, include graveled roads to access each turbine and above and below surface electrical cabling to collect and transmit the power, end quote. According to the JEDI model Loomis utilized, more than 90 percent of the capital expenditures for wind projects typically are for equipment and materials. Neither in the report nor in his testimony does Loomis identify how much of these expenditures will occur locally, if any, nor does he provide any examples of local suppliers for such equipment or materials. One important reason the construction impacts are overstated and misleading is the construction impacts are reported as annual full-time equivalent jobs, but the bottom of page 11 of the Loomis report indicates that, quote, the construction of the wind farms may actually involve hiring 768 workers for six months, end quote. Such a short period does not suggest a high quality, ongoing economic employment opportunity which would
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	<ul> <li>operating expenditures will be sourced. An</li> <li>assumption or estimate must be made by the analyst</li> <li>using the model. Accordingly, the results derived</li> <li>from impact models are sensitive to changes in</li> <li>assumptions about the percentages and amounts of</li> <li>direct materials and labor that will be supplied</li> <li>from within the geographic study area, in this case,</li> <li>Livingston County.</li> <li>When the project proponent is the source</li> <li>of these assumptions, it would be especially</li> <li>appropriate to reveal the key assumptions and back</li> <li>them up. Because the basic inputs and assumptions</li> <li>were not disclosed in neither the report or the</li> <li>testimony, we have no way of conducting our own</li> <li>impact analysis or validating the appropriateness of</li> <li>individual inputs into the models or identifying the</li> <li>multipliers produced by direct impacts.</li> <li>Loomis estimates that during the</li> <li>construction phase the equivalent of 384 full-time</li> <li>jobs will be created in Livingston County. The</li> <li>analytical, generally accepted convention is to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	County. The author states on page 6 of the report that improvements, quote, include graveled roads to access each turbine and above and below surface electrical cabling to collect and transmit the power, end quote. According to the JEDI model Loomis utilized, more than 90 percent of the capital expenditures for wind projects typically are for equipment and materials. Neither in the report nor in his testimony does Loomis identify how much of these expenditures will occur locally, if any, nor does he provide any examples of local suppliers for such equipment or materials. One important reason the construction impacts are overstated and misleading is the construction impacts are reported as annual full-time equivalent jobs, but the bottom of page 11 of the Loomis report indicates that, quote, the construction of the wind farms may actually involve hiring 768 workers for six months, end quote. Such a short period does not suggest a high quality, ongoing economic employment opportunity which would give workers confidence to spend money on
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	<ul> <li>operating expenditures will be sourced. An</li> <li>assumption or estimate must be made by the analyst</li> <li>using the model. Accordingly, the results derived</li> <li>from impact models are sensitive to changes in</li> <li>assumptions about the percentages and amounts of</li> <li>direct materials and labor that will be supplied</li> <li>from within the geographic study area, in this case,</li> <li>Livingston County.</li> <li>When the project proponent is the source</li> <li>of these assumptions, it would be especially</li> <li>appropriate to reveal the key assumptions and back</li> <li>them up. Because the basic inputs and assumptions</li> <li>were not disclosed in neither the report or the</li> <li>testimony, we have no way of conducting our own</li> <li>impact analysis or validating the appropriateness of</li> <li>individual inputs into the models or identifying the</li> <li>multipliers produced by direct impacts.</li> <li>Loomis estimates that during the</li> <li>construction phase the equivalent of 384 full-time</li> <li>jobs will be created in Livingston County. The</li> <li>analytical, generally accepted convention is to</li> <li>present economic impacts in terms of direct,</li> <li>andirect and induced effects. The Loomis report</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	County. The author states on page 6 of the report that improvements, quote, include graveled roads to access each turbine and above and below surface electrical cabling to collect and transmit the power, end quote. According to the JEDI model Loomis utilized, more than 90 percent of the capital expenditures for wind projects typically are for equipment and materials. Neither in the report nor in his testimony does Loomis identify how much of these expenditures will occur locally, if any, nor does he provide any examples of local suppliers for such equipment or materials. One important reason the construction impacts are overstated and misleading is the construction impacts are reported as annual full-time equivalent jobs, but the bottom of page 11 of the Loomis report indicates that, quote, the construction of the wind farms may actually involve hiring 768 workers for six months, end quote. Such a short period does not suggest a high quality, ongoing economic employment opportunity which would give workers confidence to spend money on nonnecessities or make commitments to coming to and
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	<ul> <li>operating expenditures will be sourced. An</li> <li>assumption or estimate must be made by the analyst</li> <li>using the model. Accordingly, the results derived</li> <li>from impact models are sensitive to changes in</li> <li>assumptions about the percentages and amounts of</li> <li>direct materials and labor that will be supplied</li> <li>from within the geographic study area, in this case,</li> <li>Livingston County.</li> <li>When the project proponent is the source</li> <li>of these assumptions, it would be especially</li> <li>appropriate to reveal the key assumptions and back</li> <li>them up. Because the basic inputs and assumptions</li> <li>were not disclosed in neither the report or the</li> <li>testimony, we have no way of conducting our own</li> <li>impact analysis or validating the appropriateness of</li> <li>individual inputs into the models or identifying the</li> <li>multipliers produced by direct impacts.</li> <li>Loomis estimates that during the</li> <li>construction phase the equivalent of 384 full-time</li> <li>jobs will be created in Livingston County. The</li> <li>analytical, generally accepted convention is to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	County. The author states on page 6 of the report that improvements, quote, include graveled roads to access each turbine and above and below surface electrical cabling to collect and transmit the power, end quote. According to the JEDI model Loomis utilized, more than 90 percent of the capital expenditures for wind projects typically are for equipment and materials. Neither in the report nor in his testimony does Loomis identify how much of these expenditures will occur locally, if any, nor does he provide any examples of local suppliers for such equipment or materials. One important reason the construction impacts are overstated and misleading is the construction impacts are reported as annual full-time equivalent jobs, but the bottom of page 11 of the Loomis report indicates that, quote, the construction of the wind farms may actually involve hiring 768 workers for six months, end quote. Such a short period does not suggest a high quality, ongoing economic employment opportunity which would give workers confidence to spend money on

		1	January 26, 20
	Page 1564		Page 156
1	According to the Illinois Department of	1	the authors of the Shady Oaks impact analysis
2	Employment Security, as of November 2014 the	2	estimated that the ongoing operations would suppor
3	unemployment rate in the county is less than 6	3	15 and a half direct jobs and an additional 9
4	percent or only 1,040 resident unemployed workers of	4	induced jobs. The Shady Oaks report done after the
5	all occupations. Therefore, the local unemployed	5	fact of the project suggests how misleading and
6	construction base within the county is not likely to	6	overstated are the projected perspective impacts of
7	be sufficient to provide the amount of short-term	7	the Pleasant Ridge project and how essential
	labor reported to be needed. It is likely that many	8	information is not disclosed in the report.
	of the predicted construction jobs will be sourced	9	If resources are shifted away from some
	to workers residing outside the county or might be	10	other use or activity in the county, that is,
	shifting jobs from other sectors or other projects	11	
	and therefore would not be new and additional.	12	positive multiplier impacts than the gross impacts
13	A discussion with a highly experienced		predicted. The gross job estimates presented in the
14	engineer with Westwood Professional Services with		Loomis report do not take into account net effects
	significant experience in wind energy developments		on jobs, such as displacement of other jobs by the
	confirms that while concrete work or filling in a		construction of the proposed wind energy project or
	dirt road with gravel will be done locally, many	17	
	contractors will bring in workers who have worked on	18	
	other wind energy construction projects from outside		serves associated with the plant.
	Livingston County. If the developer uses mobile	20	Gross economic impacts, however, also do
	construction crews that move from site to site with		not accurately reflect the creation of new jobs or
	specialized equipment and trained labor, then they		income as they do not take into account the jobs or
	will hire local labor only to supplement their		income creation that would have occurred in absence
	needs.		of the activity being analyzed. Therefore, the
	Page 1565		Page 156
1	The Loomis report refers to the Shady Oaks		Loomis analysis overstates and provides misleading
	wind energy development in Lee County, but provides	2	estimates of the impact of the proposed project.
	no information about it even though we found an	3	The 300 megawatt Streator Cayuga Ridge
	economic impact analysis of the project is		South wind farm was under construction in 2008 and
	available. An economic impact analysis of this		2009 and it came online in March 2010. The 200
	project was conducted after the completion of	6	megawatt Minonk wind farm located in both Woodford
		-	-
	construction. In that case, the project's turbine	7	and Livingston Counties came online in 2012
8	blades were made in North Dakota, the towers were		and Livingston Counties came online in 2012 following construction in 2011. Presumably the
8 9	blades were made in North Dakota, the towers were made in Wisconsin, and the contractor was from	7 8 9	and Livingston Counties came online in 2012 following construction in 2011. Presumably the Streator Cayuga Ridge South wind farm would have
8 9 10	blades were made in North Dakota, the towers were made in Wisconsin, and the contractor was from Minnesota. The contractor is reported to have	7 8 9 10	and Livingston Counties came online in 2012 following construction in 2011. Presumably the Streator Cayuga Ridge South wind farm would have created similar gross job impacts as predicted in
8 9 10	blades were made in North Dakota, the towers were made in Wisconsin, and the contractor was from Minnesota. The contractor is reported to have completed 100 wind energy development projects.	7 8 9 10	and Livingston Counties came online in 2012 following construction in 2011. Presumably the Streator Cayuga Ridge South wind farm would have created similar gross job impacts as predicted in the Loomis report, but as described in Table 3 of
8 9 10 11 12	blades were made in North Dakota, the towers were made in Wisconsin, and the contractor was from Minnesota. The contractor is reported to have completed 100 wind energy development projects. Other components were made in China, Ohio,	7 8 9 10 11 12	and Livingston Counties came online in 2012 following construction in 2011. Presumably the Streator Cayuga Ridge South wind farm would have created similar gross job impacts as predicted in the Loomis report, but as described in Table 3 of our report, the number of construction jobs in
8 9 10 11 12 13	blades were made in North Dakota, the towers were made in Wisconsin, and the contractor was from Minnesota. The contractor is reported to have completed 100 wind energy development projects. Other components were made in China, Ohio, California and Texas.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and Livingston Counties came online in 2012 following construction in 2011. Presumably the Streator Cayuga Ridge South wind farm would have created similar gross job impacts as predicted in the Loomis report, but as described in Table 3 of our report, the number of construction jobs in Livingston County declined from 2008 through 2010
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	blades were made in North Dakota, the towers were made in Wisconsin, and the contractor was from Minnesota. The contractor is reported to have completed 100 wind energy development projects. Other components were made in China, Ohio, California and Texas. According to the Shady Oaks impact report,	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and Livingston Counties came online in 2012 following construction in 2011. Presumably the Streator Cayuga Ridge South wind farm would have created similar gross job impacts as predicted in the Loomis report, but as described in Table 3 of our report, the number of construction jobs in Livingston County declined from 2008 through 2010 and stabilized at the 2010 figures. This suggests
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	blades were made in North Dakota, the towers were made in Wisconsin, and the contractor was from Minnesota. The contractor is reported to have completed 100 wind energy development projects. Other components were made in China, Ohio, California and Texas. According to the Shady Oaks impact report, which the developer of that project sponsored, the	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and Livingston Counties came online in 2012 following construction in 2011. Presumably the Streator Cayuga Ridge South wind farm would have created similar gross job impacts as predicted in the Loomis report, but as described in Table 3 of our report, the number of construction jobs in Livingston County declined from 2008 through 2010 and stabilized at the 2010 figures. This suggests the potential that the jobs were simply shifted from
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	blades were made in North Dakota, the towers were made in Wisconsin, and the contractor was from Minnesota. The contractor is reported to have completed 100 wind energy development projects. Other components were made in China, Ohio, California and Texas. According to the Shady Oaks impact report, which the developer of that project sponsored, the JEDI model, quote, can be misleading as far as	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and Livingston Counties came online in 2012 following construction in 2011. Presumably the Streator Cayuga Ridge South wind farm would have created similar gross job impacts as predicted in the Loomis report, but as described in Table 3 of our report, the number of construction jobs in Livingston County declined from 2008 through 2010 and stabilized at the 2010 figures. This suggests the potential that the jobs were simply shifted from one construction activity to another and did not
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	blades were made in North Dakota, the towers were made in Wisconsin, and the contractor was from Minnesota. The contractor is reported to have completed 100 wind energy development projects. Other components were made in China, Ohio, California and Texas. According to the Shady Oaks impact report, which the developer of that project sponsored, the JEDI model, quote, can be misleading as far as numbers of construction jobs created, end quote.	7 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and Livingston Counties came online in 2012 following construction in 2011. Presumably the Streator Cayuga Ridge South wind farm would have created similar gross job impacts as predicted in the Loomis report, but as described in Table 3 of our report, the number of construction jobs in Livingston County declined from 2008 through 2010 and stabilized at the 2010 figures. This suggests the potential that the jobs were simply shifted from one construction activity to another and did not alter the structure or increase the employment base
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	blades were made in North Dakota, the towers were made in Wisconsin, and the contractor was from Minnesota. The contractor is reported to have completed 100 wind energy development projects. Other components were made in China, Ohio, California and Texas. According to the Shady Oaks impact report, which the developer of that project sponsored, the JEDI model, quote, can be misleading as far as numbers of construction jobs created, end quote. The contractor for the Shady Oaks project used 185	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and Livingston Counties came online in 2012 following construction in 2011. Presumably the Streator Cayuga Ridge South wind farm would have created similar gross job impacts as predicted in the Loomis report, but as described in Table 3 of our report, the number of construction jobs in Livingston County declined from 2008 through 2010 and stabilized at the 2010 figures. This suggests the potential that the jobs were simply shifted from one construction activity to another and did not alter the structure or increase the employment base in the construction sector. Loomis did not
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	blades were made in North Dakota, the towers were made in Wisconsin, and the contractor was from Minnesota. The contractor is reported to have completed 100 wind energy development projects. Other components were made in China, Ohio, California and Texas. According to the Shady Oaks impact report, which the developer of that project sponsored, the JEDI model, quote, can be misleading as far as numbers of construction jobs created, end quote. The contractor for the Shady Oaks project used 185 construction workers living within 50 miles of the	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	and Livingston Counties came online in 2012 following construction in 2011. Presumably the Streator Cayuga Ridge South wind farm would have created similar gross job impacts as predicted in the Loomis report, but as described in Table 3 of our report, the number of construction jobs in Livingston County declined from 2008 through 2010 and stabilized at the 2010 figures. This suggests the potential that the jobs were simply shifted from one construction activity to another and did not alter the structure or increase the employment base in the construction sector. Loomis did not apparently attempt to conduct any studies of the
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	blades were made in North Dakota, the towers were made in Wisconsin, and the contractor was from Minnesota. The contractor is reported to have completed 100 wind energy development projects. Other components were made in China, Ohio, California and Texas. According to the Shady Oaks impact report, which the developer of that project sponsored, the JEDI model, quote, can be misleading as far as numbers of construction jobs created, end quote. The contractor for the Shady Oaks project used 185 construction workers living within 50 miles of the project, which means workers came from areas outside	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and Livingston Counties came online in 2012 following construction in 2011. Presumably the Streator Cayuga Ridge South wind farm would have created similar gross job impacts as predicted in the Loomis report, but as described in Table 3 of our report, the number of construction jobs in Livingston County declined from 2008 through 2010 and stabilized at the 2010 figures. This suggests the potential that the jobs were simply shifted from one construction activity to another and did not alter the structure or increase the employment base in the construction sector. Loomis did not apparently attempt to conduct any studies of the wind energy projects actually built in Livingston
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	blades were made in North Dakota, the towers were made in Wisconsin, and the contractor was from Minnesota. The contractor is reported to have completed 100 wind energy development projects. Other components were made in China, Ohio, California and Texas. According to the Shady Oaks impact report, which the developer of that project sponsored, the JEDI model, quote, can be misleading as far as numbers of construction jobs created, end quote. The contractor for the Shady Oaks project used 185 construction workers living within 50 miles of the project, which means workers came from areas outside Lee County. The contractor reported that all of	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and Livingston Counties came online in 2012 following construction in 2011. Presumably the Streator Cayuga Ridge South wind farm would have created similar gross job impacts as predicted in the Loomis report, but as described in Table 3 of our report, the number of construction jobs in Livingston County declined from 2008 through 2010 and stabilized at the 2010 figures. This suggests the potential that the jobs were simply shifted from one construction activity to another and did not alter the structure or increase the employment base in the construction sector. Loomis did not apparently attempt to conduct any studies of the wind energy projects actually built in Livingston County or nearby counties to put into perspective
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	blades were made in North Dakota, the towers were made in Wisconsin, and the contractor was from Minnesota. The contractor is reported to have completed 100 wind energy development projects. Other components were made in China, Ohio, California and Texas. According to the Shady Oaks impact report, which the developer of that project sponsored, the JEDI model, quote, can be misleading as far as numbers of construction jobs created, end quote. The contractor for the Shady Oaks project used 185 construction workers living within 50 miles of the project, which means workers came from areas outside Lee County. The contractor reported that all of \$35,000 was spent locally to serve his 60 trucks and	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and Livingston Counties came online in 2012 following construction in 2011. Presumably the Streator Cayuga Ridge South wind farm would have created similar gross job impacts as predicted in the Loomis report, but as described in Table 3 of our report, the number of construction jobs in Livingston County declined from 2008 through 2010 and stabilized at the 2010 figures. This suggests the potential that the jobs were simply shifted from one construction activity to another and did not alter the structure or increase the employment base in the construction sector. Loomis did not apparently attempt to conduct any studies of the wind energy projects actually built in Livingston County or nearby counties to put into perspective the gross figures for a hypothetical project not yet
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	blades were made in North Dakota, the towers were made in Wisconsin, and the contractor was from Minnesota. The contractor is reported to have completed 100 wind energy development projects. Other components were made in China, Ohio, California and Texas. According to the Shady Oaks impact report, which the developer of that project sponsored, the JEDI model, quote, can be misleading as far as numbers of construction jobs created, end quote. The contractor for the Shady Oaks project used 185 construction workers living within 50 miles of the project, which means workers came from areas outside Lee County. The contractor reported that all of \$35,000 was spent locally to serve his 60 trucks and vehicles. Correcting for the improper presentation	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and Livingston Counties came online in 2012 following construction in 2011. Presumably the Streator Cayuga Ridge South wind farm would have created similar gross job impacts as predicted in the Loomis report, but as described in Table 3 of our report, the number of construction jobs in Livingston County declined from 2008 through 2010 and stabilized at the 2010 figures. This suggests the potential that the jobs were simply shifted from one construction activity to another and did not alter the structure or increase the employment base in the construction sector. Loomis did not apparently attempt to conduct any studies of the wind energy projects actually built in Livingston County or nearby counties to put into perspective the gross figures for a hypothetical project not yet built or operated and instead relies on employment
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	blades were made in North Dakota, the towers were made in Wisconsin, and the contractor was from Minnesota. The contractor is reported to have completed 100 wind energy development projects. Other components were made in China, Ohio, California and Texas. According to the Shady Oaks impact report, which the developer of that project sponsored, the JEDI model, quote, can be misleading as far as numbers of construction jobs created, end quote. The contractor for the Shady Oaks project used 185 construction workers living within 50 miles of the project, which means workers came from areas outside Lee County. The contractor reported that all of \$35,000 was spent locally to serve his 60 trucks and	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and Livingston Counties came online in 2012 following construction in 2011. Presumably the Streator Cayuga Ridge South wind farm would hav created similar gross job impacts as predicted in the Loomis report, but as described in Table 3 of our report, the number of construction jobs in Livingston County declined from 2008 through 201 and stabilized at the 2010 figures. This suggests the potential that the jobs were simply shifted from one construction activity to another and did not alter the structure or increase the employment base in the construction sector. Loomis did not apparently attempt to conduct any studies of the wind energy projects actually built in Livingston County or nearby counties to put into perspective the gross figures for a hypothetical project not yet

			January 26, 2015
	Page 1568		Page 1570
1	Loomis cites his study conducted for an	1	completed and the wind energy project is operating,
2			13 jobs will be created on site in Livingston County
	indicates Livingston County contains 5 of the 22		directly from operations. The model was then used
	industries which would potentially produce one or		to forecast another 56 local jobs would result from,
	more components of a wind turbine, but what he does		quote, local revenue and supply chain impacts. As
	not note is, as a comparison, Cook, DuPage, Kane,		with the construction period impacts, despite the
	Lake, McHenry, Winnebago and Will Counties each		initial claim of the purpose of the study, the
	contains 16 of the relevant 22 industries. As I		Loomis report does not specify how many of these
_	indicated earlier, Loomis does not state which firms		jobs will be created directly versus indirectly. An
	in such industry sectors in Livingston County, if		
11		11	from the induced effects of worker and household
12			spending.
13		13	Loomis forecasts that the operation of the
	developed and does not contain major agglomerations	-	wind energy project will increase the total earnings
	or clusters of engineering and design and wind farm		
16			the output of the Livingston County economy would
	Livingston County's own comprehensive economic	17	increase by nearly 20.1 million. Because the
	development strategy in its 2014 report indicates		economic impact estimates are not presented by
	industry clusters which do not include engineering	19	Loomis in the accepted manner, the total impacts
20		20	from the direct effects and the two types of
	materials. Similarly, it is unlikely that the		indirect effects, one generated by industry to
	components of the wind supply chain would relocate	22	industry purchase and sales and one generated by
	for a single project lasting six months. I draw	23	expenditures by employees from wages and salaries,
	this conclusion not only because of the short		cannot be divided by the direct impacts to obtain
	Page 1569		Page 1571
	-		-
	duration of the construction project, even assuming		the multiplier ripple effect. Loomis did not reveal
	it's feasible to build and finance in the first		the data assumptions utilized in either the report
	place, but also because most firms now are seeking		or his testimony, and therefore his findings cannot
	to exploit scale economies that yield greater	4	be validated.
5	returns than savings in transportation costs.	5	Given the lack of access to the necessary
6	Neither the report nor testimony of Loomis provides	6	data and the cost that would be involved, we did not
7	5 5	7	prepare an independent objective economic impact
8		8	analysis, but based on our review of the Loomis
	Livingston County nor is there any evidence of this		report, the Shady Oaks impact report and the
10		10	employment and other data we have reviewed, the
11	5	11	gross impacts will not be as high as predicted by
12	11		the Loomis report, and the net impacts will not
	duration construction project are likely to be	13	alter the economic base to provide justification for
	overstated given the size and composition of the	14	approving the project.
	county's economic and retailing base and that	15	The Loomis report and the discussion in
	stores, for example, are unlikely to open new stores	16	the testimony fails to describe how much, if any, of
17	1	17	the nonIMPLAN parts of the JEDI model are locally
18		18	based. The information provided in the report and
19		19	testimony Loomis provides appears to be misleading
20	5 1	20	with respect to the local share estimates. Given
	ongoing impacts are likely to be overstated and	21	the open nature of rural counties multipliers or the
21			· · · · ·
22	misleading and even if accurate would not represent a significant positive impact to the local economy.		indirect effects, the direct impacts should be much

**24** Loomis estimates that once construction is

		January 26, 2015
	Page 1572	Page 1574
1	inputs and expenditures from wage and salaries.	1 county. It is not clear to what extent the
	Typically the rounds of spending associated with the	2 estimates include impacts associated with nonpayroll
	multiplier would be smaller in number in a rural	<b>3</b> O&M costs, which Loomis did not reveal in the report
	county, and thus the summary ripple effect is likely	4 or testimony.
	to be smaller. For example, income for jobs	5 In addition, the JEDI model includes in
6		6 the local revenue and supply chain impacts during
7	goods is more likely to be spent outside of	7 operations the revenue from property taxes and
	Livingston County where greater concentrations of	8 revenue to equity investors. The JEDI model default
	retail outlets and services are located. The larger	<b>9</b> assumes that revenue to equity investors leaks out
	amount of retail space in Bloomington, Peoria and	10 of the local economy, but that a hundred percent of
	Kankakee can be expected to capture income spent on	11 property tax revenue and land lease revenue remains
	retail goods not readily available in Livingston	<b>12</b> in the local economy. The Loomis report does not
	County.	<b>13</b> specify if these default assumptions in the JEDI
14	But what page 10 of the Loomis report	14 model were changed or adjusted to reflect actual
15	states to explain the reasoning behind the impact	15 local conditions. The project developer is
16	estimates is, quote, as workers receive income, they	16 headquartered in Chicago and therefore revenues to
17	may decide to purchase more expensive clothes along	17 equity investors should not be considered to be
18	with other goods and services from local businesses,	<b>18</b> captured in Livingston County. Any increase in
19	end quote. The model in the analysis does not take	<b>19</b> property taxes or other local tax revenues could be
20	into proper account of the nature of the Livingston	<b>20</b> offset by a decline in property values or the taxes
21	County economy and the proximity to larger economies	<b>21</b> could be used in ways that do not increase local
22	nearby with more of the kinds of stores at which	22 economic activity, such as paying municipal debt or
23	more expensive clothes could be purchased.	<b>23</b> adding to reserves.
24	To give you another example drawn directly	<b>24</b> The convention and accepted practice in
	Page 1573	
		Page 1575
1	from the Loomis report of why the impacts are	Page 1575 1 impact analysis is not followed in the JEDI model or
	from the Loomis report of why the impacts are misleading and overstated, page 9 of the Loomis	
2		1 impact analysis is not followed in the JEDI model or
2	misleading and overstated, page 9 of the Loomis	<ol> <li>impact analysis is not followed in the JEDI model or</li> <li>Loomis report, which is to present tax impacts</li> <li>separately and not as part of indirect economic</li> <li>impacts. But even if the undisclosed local share</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	misleading and overstated, page 9 of the Loomis report states, quote, the banker who finances the contractor are both considered indirect impacts, end quote. However, if the contractor selected is not	<ol> <li>impact analysis is not followed in the JEDI model or</li> <li>Loomis report, which is to present tax impacts</li> <li>separately and not as part of indirect economic</li> <li>impacts. But even if the undisclosed local share</li> <li>and multiplier estimates were reasonable, the total</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	misleading and overstated, page 9 of the Loomis report states, quote, the banker who finances the contractor are both considered indirect impacts, end	<ol> <li>impact analysis is not followed in the JEDI model or</li> <li>Loomis report, which is to present tax impacts</li> <li>separately and not as part of indirect economic</li> <li>impacts. But even if the undisclosed local share</li> <li>and multiplier estimates were reasonable, the total</li> <li>projected economic impacts are not significant</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7	misleading and overstated, page 9 of the Loomis report states, quote, the banker who finances the contractor are both considered indirect impacts, end quote. However, if the contractor selected is not local, and no indication has been provided that the contractor will be local, the banker will not be	<ol> <li>impact analysis is not followed in the JEDI model or</li> <li>Loomis report, which is to present tax impacts</li> <li>separately and not as part of indirect economic</li> <li>impacts. But even if the undisclosed local share</li> <li>and multiplier estimates were reasonable, the total</li> <li>projected economic impacts are not significant</li> <li>relative to the size of the local economy. The</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	misleading and overstated, page 9 of the Loomis report states, quote, the banker who finances the contractor are both considered indirect impacts, end quote. However, if the contractor selected is not local, and no indication has been provided that the contractor will be local, the banker will not be local. And further, no indication is given that the	<ol> <li>impact analysis is not followed in the JEDI model or</li> <li>Loomis report, which is to present tax impacts</li> <li>separately and not as part of indirect economic</li> <li>impacts. But even if the undisclosed local share</li> <li>and multiplier estimates were reasonable, the total</li> <li>projected economic impacts are not significant</li> <li>relative to the size of the local economy. The</li> <li>gross job impacts, not the net, would be only</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	misleading and overstated, page 9 of the Loomis report states, quote, the banker who finances the contractor are both considered indirect impacts, end quote. However, if the contractor selected is not local, and no indication has been provided that the contractor will be local, the banker will not be local. And further, no indication is given that the banker will hire more bankers or otherwise increase	<ol> <li>impact analysis is not followed in the JEDI model or</li> <li>Loomis report, which is to present tax impacts</li> <li>separately and not as part of indirect economic</li> <li>impacts. But even if the undisclosed local share</li> <li>and multiplier estimates were reasonable, the total</li> <li>projected economic impacts are not significant</li> <li>relative to the size of the local economy. The</li> <li>gross job impacts, not the net, would be only</li> <li>one-half of 1 percent of the total jobs while the</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	misleading and overstated, page 9 of the Loomis report states, quote, the banker who finances the contractor are both considered indirect impacts, end quote. However, if the contractor selected is not local, and no indication has been provided that the contractor will be local, the banker will not be local. And further, no indication is given that the banker will hire more bankers or otherwise increase hiring and incomes locally because of financing the	<ol> <li>impact analysis is not followed in the JEDI model or</li> <li>Loomis report, which is to present tax impacts</li> <li>separately and not as part of indirect economic</li> <li>impacts. But even if the undisclosed local share</li> <li>and multiplier estimates were reasonable, the total</li> <li>projected economic impacts are not significant</li> <li>relative to the size of the local economy. The</li> <li>gross job impacts, not the net, would be only</li> <li>one-half of 1 percent of the total jobs while the</li> <li>gross income impacts would represent only a third of</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	misleading and overstated, page 9 of the Loomis report states, quote, the banker who finances the contractor are both considered indirect impacts, end quote. However, if the contractor selected is not local, and no indication has been provided that the contractor will be local, the banker will not be local. And further, no indication is given that the banker will hire more bankers or otherwise increase hiring and incomes locally because of financing the contract for this project.	<ol> <li>impact analysis is not followed in the JEDI model or</li> <li>Loomis report, which is to present tax impacts</li> <li>separately and not as part of indirect economic</li> <li>impacts. But even if the undisclosed local share</li> <li>and multiplier estimates were reasonable, the total</li> <li>projected economic impacts are not significant</li> <li>relative to the size of the local economy. The</li> <li>gross job impacts, not the net, would be only</li> <li>one-half of 1 percent of the total jobs while the</li> <li>gross income impacts would represent only a third of</li> <li>1 percent of the county's earnings. The key point</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	misleading and overstated, page 9 of the Loomis report states, quote, the banker who finances the contractor are both considered indirect impacts, end quote. However, if the contractor selected is not local, and no indication has been provided that the contractor will be local, the banker will not be local. And further, no indication is given that the banker will hire more bankers or otherwise increase hiring and incomes locally because of financing the contract for this project. Our review of the JEDI model indicates,	<ol> <li>impact analysis is not followed in the JEDI model or</li> <li>Loomis report, which is to present tax impacts</li> <li>separately and not as part of indirect economic</li> <li>impacts. But even if the undisclosed local share</li> <li>and multiplier estimates were reasonable, the total</li> <li>projected economic impacts are not significant</li> <li>relative to the size of the local economy. The</li> <li>gross job impacts, not the net, would be only</li> <li>one-half of 1 percent of the total jobs while the</li> <li>gross income impacts would represent only a third of</li> <li>1 percent of the county's earnings. The key point</li> <li>that the Loomis report did not put into context is</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>misleading and overstated, page 9 of the Loomis</li> <li>report states, quote, the banker who finances the</li> <li>contractor are both considered indirect impacts, end</li> <li>quote. However, if the contractor selected is not</li> <li>local, and no indication has been provided that the</li> <li>contractor will be local, the banker will not be</li> <li>local. And further, no indication is given that the</li> <li>banker will hire more bankers or otherwise increase</li> <li>hiring and incomes locally because of financing the</li> <li>contract for this project.</li> <li>Our review of the JEDI model indicates,</li> <li>for example, that the default JEDI model estimate</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>impact analysis is not followed in the JEDI model or</li> <li>Loomis report, which is to present tax impacts</li> <li>separately and not as part of indirect economic</li> <li>impacts. But even if the undisclosed local share</li> <li>and multiplier estimates were reasonable, the total</li> <li>projected economic impacts are not significant</li> <li>relative to the size of the local economy. The</li> <li>gross job impacts, not the net, would be only</li> <li>one-half of 1 percent of the total jobs while the</li> <li>gross income impacts would represent only a third of</li> <li>1 percent of the county's earnings. The key point</li> <li>that the Loomis report did not put into context is</li> <li>that given the size of the county's employment and</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>misleading and overstated, page 9 of the Loomis</li> <li>report states, quote, the banker who finances the</li> <li>contractor are both considered indirect impacts, end</li> <li>quote. However, if the contractor selected is not</li> <li>local, and no indication has been provided that the</li> <li>contractor will be local, the banker will not be</li> <li>local. And further, no indication is given that the</li> <li>banker will hire more bankers or otherwise increase</li> <li>hiring and incomes locally because of financing the</li> <li>contract for this project.</li> <li>Our review of the JEDI model indicates,</li> <li>for example, that the default JEDI model estimate</li> <li>for ongoing personnel expenditures for a 243</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>impact analysis is not followed in the JEDI model or</li> <li>Loomis report, which is to present tax impacts</li> <li>separately and not as part of indirect economic</li> <li>impacts. But even if the undisclosed local share</li> <li>and multiplier estimates were reasonable, the total</li> <li>projected economic impacts are not significant</li> <li>relative to the size of the local economy. The</li> <li>gross job impacts, not the net, would be only</li> <li>one-half of 1 percent of the total jobs while the</li> <li>gross income impacts would represent only a third of</li> <li>1 percent of the county's earnings. The key point</li> <li>that the Loomis report did not put into context is</li> <li>that given the size of the county's employment and</li> <li>income base, the projected impacts are not</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 6 7 7 8 8 9 9 10 11 11 12 13 14 14	<ul> <li>misleading and overstated, page 9 of the Loomis</li> <li>report states, quote, the banker who finances the</li> <li>contractor are both considered indirect impacts, end</li> <li>quote. However, if the contractor selected is not</li> <li>local, and no indication has been provided that the</li> <li>contractor will be local, the banker will not be</li> <li>local. And further, no indication is given that the</li> <li>banker will hire more bankers or otherwise increase</li> <li>hiring and incomes locally because of financing the</li> <li>contract for this project.</li> <li>Our review of the JEDI model indicates,</li> <li>for example, that the default JEDI model estimate</li> <li>for ongoing personnel expenditures for a 243</li> <li>megawatt wind project in Illinois is 887,000 per</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>impact analysis is not followed in the JEDI model or</li> <li>Loomis report, which is to present tax impacts</li> <li>separately and not as part of indirect economic</li> <li>impacts. But even if the undisclosed local share</li> <li>and multiplier estimates were reasonable, the total</li> <li>projected economic impacts are not significant</li> <li>relative to the size of the local economy. The</li> <li>gross job impacts, not the net, would be only</li> <li>one-half of 1 percent of the total jobs while the</li> <li>gross income impacts would represent only a third of</li> <li>1 percent of the county's earnings. The key point</li> <li>that the Loomis report did not put into context is</li> <li>that given the size of the county's employment and</li> <li>income base, the projected impacts are not</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 5 6 6 7 7 8 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>misleading and overstated, page 9 of the Loomis</li> <li>report states, quote, the banker who finances the</li> <li>contractor are both considered indirect impacts, end</li> <li>quote. However, if the contractor selected is not</li> <li>local, and no indication has been provided that the</li> <li>contractor will be local, the banker will not be</li> <li>local. And further, no indication is given that the</li> <li>banker will hire more bankers or otherwise increase</li> <li>hiring and incomes locally because of financing the</li> <li>contract for this project.</li> <li>Our review of the JEDI model indicates,</li> <li>for example, that the default JEDI model estimate</li> <li>for ongoing personnel expenditures for a 243</li> <li>megawatt wind project in Illinois is 887,000 per</li> <li>year. The Loomis report suggests he adjusted the</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>impact analysis is not followed in the JEDI model or</li> <li>Loomis report, which is to present tax impacts</li> <li>separately and not as part of indirect economic</li> <li>impacts. But even if the undisclosed local share</li> <li>and multiplier estimates were reasonable, the total</li> <li>projected economic impacts are not significant</li> <li>relative to the size of the local economy. The</li> <li>gross job impacts, not the net, would be only</li> <li>one-half of 1 percent of the total jobs while the</li> <li>gross income impacts would represent only a third of</li> <li>1 percent of the county's earnings. The key point</li> <li>that given the size of the county's employment and</li> <li>income base, the projected impacts are not</li> <li>significant.</li> <li>And then in conclusion, I point out that</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 7 8 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>misleading and overstated, page 9 of the Loomis</li> <li>report states, quote, the banker who finances the</li> <li>contractor are both considered indirect impacts, end</li> <li>quote. However, if the contractor selected is not</li> <li>local, and no indication has been provided that the</li> <li>contractor will be local, the banker will not be</li> <li>local. And further, no indication is given that the</li> <li>banker will hire more bankers or otherwise increase</li> <li>hiring and incomes locally because of financing the</li> <li>contract for this project.</li> <li>Our review of the JEDI model indicates,</li> <li>for example, that the default JEDI model estimate</li> <li>for ongoing personnel expenditures for a 243</li> <li>megawatt wind project in Illinois is 887,000 per</li> <li>year. The Loomis report suggests he adjusted the</li> <li>default assumptions upwards to 993,000. Material</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>impact analysis is not followed in the JEDI model or</li> <li>Loomis report, which is to present tax impacts</li> <li>separately and not as part of indirect economic</li> <li>impacts. But even if the undisclosed local share</li> <li>and multiplier estimates were reasonable, the total</li> <li>projected economic impacts are not significant</li> <li>relative to the size of the local economy. The</li> <li>gross job impacts, not the net, would be only</li> <li>one-half of 1 percent of the total jobs while the</li> <li>gross income impacts would represent only a third of</li> <li>1 percent of the county's earnings. The key point</li> <li>that the Loomis report did not put into context is</li> <li>that given the size of the county's employment and</li> <li>income base, the projected impacts are not</li> <li>significant.</li> <li>And then in conclusion, I point out that</li> </ol>
22 33 44 5 5 7 7 8 5 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 7 18	<ul> <li>misleading and overstated, page 9 of the Loomis</li> <li>report states, quote, the banker who finances the</li> <li>contractor are both considered indirect impacts, end</li> <li>quote. However, if the contractor selected is not</li> <li>local, and no indication has been provided that the</li> <li>contractor will be local, the banker will not be</li> <li>local. And further, no indication is given that the</li> <li>banker will hire more bankers or otherwise increase</li> <li>hiring and incomes locally because of financing the</li> <li>contract for this project.</li> <li>Our review of the JEDI model indicates,</li> <li>for example, that the default JEDI model estimate</li> <li>for ongoing personnel expenditures for a 243</li> <li>megawatt wind project in Illinois is 887,000 per</li> <li>year. The Loomis report suggests he adjusted the</li> <li>default assumptions upwards to 993,000. Material</li> <li>and services are estimated to represent the</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>impact analysis is not followed in the JEDI model or</li> <li>Loomis report, which is to present tax impacts</li> <li>separately and not as part of indirect economic</li> <li>impacts. But even if the undisclosed local share</li> <li>and multiplier estimates were reasonable, the total</li> <li>projected economic impacts are not significant</li> <li>relative to the size of the local economy. The</li> <li>gross job impacts, not the net, would be only</li> <li>one-half of 1 percent of the total jobs while the</li> <li>gross income impacts would represent only a third of</li> <li>1 percent of the county's earnings. The key point</li> <li>that given the size of the county's employment and</li> <li>income base, the projected impacts are not</li> <li>significant.</li> <li>And then in conclusion, I point out that</li> <li>previously built and operating wind energy projects</li> <li>have not altered the economic structure or caused</li> </ol>
22 33 44 5 6 6 7 8 9 9 9 10 111 12 13 14 15 16 17 7 18 19	<ul> <li>misleading and overstated, page 9 of the Loomis</li> <li>report states, quote, the banker who finances the</li> <li>contractor are both considered indirect impacts, end</li> <li>quote. However, if the contractor selected is not</li> <li>local, and no indication has been provided that the</li> <li>contractor will be local, the banker will not be</li> <li>local. And further, no indication is given that the</li> <li>banker will hire more bankers or otherwise increase</li> <li>hiring and incomes locally because of financing the</li> <li>contract for this project.</li> <li>Our review of the JEDI model indicates,</li> <li>for example, that the default JEDI model estimate</li> <li>for ongoing personnel expenditures for a 243</li> <li>megawatt wind project in Illinois is 887,000 per</li> <li>year. The Loomis report suggests he adjusted the</li> <li>default assumptions upwards to 993,000. Material</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>impact analysis is not followed in the JEDI model or</li> <li>Loomis report, which is to present tax impacts</li> <li>separately and not as part of indirect economic</li> <li>impacts. But even if the undisclosed local share</li> <li>and multiplier estimates were reasonable, the total</li> <li>projected economic impacts are not significant</li> <li>relative to the size of the local economy. The</li> <li>gross job impacts, not the net, would be only</li> <li>one-half of 1 percent of the total jobs while the</li> <li>gross income impacts would represent only a third of</li> <li>1 percent of the county's earnings. The key point</li> <li>that the Loomis report did not put into context is</li> <li>that given the size of the county's employment and</li> <li>income base, the projected impacts are not</li> <li>significant.</li> <li>And then in conclusion, I point out that</li> </ol>

- 20 expenditures according to the JEDI model. These21 primarily consist of insurance costs and replacement
- 22 parts and equipment. Again, the default assumption
- **23** of the JEDI model is that none of these ongoing
- 24 expenditures are likely to be made in a small

23 What the review of economic employment24 conditions contained in our memorandum report

21 justification to believe this proposed wind energy

22 project will produce any different results.

	INGSTON COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS		January 26, 2015
	D (570	1	January 26, 2015
	Page 1576		Page 1578
1	suggests is the importance of recognizing that no	1	correct, sir, it's marked Pleasant Ridge
2	short-run construction project is likely to have any	2	A. Yes.
3	sustained positive economic impact, and the proposed	3	Q. Okay. Did you review that entire report
4	project can be expected to be no different. And the	4	in preparing what you submitted?
5	direct on-site, ongoing impacts, that is, 13 jobs,	5	A. I believe so, yes.
6	are negligible relative to the employment base in	6	Q. And are you the only person who worked on
7	the county.	7	the report that you submitted?
8	Given the overstated, misleading economic	8	A. No.
9	impacts presented in the Loomis report and that the	9	Q. Who else worked on it?
10	report does not cover the other types of impacts	10	A. Colleagues in my office.
	that could have more ramifications for the county,	11	Q. Who wrote it?
	the Loomis report should not be relied upon to make	12	A. I take full responsibility for the report.
	land use decisions that have long run and ongoing	13	Q. That wasn't my question. Who wrote the
	economic, social, environmental and other important	14	report?
15	consequences. And that completes the testimony.	15	A. Well, I just told you there were several
16	CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Thank you, Mr. Gruen.	16	of us who worked on the report. I wrote most of it,
17	I believe at this time Chuck wants to	17	but I also had assistance from other colleagues.
18	<b>MR. SCHOPP:</b> We want to make a note that	18	Q. What was the nature of that assistance?
19	during his testimony that two more of the Zoning	19	A. Standard assistance in doing research and
	Board of Appeals members attended the meeting.	20	analysis, so reviews of they reviewed the
	Michael Cornale and Joan Huisman added their	21	reports, helped track down other studies, such as
	presence to the meeting. So we're glad to have them	22	the Shady Oaks report that I referred to, a review
	here.	23	of the JEDI model inputs, standard model from the
24	CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, at this	24	department that provides the report, that sort of
	Page 1577		Page 1579
1	-	1	-
	time, do you guys have any questions for Mr. Gruen?	1	thing.
2	time, do you guys have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MS. HUISMAN: No.	2	<b>thing.</b> Q. So did you review the JEDI model inputs or
2 3	time, do you guys have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MS. HUISMAN: No. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right. Yeah, we'll	2 3	thing. Q. So did you review the JEDI model inputs or did somebody else do that?
2 3	time, do you guys have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MS. HUISMAN: No. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right. Yeah, we'll reserve our opportunity to question Mr. Gruen.	2	<ul><li>thing.</li><li>Q. So did you review the JEDI model inputs or did somebody else do that?</li><li>A. Two of us did.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	time, do you guys have any questions for Mr. Gruen? <b>MS. HUISMAN:</b> No. <b>CHAIRMAN CORNALE:</b> All right. Yeah, we'll reserve our opportunity to question Mr. Gruen. Government and school, government bodies	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>thing.</li> <li>Q. So did you review the JEDI model inputs or did somebody else do that?</li> <li>A. Two of us did.</li> <li>Q. And just from the title of your report,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	time, do you guys have any questions for Mr. Gruen? <b>MS. HUISMAN:</b> No. <b>CHAIRMAN CORNALE:</b> All right. Yeah, we'll reserve our opportunity to question Mr. Gruen. Government and school, government bodies or school boards, anybody out there with questions	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>thing.</li> <li>Q. So did you review the JEDI model inputs or did somebody else do that?</li> <li>A. Two of us did.</li> <li>Q. And just from the title of your report, correct me if I'm wrong, and this is UCLC Exhibit</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	time, do you guys have any questions for Mr. Gruen? <b>MS. HUISMAN:</b> No. <b>CHAIRMAN CORNALE:</b> All right. Yeah, we'll reserve our opportunity to question Mr. Gruen. Government and school, government bodies or school boards, anybody out there with questions for Mr. Gruen?	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>thing.</li> <li>Q. So did you review the JEDI model inputs or did somebody else do that?</li> <li>A. Two of us did.</li> <li>Q. And just from the title of your report, correct me if I'm wrong, and this is UCLC Exhibit 61, it's intended to be comments, findings and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	time, do you guys have any questions for Mr. Gruen? <b>MS. HUISMAN:</b> No. <b>CHAIRMAN CORNALE:</b> All right. Yeah, we'll reserve our opportunity to question Mr. Gruen. Government and school, government bodies or school boards, anybody out there with questions for Mr. Gruen? All right. Mr. Blazer, do you have any	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>thing.</li> <li>Q. So did you review the JEDI model inputs or did somebody else do that?</li> <li>A. Two of us did.</li> <li>Q. And just from the title of your report, correct me if I'm wrong, and this is UCLC Exhibit</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	time, do you guys have any questions for Mr. Gruen? <b>MS. HUISMAN:</b> No. <b>CHAIRMAN CORNALE:</b> All right. Yeah, we'll reserve our opportunity to question Mr. Gruen. Government and school, government bodies or school boards, anybody out there with questions for Mr. Gruen? All right. Mr. Blazer, do you have any questions for Mr. Gruen?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>thing.</li> <li>Q. So did you review the JEDI model inputs or did somebody else do that?</li> <li>A. Two of us did.</li> <li>Q. And just from the title of your report, correct me if I'm wrong, and this is UCLC Exhibit 61, it's intended to be comments, findings and conclusion about Dr. Loomis's entire report, correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	time, do you guys have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MS. HUISMAN: No. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right. Yeah, we'll reserve our opportunity to question Mr. Gruen. Government and school, government bodies or school boards, anybody out there with questions for Mr. Gruen? All right. Mr. Blazer, do you have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MR. BLAZER: Thank you, Mr. Cornale.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>thing.</li> <li>Q. So did you review the JEDI model inputs or did somebody else do that?</li> <li>A. Two of us did.</li> <li>Q. And just from the title of your report, correct me if I'm wrong, and this is UCLC Exhibit 61, it's intended to be comments, findings and conclusion about Dr. Loomis's entire report,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	time, do you guys have any questions for Mr. Gruen? <b>MS. HUISMAN:</b> No. <b>CHAIRMAN CORNALE:</b> All right. Yeah, we'll reserve our opportunity to question Mr. Gruen. Government and school, government bodies or school boards, anybody out there with questions for Mr. Gruen? All right. Mr. Blazer, do you have any questions for Mr. Gruen?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>thing.</li> <li>Q. So did you review the JEDI model inputs or did somebody else do that?</li> <li>A. Two of us did.</li> <li>Q. And just from the title of your report, correct me if I'm wrong, and this is UCLC Exhibit 61, it's intended to be comments, findings and conclusion about Dr. Loomis's entire report, correct?</li> <li>A. Parts of the report that I made comments</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	time, do you guys have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MS. HUISMAN: No. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right. Yeah, we'll reserve our opportunity to question Mr. Gruen. Government and school, government bodies or school boards, anybody out there with questions for Mr. Gruen? All right. Mr. Blazer, do you have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MR. BLAZER: Thank you, Mr. Cornale. QUESTIONS BY	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>thing.</li> <li>Q. So did you review the JEDI model inputs or did somebody else do that?</li> <li>A. Two of us did.</li> <li>Q. And just from the title of your report, correct me if I'm wrong, and this is UCLC Exhibit 61, it's intended to be comments, findings and conclusion about Dr. Loomis's entire report, correct?</li> <li>A. Parts of the report that I made comments on, yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	time, do you guys have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MS. HUISMAN: No. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right. Yeah, we'll reserve our opportunity to question Mr. Gruen. Government and school, government bodies or school boards, anybody out there with questions for Mr. Gruen? All right. Mr. Blazer, do you have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MR. BLAZER: Thank you, Mr. Cornale. QUESTIONS BY MR. BLAZER:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>thing.</li> <li>Q. So did you review the JEDI model inputs or did somebody else do that?</li> <li>A. Two of us did.</li> <li>Q. And just from the title of your report, correct me if I'm wrong, and this is UCLC Exhibit 61, it's intended to be comments, findings and conclusion about Dr. Loomis's entire report, correct?</li> <li>A. Parts of the report that I made comments on, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, I mean, again, you did review</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>time, do you guys have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MS. HUISMAN: No. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right. Yeah, we'll reserve our opportunity to question Mr. Gruen. Government and school, government bodies or school boards, anybody out there with questions for Mr. Gruen? All right. Mr. Blazer, do you have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MR. BLAZER: Thank you, Mr. Cornale. QUESTIONS BY MR. BLAZER: Q. Mr. Gruen, your presentation sounded like</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>thing.</li> <li>Q. So did you review the JEDI model inputs or did somebody else do that?</li> <li>A. Two of us did.</li> <li>Q. And just from the title of your report, correct me if I'm wrong, and this is UCLC Exhibit 61, it's intended to be comments, findings and conclusion about Dr. Loomis's entire report, correct?</li> <li>A. Parts of the report that I made comments on, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, I mean, again, you did review the entire Loomis report, correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>time, do you guys have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MS. HUISMAN: No. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right. Yeah, we'll reserve our opportunity to question Mr. Gruen. Government and school, government bodies or school boards, anybody out there with questions for Mr. Gruen? All right. Mr. Blazer, do you have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MR. BLAZER: Thank you, Mr. Cornale. QUESTIONS BY MR. BLAZER: Q. Mr. Gruen, your presentation sounded like substantially a verbatim recitation of your report;</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>thing.</li> <li>Q. So did you review the JEDI model inputs or did somebody else do that?</li> <li>A. Two of us did.</li> <li>Q. And just from the title of your report, correct me if I'm wrong, and this is UCLC Exhibit 61, it's intended to be comments, findings and conclusion about Dr. Loomis's entire report, correct?</li> <li>A. Parts of the report that I made comments on, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, I mean, again, you did review the entire Loomis report, correct?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>time, do you guys have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MS. HUISMAN: No. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right. Yeah, we'll reserve our opportunity to question Mr. Gruen. Government and school, government bodies or school boards, anybody out there with questions for Mr. Gruen? All right. Mr. Blazer, do you have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MR. BLAZER: Thank you, Mr. Cornale. QUESTIONS BY MR. BLAZER: Q. Mr. Gruen, your presentation sounded like substantially a verbatim recitation of your report; is that correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>thing.</li> <li>Q. So did you review the JEDI model inputs or did somebody else do that?</li> <li>A. Two of us did.</li> <li>Q. And just from the title of your report, correct me if I'm wrong, and this is UCLC Exhibit 61, it's intended to be comments, findings and conclusion about Dr. Loomis's entire report, correct?</li> <li>A. Parts of the report that I made comments on, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, I mean, again, you did review the entire Loomis report, correct?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What else did you personally review</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>time, do you guys have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MS. HUISMAN: No. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right. Yeah, we'll reserve our opportunity to question Mr. Gruen. Government and school, government bodies or school boards, anybody out there with questions for Mr. Gruen? All right. Mr. Blazer, do you have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MR. BLAZER: Thank you, Mr. Cornale. QUESTIONS BY MR. BLAZER:</li> <li>Q. Mr. Gruen, your presentation sounded like substantially a verbatim recitation of your report; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I would have to compare it, but certainly</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>thing.</li> <li>Q. So did you review the JEDI model inputs or did somebody else do that?</li> <li>A. Two of us did.</li> <li>Q. And just from the title of your report, correct me if I'm wrong, and this is UCLC Exhibit 61, it's intended to be comments, findings and conclusion about Dr. Loomis's entire report, correct?</li> <li>A. Parts of the report that I made comments on, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, I mean, again, you did review the entire Loomis report, correct?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What else did you personally review in order to prepare your report and testify here?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>time, do you guys have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MS. HUISMAN: No. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right. Yeah, we'll reserve our opportunity to question Mr. Gruen. Government and school, government bodies or school boards, anybody out there with questions for Mr. Gruen? All right. Mr. Blazer, do you have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MR. BLAZER: Thank you, Mr. Cornale. QUESTIONS BY MR. BLAZER: Q. Mr. Gruen, your presentation sounded like substantially a verbatim recitation of your report; is that correct? A. I would have to compare it, but certainly much of it was read from the report.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>thing.</li> <li>Q. So did you review the JEDI model inputs or did somebody else do that?</li> <li>A. Two of us did.</li> <li>Q. And just from the title of your report, correct me if I'm wrong, and this is UCLC Exhibit 61, it's intended to be comments, findings and conclusion about Dr. Loomis's entire report, correct?</li> <li>A. Parts of the report that I made comments on, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, I mean, again, you did review the entire Loomis report, correct?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What else did you personally review in order to prepare your report and testify here?</li> <li>A. I reviewed the employment data that's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>time, do you guys have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MS. HUISMAN: No. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right. Yeah, we'll reserve our opportunity to question Mr. Gruen. Government and school, government bodies or school boards, anybody out there with questions for Mr. Gruen? All right. Mr. Blazer, do you have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MR. BLAZER: Thank you, Mr. Cornale. QUESTIONS BY MR. BLAZER:</li> <li>Q. Mr. Gruen, your presentation sounded like substantially a verbatim recitation of your report; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I would have to compare it, but certainly much of it was read from the report.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you have Dr. Loomis's report up</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>thing.</li> <li>Q. So did you review the JEDI model inputs or did somebody else do that?</li> <li>A. Two of us did.</li> <li>Q. And just from the title of your report, correct me if I'm wrong, and this is UCLC Exhibit 61, it's intended to be comments, findings and conclusion about Dr. Loomis's entire report, correct?</li> <li>A. Parts of the report that I made comments on, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, I mean, again, you did review the entire Loomis report, correct?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What else did you personally review in order to prepare your report and testify here?</li> <li>A. I reviewed the employment data that's reflected in the in our report, the unemployment</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>time, do you guys have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MS. HUISMAN: No. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right. Yeah, we'll reserve our opportunity to question Mr. Gruen. Government and school, government bodies or school boards, anybody out there with questions for Mr. Gruen? All right. Mr. Blazer, do you have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MR. BLAZER: Thank you, Mr. Cornale. QUESTIONS BY MR. BLAZER:</li> <li>Q. Mr. Gruen, your presentation sounded like substantially a verbatim recitation of your report; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I would have to compare it, but certainly much of it was read from the report.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you have Dr. Loomis's report up there with you? Here, I have it.</li> <li>A. I have a copy, I'll get his copy.</li> <li>Q. That's all right. We'll be referring to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>thing.</li> <li>Q. So did you review the JEDI model inputs or did somebody else do that?</li> <li>A. Two of us did.</li> <li>Q. And just from the title of your report, correct me if I'm wrong, and this is UCLC Exhibit 61, it's intended to be comments, findings and conclusion about Dr. Loomis's entire report, correct?</li> <li>A. Parts of the report that I made comments on, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, I mean, again, you did review the entire Loomis report, correct?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What else did you personally review in order to prepare your report and testify here?</li> <li>A. I reviewed the employment data that's reflected in the in our report, the unemployment data. Give me one minute. There's a series of articles, newspaper articles that I reviewed. There's the Illinois Wind Turbine Supply Chain</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>time, do you guys have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MS. HUISMAN: No. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right. Yeah, we'll reserve our opportunity to question Mr. Gruen. Government and school, government bodies or school boards, anybody out there with questions for Mr. Gruen? All right. Mr. Blazer, do you have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MR. BLAZER: Thank you, Mr. Cornale. QUESTIONS BY MR. BLAZER:</li> <li>Q. Mr. Gruen, your presentation sounded like substantially a verbatim recitation of your report; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I would have to compare it, but certainly much of it was read from the report.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you have Dr. Loomis's report up there with you? Here, I have it.</li> <li>A. I have a copy, I'll get his copy.</li> <li>Q. That's all right. We'll be referring to it. This is the one that's actually in the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>thing.</li> <li>Q. So did you review the JEDI model inputs or did somebody else do that?</li> <li>A. Two of us did.</li> <li>Q. And just from the title of your report, correct me if I'm wrong, and this is UCLC Exhibit 61, it's intended to be comments, findings and conclusion about Dr. Loomis's entire report, correct?</li> <li>A. Parts of the report that I made comments on, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, I mean, again, you did review the entire Loomis report, correct?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What else did you personally review in order to prepare your report and testify here?</li> <li>A. I reviewed the employment data that's reflected in the in our report, the unemployment data. Give me one minute. There's a series of articles, newspaper articles that I reviewed. There's the Illinois Wind Turbine Supply Chain Report June 10, Center for Renewable Energy, I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>time, do you guys have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MS. HUISMAN: No. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right. Yeah, we'll reserve our opportunity to question Mr. Gruen. Government and school, government bodies or school boards, anybody out there with questions for Mr. Gruen? All right. Mr. Blazer, do you have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MR. BLAZER: Thank you, Mr. Cornale. QUESTIONS BY MR. BLAZER:</li> <li>Q. Mr. Gruen, your presentation sounded like substantially a verbatim recitation of your report; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I would have to compare it, but certainly much of it was read from the report.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you have Dr. Loomis's report up there with you? Here, I have it.</li> <li>A. I have a copy, I'll get his copy.</li> <li>Q. That's all right. We'll be referring to it. This is the one that's actually in the material. And for the record, that's Pleasant Ridge</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>thing.</li> <li>Q. So did you review the JEDI model inputs or did somebody else do that?</li> <li>A. Two of us did.</li> <li>Q. And just from the title of your report, correct me if I'm wrong, and this is UCLC Exhibit 61, it's intended to be comments, findings and conclusion about Dr. Loomis's entire report, correct?</li> <li>A. Parts of the report that I made comments on, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, I mean, again, you did review the entire Loomis report, correct?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What else did you personally review in order to prepare your report and testify here?</li> <li>A. I reviewed the employment data that's reflected in the in our report, the unemployment data. Give me one minute. There's a series of articles, newspaper articles that I reviewed. There's the Illinois Wind Turbine Supply Chain Report June 10, Center for Renewable Energy, I reviewed. The database of permitted projects by the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>time, do you guys have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MS. HUISMAN: No. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right. Yeah, we'll reserve our opportunity to question Mr. Gruen. Government and school, government bodies or school boards, anybody out there with questions for Mr. Gruen? All right. Mr. Blazer, do you have any questions for Mr. Gruen? MR. BLAZER: Thank you, Mr. Cornale. QUESTIONS BY MR. BLAZER:</li> <li>Q. Mr. Gruen, your presentation sounded like substantially a verbatim recitation of your report; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I would have to compare it, but certainly much of it was read from the report.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you have Dr. Loomis's report up there with you? Here, I have it.</li> <li>A. I have a copy, I'll get his copy.</li> <li>Q. That's all right. We'll be referring to it. This is the one that's actually in the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>thing.</li> <li>Q. So did you review the JEDI model inputs or did somebody else do that?</li> <li>A. Two of us did.</li> <li>Q. And just from the title of your report, correct me if I'm wrong, and this is UCLC Exhibit 61, it's intended to be comments, findings and conclusion about Dr. Loomis's entire report, correct?</li> <li>A. Parts of the report that I made comments on, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, I mean, again, you did review the entire Loomis report, correct?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What else did you personally review in order to prepare your report and testify here?</li> <li>A. I reviewed the employment data that's reflected in the in our report, the unemployment data. Give me one minute. There's a series of articles, newspaper articles that I reviewed. There's the Illinois Wind Turbine Supply Chain Report June 10, Center for Renewable Energy, I</li> </ul>

	INGSTON COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS		January 26, 2015
	Page 1580		Page 1582
1	Q. So you're talking about the references in	1	Q. Water and sewer services?
2	your report?	2	A. Yes.
3	A. Yes, sir.	3	Q. Schools you mentioned, education. What's
4	Q. And you reviewed every one of those	4	the impact on a community if its infrastructure
5	references personally?	5	deteriorates?
6	A. Yes. And so I think there was also some	6	A. If infrastructure deteriorates, it's going
7	articles, including an important article that	7	to have less good infrastructure and all that goes
8	describes the limitations of input/output models.	8	along with that less good infrastructure.
9	Footnote 8 on page 70, I actually read that article,	9	Q. Okay, you're going to have to keep that up
10	Net Multipliers Avoid Exaggerating Impacts: With a	10	there. I didn't hear your answer, I'm sorry.
11	<b>Bi-Regional Illustration for the Dutch</b>	11	A. If infrastructure deteriorates, it will
12	Transportation Sector, Journal of Regional Science.	12	have less good infrastructure and therefore less
13	If I can	13	whatever goes along with whatever the particular
14	Q. So you went out and looked for articles	14	decline in infrastructure is.
15	that address input/output models?	15	Q. Well, for example, would a deterioration
16	A. Right.	16	in infrastructure have an impact on the community's
17	Q. Okay, and that's the one you found?	17	real estate values?
18	A. Well, there are other ones I found. That	18	A. It could.
19	was the one that I cited in that footnote.	19	Q. All right. And would that then have an
20	Q. Okay. Did you review any of the testimony	20	impact on the community's tax base?
21	that's been given in this proceeding?	21	A. It could.
22	A. Yes.	22	Q. Okay. You have the report there, right?
23	Q. Okay. Which testimony did you review?	23	A. My report, yes.
24	A. The testimony that was given to me by the	24	Q. Okay. On page 1 you say, "The analysis of
	Page 1581		Page 1583
1	attorney for Dr. Loomis.	1	the economic impact of the proposed wind energy
2	Q. Well, that's me, so I assume you mean the	2	development does not comprehensively portray impacts
3	attorney for UCLC	3	that the proposed development may induce."
4	A. I mean	4	A. Correct.
Ē	Q Phil Luetkehans?		
5		5	
5 6	A his, Dr. Loomis's testimony, it was	5 6	Q. Now, are you saying that Dr. Loomis's report does not address all economic impacts that
5 6 7	-		Q. Now, are you saying that Dr. Loomis's report does not address all economic impacts that
	A his, Dr. Loomis's testimony, it was sent to me.	6	Q. Now, are you saying that Dr. Loomis's report does not address all economic impacts that will result from this project?
7	A his, Dr. Loomis's testimony, it was	6 7	Q. Now, are you saying that Dr. Loomis's report does not address all economic impacts that
7 8 9	<ul><li>A his, Dr. Loomis's testimony, it was sent to me.</li><li>Q. All right. That's the only thing you</li></ul>	6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Now, are you saying that Dr. Loomis's report does not address all economic impacts that will result from this project?</li> <li>A. I'm saying that there's no, I'm saying</li> </ul>
7 8	<ul><li>A his, Dr. Loomis's testimony, it was sent to me.</li><li>Q. All right. That's the only thing you reviewed?</li></ul>	6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Now, are you saying that Dr. Loomis's report does not address all economic impacts that will result from this project?</li> <li>A. I'm saying that there's no, I'm saying that that may be that as well, that is true, but the</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A his, Dr. Loomis's testimony, it was sent to me.</li> <li>Q. All right. That's the only thing you reviewed?</li> <li>A. In addition to the things we've just discussed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What are the elements of a</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. Now, are you saying that Dr. Loomis's report does not address all economic impacts that will result from this project?</li> <li>A. I'm saying that there's no, I'm saying that that may be that as well, that is true, but the point that I'm trying to make on page 1 is more</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A his, Dr. Loomis's testimony, it was sent to me.</li> <li>Q. All right. That's the only thing you reviewed?</li> <li>A. In addition to the things we've just discussed.</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Now, are you saying that Dr. Loomis's report does not address all economic impacts that will result from this project?</li> <li>A. I'm saying that there's no, I'm saying that that may be that as well, that is true, but the point that I'm trying to make on page 1 is more simple than that. Economic impacts do not measure</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A his, Dr. Loomis's testimony, it was sent to me.</li> <li>Q. All right. That's the only thing you reviewed?</li> <li>A. In addition to the things we've just discussed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What are the elements of a community's infrastructure?</li> <li>A. What are the elements of a community's</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Now, are you saying that Dr. Loomis's report does not address all economic impacts that will result from this project?</li> <li>A. I'm saying that there's no, I'm saying that that may be that as well, that is true, but the point that I'm trying to make on page 1 is more simple than that. Economic impacts do not measure all impacts of a project. That's all I was trying to say.</li> <li>Q. Well, for example, Dr. Loomis's report</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A his, Dr. Loomis's testimony, it was sent to me.</li> <li>Q. All right. That's the only thing you reviewed?</li> <li>A. In addition to the things we've just discussed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What are the elements of a community's infrastructure?</li> <li>A. What are the elements of a community's infrastructure?</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Now, are you saying that Dr. Loomis's report does not address all economic impacts that will result from this project?</li> <li>A. I'm saying that there's no, I'm saying that that may be that as well, that is true, but the point that I'm trying to make on page 1 is more simple than that. Economic impacts do not measure all impacts of a project. That's all I was trying to say.</li> <li>Q. Well, for example, Dr. Loomis's report doesn't mention the economic benefits agreement that</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A his, Dr. Loomis's testimony, it was sent to me.</li> <li>Q. All right. That's the only thing you reviewed?</li> <li>A. In addition to the things we've just discussed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What are the elements of a community's infrastructure?</li> <li>A. What are the elements of a community's infrastructure?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Now, are you saying that Dr. Loomis's report does not address all economic impacts that will result from this project?</li> <li>A. I'm saying that there's no, I'm saying that that may be that as well, that is true, but the point that I'm trying to make on page 1 is more simple than that. Economic impacts do not measure all impacts of a project. That's all I was trying to say.</li> <li>Q. Well, for example, Dr. Loomis's report doesn't mention the economic benefits agreement that Invenergy has said it will enter into with the</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A his, Dr. Loomis's testimony, it was sent to me.</li> <li>Q. All right. That's the only thing you reviewed?</li> <li>A. In addition to the things we've just discussed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What are the elements of a community's infrastructure?</li> <li>A. What are the elements of a community's infrastructure?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Well, there's hard infrastructure, like</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Now, are you saying that Dr. Loomis's report does not address all economic impacts that will result from this project?</li> <li>A. I'm saying that there's no, I'm saying that that may be that as well, that is true, but the point that I'm trying to make on page 1 is more simple than that. Economic impacts do not measure all impacts of a project. That's all I was trying to say.</li> <li>Q. Well, for example, Dr. Loomis's report doesn't mention the economic benefits agreement that Invenergy has said it will enter into with the county, right?</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A his, Dr. Loomis's testimony, it was sent to me.</li> <li>Q. All right. That's the only thing you reviewed?</li> <li>A. In addition to the things we've just discussed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What are the elements of a community's infrastructure?</li> <li>A. What are the elements of a community's infrastructure?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Well, there's hard infrastructure, like roads, airports, bridges, utilities and so forth.</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Now, are you saying that Dr. Loomis's report does not address all economic impacts that will result from this project?</li> <li>A. I'm saying that there's no, I'm saying that that may be that as well, that is true, but the point that I'm trying to make on page 1 is more simple than that. Economic impacts do not measure all impacts of a project. That's all I was trying to say.</li> <li>Q. Well, for example, Dr. Loomis's report doesn't mention the economic benefits agreement that Invenergy has said it will enter into with the county, right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A his, Dr. Loomis's testimony, it was sent to me.</li> <li>Q. All right. That's the only thing you reviewed?</li> <li>A. In addition to the things we've just discussed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What are the elements of a community's infrastructure?</li> <li>A. What are the elements of a community's infrastructure?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Well, there's hard infrastructure, like roads, airports, bridges, utilities and so forth. There's soft infrastructure, which is education, the</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Now, are you saying that Dr. Loomis's report does not address all economic impacts that will result from this project?</li> <li>A. I'm saying that there's no, I'm saying that that may be that as well, that is true, but the point that I'm trying to make on page 1 is more simple than that. Economic impacts do not measure all impacts of a project. That's all I was trying to say.</li> <li>Q. Well, for example, Dr. Loomis's report doesn't mention the economic benefits agreement that Invenergy has said it will enter into with the county, right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. And you are aware that</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A his, Dr. Loomis's testimony, it was sent to me.</li> <li>Q. All right. That's the only thing you reviewed?</li> <li>A. In addition to the things we've just discussed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What are the elements of a community's infrastructure?</li> <li>A. What are the elements of a community's infrastructure?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Well, there's hard infrastructure, like roads, airports, bridges, utilities and so forth. There's soft infrastructure, which is education, the social capital of a community, education of the</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Now, are you saying that Dr. Loomis's report does not address all economic impacts that will result from this project?</li> <li>A. I'm saying that there's no, I'm saying that that may be that as well, that is true, but the point that I'm trying to make on page 1 is more simple than that. Economic impacts do not measure all impacts of a project. That's all I was trying to say.</li> <li>Q. Well, for example, Dr. Loomis's report doesn't mention the economic benefits agreement that Invenergy has said it will enter into with the county, right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. And you are aware that Invenergy has indicated that they are prepared to</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A his, Dr. Loomis's testimony, it was sent to me.</li> <li>Q. All right. That's the only thing you reviewed?</li> <li>A. In addition to the things we've just discussed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What are the elements of a community's infrastructure?</li> <li>A. What are the elements of a community's infrastructure?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Well, there's hard infrastructure, like roads, airports, bridges, utilities and so forth. There's soft infrastructure, which is education, the social capital of a community, education of the community, educational facilities and services.</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Now, are you saying that Dr. Loomis's report does not address all economic impacts that will result from this project?</li> <li>A. I'm saying that there's no, I'm saying that that may be that as well, that is true, but the point that I'm trying to make on page 1 is more simple than that. Economic impacts do not measure all impacts of a project. That's all I was trying to say.</li> <li>Q. Well, for example, Dr. Loomis's report doesn't mention the economic benefits agreement that Invenergy has said it will enter into with the county, right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. And you are aware that Invenergy has indicated that they are prepared to enter into such an agreement with the county,</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A his, Dr. Loomis's testimony, it was sent to me.</li> <li>Q. All right. That's the only thing you reviewed?</li> <li>A. In addition to the things we've just discussed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What are the elements of a community's infrastructure?</li> <li>A. What are the elements of a community's infrastructure?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Well, there's hard infrastructure, like roads, airports, bridges, utilities and so forth. There's soft infrastructure, which is education, the social capital of a community, education of the community, educational facilities and services.</li> <li>Q. Public safety?</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Now, are you saying that Dr. Loomis's report does not address all economic impacts that will result from this project?</li> <li>A. I'm saying that there's no, I'm saying that that may be that as well, that is true, but the point that I'm trying to make on page 1 is more simple than that. Economic impacts do not measure all impacts of a project. That's all I was trying to say.</li> <li>Q. Well, for example, Dr. Loomis's report doesn't mention the economic benefits agreement that Invenergy has said it will enter into with the county, right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. And you are aware that Invenergy has indicated that they are prepared to enter into such an agreement with the county, correct?</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A his, Dr. Loomis's testimony, it was sent to me.</li> <li>Q. All right. That's the only thing you reviewed?</li> <li>A. In addition to the things we've just discussed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What are the elements of a community's infrastructure?</li> <li>A. What are the elements of a community's infrastructure?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Well, there's hard infrastructure, like roads, airports, bridges, utilities and so forth. There's soft infrastructure, which is education, the social capital of a community, education of the community, educational facilities and services.</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Now, are you saying that Dr. Loomis's report does not address all economic impacts that will result from this project?</li> <li>A. I'm saying that there's no, I'm saying that that may be that as well, that is true, but the point that I'm trying to make on page 1 is more simple than that. Economic impacts do not measure all impacts of a project. That's all I was trying to say.</li> <li>Q. Well, for example, Dr. Loomis's report doesn't mention the economic benefits agreement that Invenergy has said it will enter into with the county, right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. And you are aware that Invenergy has indicated that they are prepared to enter into such an agreement with the county,</li> </ul>

			January 26, 2015
	Page 1584		Page 1586
1	transcript of this proceeding. It's from November	1	MR. BLAZER: No, there have been for
2	17, 2014, from Mr. Parzyck.	2	the record, Mr. Cornale, there have been no
3	MR. BLAZER: Counsel, it's page 45 line 23	3	solidification of details because there have been no
4	to page 46 line 4.	4	negotiations, nor can there be, with the county
5	Q. "I'd like to briefly mention the fact that	5	until this board makes its recommendation.
6	we are prepared to discuss an economic benefit	6	However, Mr. Parzyck, as I just indicated
7	agreement, an agreement that would add millions of	7	on the record, on the first day of this proceeding
8	dollars to Livingston County's economy, and it would	8	indicated that Invenergy is prepared to enter into
9	be based on the agreement that Iberdrola put	8 9	an agreement similar to the one that was entered
		_	
10	together for the Deer Run project." You're not	10	into with the Deer Run project. And this county is
11	aware of that?	11	fully aware of what the terms of that agreement
12	A. I haven't studied that. I'm not aware of	12	were. But we're going to get there in a minute.
13	it.	13	CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay.
14	MR. LUETKEHANS: I haven't seen it either,	14	<b>MR. LUETKEHANS:</b> So we don't know if it's
15	so if it exists	15	a dollar or a million dollars.
16	MR. BLAZER: Well	16	MR. BLAZER: We're going to get there in a
17	<b>MR. LUETKEHANS:</b> I'd love to see it.	17	minute.
18	MR. BLAZER: this is based on	18	CHAIRMAN CORNALE: But given the
19	testimony. That's all we're talking about right	19	information that's been presented to date, there is
20	now.	20	no economic impact that Mr. Gruen could, in fact,
21	MR. LUETKEHANS: He already said he didn't	21	input into his model to determine a more reliable
22	review Dr Mr. Parzyck's testimony, so if you	22	result; is that correct?
23	want to ask him about something he actually	23	MR. BLAZER: That is not correct, and I
24	reviewed, that would be a great idea.	24	think we'll get to that in a few minutes. So if I
	Page 1585		Page 1587
1	-	1	-
1	MR. BLAZER: Well, part of what we're	1	can proceed, Mr. Cornale, I think we're going to get
2	<b>MR. BLAZER:</b> Well, part of what we're discussing here is what he didn't review and why he	2	can proceed, Mr. Cornale, I think we're going to get there.
2 3	<b>MR. BLAZER:</b> Well, part of what we're discussing here is what he didn't review and why he didn't review it.	2 3	can proceed, Mr. Cornale, I think we're going to get there. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Hold. Okay, so moving
2 3 4	MR. BLAZER: Well, part of what we're discussing here is what he didn't review and why he didn't review it. Q. So anyway, going to page 11 of your	2 3 4	can proceed, Mr. Cornale, I think we're going to get there. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Hold. Okay, so moving forward, the economic impact that you've alluded to
2 3 4 5	MR. BLAZER: Well, part of what we're discussing here is what he didn't review and why he didn't review it. Q. So anyway, going to page 11 of your report, Mr. Gruen	2 3 4 5	can proceed, Mr. Cornale, I think we're going to get there. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Hold. Okay, so moving forward, the economic impact that you've alluded to cannot be further discussed. There's nothing out
2 3 4 5 6	MR. BLAZER: Well, part of what we're discussing here is what he didn't review and why he didn't review it. Q. So anyway, going to page 11 of your report, Mr. Gruen MR. LUETKEHANS: Maybe because I don't	2 3 4 5 6	can proceed, Mr. Cornale, I think we're going to get there. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Hold. Okay, so moving forward, the economic impact that you've alluded to cannot be further discussed. There's nothing out there. No one's testified to it. He can't he
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. BLAZER: Well, part of what we're discussing here is what he didn't review and why he didn't review it. Q. So anyway, going to page 11 of your report, Mr. Gruen MR. LUETKEHANS: Maybe because I don't have it.	2 3 4 5 6 7	can proceed, Mr. Cornale, I think we're going to get there. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Hold. Okay, so moving forward, the economic impact that you've alluded to cannot be further discussed. There's nothing out there. No one's testified to it. He can't he can't input that into his model. So any questions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. BLAZER: Well, part of what we're discussing here is what he didn't review and why he didn't review it. Q. So anyway, going to page 11 of your report, Mr. Gruen MR. LUETKEHANS: Maybe because I don't have it. MR. BLAZER: You don't have the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	can proceed, Mr. Cornale, I think we're going to get there. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Hold. Okay, so moving forward, the economic impact that you've alluded to cannot be further discussed. There's nothing out there. No one's testified to it. He can't he can't input that into his model. So any questions that potentially address that are not allowed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. BLAZER: Well, part of what we're discussing here is what he didn't review and why he didn't review it. Q. So anyway, going to page 11 of your report, Mr. Gruen MR. LUETKEHANS: Maybe because I don't have it. MR. BLAZER: You don't have the transcript? I'm sorry?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	can proceed, Mr. Cornale, I think we're going to get there. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Hold. Okay, so moving forward, the economic impact that you've alluded to cannot be further discussed. There's nothing out there. No one's testified to it. He can't he can't input that into his model. So any questions that potentially address that are not allowed. There's no there's been no in good faith working
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. BLAZER: Well, part of what we're discussing here is what he didn't review and why he didn't review it. Q. So anyway, going to page 11 of your report, Mr. Gruen MR. LUETKEHANS: Maybe because I don't have it. MR. BLAZER: You don't have the transcript? I'm sorry? MR. LUETKEHANS: I don't actually have the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	can proceed, Mr. Cornale, I think we're going to get there. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Hold. Okay, so moving forward, the economic impact that you've alluded to cannot be further discussed. There's nothing out there. No one's testified to it. He can't he can't input that into his model. So any questions that potentially address that are not allowed. There's no there's been no in good faith working towards that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. BLAZER: Well, part of what we're discussing here is what he didn't review and why he didn't review it. Q. So anyway, going to page 11 of your report, Mr. Gruen MR. LUETKEHANS: Maybe because I don't have it. MR. BLAZER: You don't have the transcript? I'm sorry? MR. LUETKEHANS: I don't actually have the report. I don't have the agreement you keep talking	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	can proceed, Mr. Cornale, I think we're going to get there. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Hold. Okay, so moving forward, the economic impact that you've alluded to cannot be further discussed. There's nothing out there. No one's testified to it. He can't he can't input that into his model. So any questions that potentially address that are not allowed. There's no there's been no in good faith working towards that. MR. BLAZER: Well, except that there is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. BLAZER: Well, part of what we're discussing here is what he didn't review and why he didn't review it. Q. So anyway, going to page 11 of your report, Mr. Gruen MR. LUETKEHANS: Maybe because I don't have it. MR. BLAZER: You don't have the transcript? I'm sorry? MR. LUETKEHANS: I don't actually have the report. I don't have the agreement you keep talking about. We've tried to ask about it, and no one who	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	can proceed, Mr. Cornale, I think we're going to get there. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Hold. Okay, so moving forward, the economic impact that you've alluded to cannot be further discussed. There's nothing out there. No one's testified to it. He can't he can't input that into his model. So any questions that potentially address that are not allowed. There's no there's been no in good faith working towards that. MR. BLAZER: Well, except that there is evidence in this record regarding what that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. BLAZER: Well, part of what we're discussing here is what he didn't review and why he didn't review it. Q. So anyway, going to page 11 of your report, Mr. Gruen MR. LUETKEHANS: Maybe because I don't have it. MR. BLAZER: You don't have the transcript? I'm sorry? MR. LUETKEHANS: I don't actually have the report. I don't have the agreement you keep talking about. We've tried to ask about it, and no one who was in the meeting is willing to come up here and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	can proceed, Mr. Cornale, I think we're going to get there. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Hold. Okay, so moving forward, the economic impact that you've alluded to cannot be further discussed. There's nothing out there. No one's testified to it. He can't he can't input that into his model. So any questions that potentially address that are not allowed. There's no there's been no in good faith working towards that. MR. BLAZER: Well, except that there is evidence in this record regarding what that agreement is because we know what that agreement was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. BLAZER: Well, part of what we're discussing here is what he didn't review and why he didn't review it. Q. So anyway, going to page 11 of your report, Mr. Gruen MR. LUETKEHANS: Maybe because I don't have it. MR. BLAZER: You don't have the transcript? I'm sorry? MR. LUETKEHANS: I don't actually have the report. I don't have the agreement you keep talking about. We've tried to ask about it, and no one who was in the meeting is willing to come up here and talk about it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	can proceed, Mr. Cornale, I think we're going to get there. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Hold. Okay, so moving forward, the economic impact that you've alluded to cannot be further discussed. There's nothing out there. No one's testified to it. He can't he can't input that into his model. So any questions that potentially address that are not allowed. There's no there's been no in good faith working towards that. MR. BLAZER: Well, except that there is evidence in this record regarding what that agreement is because we know what that agreement was that's also in this record. So all I ask right now
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. BLAZER: Well, part of what we're discussing here is what he didn't review and why he didn't review it. Q. So anyway, going to page 11 of your report, Mr. Gruen MR. LUETKEHANS: Maybe because I don't have it. MR. BLAZER: You don't have the transcript? I'm sorry? MR. LUETKEHANS: I don't actually have the report. I don't have the agreement you keep talking about. We've tried to ask about it, and no one who was in the meeting is willing to come up here and talk about it. MR. BLAZER: I don't know where that's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	can proceed, Mr. Cornale, I think we're going to get there. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Hold. Okay, so moving forward, the economic impact that you've alluded to cannot be further discussed. There's nothing out there. No one's testified to it. He can't he can't input that into his model. So any questions that potentially address that are not allowed. There's no there's been no in good faith working towards that. MR. BLAZER: Well, except that there is evidence in this record regarding what that agreement is because we know what that agreement was that's also in this record. So all I ask right now is that
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. BLAZER: Well, part of what we're discussing here is what he didn't review and why he didn't review it. Q. So anyway, going to page 11 of your report, Mr. Gruen MR. LUETKEHANS: Maybe because I don't have it. MR. BLAZER: You don't have the transcript? I'm sorry? MR. LUETKEHANS: I don't actually have the report. I don't have the agreement you keep talking about. We've tried to ask about it, and no one who was in the meeting is willing to come up here and talk about it. MR. BLAZER: I don't know where that's coming from, Mr. Cornale. I let's move on, shall	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	can proceed, Mr. Cornale, I think we're going to get there. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Hold. Okay, so moving forward, the economic impact that you've alluded to cannot be further discussed. There's nothing out there. No one's testified to it. He can't he can't input that into his model. So any questions that potentially address that are not allowed. There's no there's been no in good faith working towards that. MR. BLAZER: Well, except that there is evidence in this record regarding what that agreement is because we know what that agreement was that's also in this record. So all I ask right now is that MR. LUETKEHANS: What the agreement was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. BLAZER: Well, part of what we're discussing here is what he didn't review and why he didn't review it. Q. So anyway, going to page 11 of your report, Mr. Gruen MR. LUETKEHANS: Maybe because I don't have it. MR. BLAZER: You don't have the transcript? I'm sorry? MR. LUETKEHANS: I don't actually have the report. I don't have the agreement you keep talking about. We've tried to ask about it, and no one who was in the meeting is willing to come up here and talk about it. MR. BLAZER: I don't know where that's coming from, Mr. Cornale. I let's move on, shall we?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	can proceed, Mr. Cornale, I think we're going to get there. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Hold. Okay, so moving forward, the economic impact that you've alluded to cannot be further discussed. There's nothing out there. No one's testified to it. He can't he can't input that into his model. So any questions that potentially address that are not allowed. There's no there's been no in good faith working towards that. MR. BLAZER: Well, except that there is evidence in this record regarding what that agreement is because we know what that agreement was that's also in this record. So all I ask right now is that MR. LUETKEHANS: What the agreement was that's in this record? I'm sorry, I got lost.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. BLAZER: Well, part of what we're discussing here is what he didn't review and why he didn't review it. Q. So anyway, going to page 11 of your report, Mr. Gruen MR. LUETKEHANS: Maybe because I don't have it. MR. BLAZER: You don't have the transcript? I'm sorry? MR. LUETKEHANS: I don't actually have the report. I don't have the agreement you keep talking about. We've tried to ask about it, and no one who was in the meeting is willing to come up here and talk about it. MR. BLAZER: I don't know where that's coming from, Mr. Cornale. I let's move on, shall we? CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Please. We've got one	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	can proceed, Mr. Cornale, I think we're going to get there. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Hold. Okay, so moving forward, the economic impact that you've alluded to cannot be further discussed. There's nothing out there. No one's testified to it. He can't he can't input that into his model. So any questions that potentially address that are not allowed. There's no there's been no in good faith working towards that. MR. BLAZER: Well, except that there is evidence in this record regarding what that agreement is because we know what that agreement was that's also in this record. So all I ask right now is that MR. LUETKEHANS: What the agreement was that's in this record? I'm sorry, I got lost. Iberdrola is not in this record. Is Iberdrola in
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. BLAZER: Well, part of what we're discussing here is what he didn't review and why he didn't review it. Q. So anyway, going to page 11 of your report, Mr. Gruen MR. LUETKEHANS: Maybe because I don't have it. MR. BLAZER: You don't have the transcript? I'm sorry? MR. LUETKEHANS: I don't actually have the report. I don't have the agreement you keep talking about. We've tried to ask about it, and no one who was in the meeting is willing to come up here and talk about it. MR. BLAZER: I don't know where that's coming from, Mr. Cornale. I let's move on, shall we? CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Please. We've got one other thing that we need to address. The specifics	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	can proceed, Mr. Cornale, I think we're going to get there. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Hold. Okay, so moving forward, the economic impact that you've alluded to cannot be further discussed. There's nothing out there. No one's testified to it. He can't he can't input that into his model. So any questions that potentially address that are not allowed. There's no there's been no in good faith working towards that. MR. BLAZER: Well, except that there is evidence in this record regarding what that agreement is because we know what that agreement was that's also in this record. So all I ask right now is that MR. LUETKEHANS: What the agreement was that's in this record? I'm sorry, I got lost. Iberdrola is not in this record. Is Iberdrola in this record, that agreement?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. BLAZER: Well, part of what we're discussing here is what he didn't review and why he didn't review it. Q. So anyway, going to page 11 of your report, Mr. Gruen MR. LUETKEHANS: Maybe because I don't have it. MR. BLAZER: You don't have the transcript? I'm sorry? MR. LUETKEHANS: I don't actually have the report. I don't have the agreement you keep talking about. We've tried to ask about it, and no one who was in the meeting is willing to come up here and talk about it. MR. BLAZER: I don't know where that's coming from, Mr. Cornale. I let's move on, shall we? CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Please. We've got one other thing that we need to address. The specifics of this economic agreement that's made reference to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	can proceed, Mr. Cornale, I think we're going to get there. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Hold. Okay, so moving forward, the economic impact that you've alluded to cannot be further discussed. There's nothing out there. No one's testified to it. He can't he can't input that into his model. So any questions that potentially address that are not allowed. There's no there's been no in good faith working towards that. MR. BLAZER: Well, except that there is evidence in this record regarding what that agreement is because we know what that agreement was that's also in this record. So all I ask right now is that MR. LUETKEHANS: What the agreement was that's in this record? I'm sorry, I got lost. Iberdrola is not in this record. Is Iberdrola in this record, that agreement? MR. BLAZER: The terms of that agreement
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. BLAZER: Well, part of what we're discussing here is what he didn't review and why he didn't review it. Q. So anyway, going to page 11 of your report, Mr. Gruen MR. LUETKEHANS: Maybe because I don't have it. MR. BLAZER: You don't have the transcript? I'm sorry? MR. LUETKEHANS: I don't actually have the report. I don't have the agreement you keep talking about. We've tried to ask about it, and no one who was in the meeting is willing to come up here and talk about it. MR. BLAZER: I don't know where that's coming from, Mr. Cornale. I let's move on, shall we? CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Please. We've got one other thing that we need to address. The specifics of this economic agreement that's made reference to has been questioned by a zoning board member, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	can proceed, Mr. Cornale, I think we're going to get there. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Hold. Okay, so moving forward, the economic impact that you've alluded to cannot be further discussed. There's nothing out there. No one's testified to it. He can't he can't input that into his model. So any questions that potentially address that are not allowed. There's no there's been no in good faith working towards that. MR. BLAZER: Well, except that there is evidence in this record regarding what that agreement is because we know what that agreement was that's also in this record. So all I ask right now is that MR. LUETKEHANS: What the agreement was that's in this record? I'm sorry, I got lost. Iberdrola is not in this record. Is Iberdrola in this record, that agreement? MR. BLAZER: The terms of that agreement certainly are in this record, yes, they are.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. BLAZER: Well, part of what we're discussing here is what he didn't review and why he didn't review it. Q. So anyway, going to page 11 of your report, Mr. Gruen MR. LUETKEHANS: Maybe because I don't have it. MR. BLAZER: You don't have the transcript? I'm sorry? MR. LUETKEHANS: I don't actually have the report. I don't have the agreement you keep talking about. We've tried to ask about it, and no one who was in the meeting is willing to come up here and talk about it. MR. BLAZER: I don't know where that's coming from, Mr. Cornale. I let's move on, shall we? CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Please. We've got one other thing that we need to address. The specifics of this economic agreement that's made reference to has been questioned by a zoning board member, and Mr. Parzyck declined to comment on that. Is there	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	can proceed, Mr. Cornale, I think we're going to get there. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Hold. Okay, so moving forward, the economic impact that you've alluded to cannot be further discussed. There's nothing out there. No one's testified to it. He can't he can't input that into his model. So any questions that potentially address that are not allowed. There's no there's been no in good faith working towards that. MR. BLAZER: Well, except that there is evidence in this record regarding what that agreement is because we know what that agreement was that's also in this record. So all I ask right now is that MR. LUETKEHANS: What the agreement was that's in this record? I'm sorry, I got lost. Iberdrola is not in this record. Is Iberdrola in this record, that agreement? MR. BLAZER: The terms of that agreement certainly are in this record, yes, they are. MR. LUETKEHANS: What's the exhibit
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. BLAZER: Well, part of what we're discussing here is what he didn't review and why he didn't review it. Q. So anyway, going to page 11 of your report, Mr. Gruen MR. LUETKEHANS: Maybe because I don't have it. MR. BLAZER: You don't have the transcript? I'm sorry? MR. LUETKEHANS: I don't actually have the report. I don't have the agreement you keep talking about. We've tried to ask about it, and no one who was in the meeting is willing to come up here and talk about it. MR. BLAZER: I don't know where that's coming from, Mr. Cornale. I let's move on, shall we? CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Please. We've got one other thing that we need to address. The specifics of this economic agreement that's made reference to has been questioned by a zoning board member, and Mr. Parzyck declined to comment on that. Is there any has there been any solidification of details	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	can proceed, Mr. Cornale, I think we're going to get there. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Hold. Okay, so moving forward, the economic impact that you've alluded to cannot be further discussed. There's nothing out there. No one's testified to it. He can't he can't input that into his model. So any questions that potentially address that are not allowed. There's no there's been no in good faith working towards that. MR. BLAZER: Well, except that there is evidence in this record regarding what that agreement is because we know what that agreement was that's also in this record. So all I ask right now is that MR. LUETKEHANS: What the agreement was that's in this record? I'm sorry, I got lost. Iberdrola is not in this record. Is Iberdrola in this record, that agreement? MR. BLAZER: The terms of that agreement certainly are in this record, yes, they are. MR. LUETKEHANS: What's the exhibit number?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. BLAZER: Well, part of what we're discussing here is what he didn't review and why he didn't review it. Q. So anyway, going to page 11 of your report, Mr. Gruen MR. LUETKEHANS: Maybe because I don't have it. MR. BLAZER: You don't have the transcript? I'm sorry? MR. LUETKEHANS: I don't actually have the report. I don't have the agreement you keep talking about. We've tried to ask about it, and no one who was in the meeting is willing to come up here and talk about it. MR. BLAZER: I don't know where that's coming from, Mr. Cornale. I let's move on, shall we? CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Please. We've got one other thing that we need to address. The specifics of this economic agreement that's made reference to has been questioned by a zoning board member, and Mr. Parzyck declined to comment on that. Is there	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	can proceed, Mr. Cornale, I think we're going to get there. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Hold. Okay, so moving forward, the economic impact that you've alluded to cannot be further discussed. There's nothing out there. No one's testified to it. He can't he can't input that into his model. So any questions that potentially address that are not allowed. There's no there's been no in good faith working towards that. MR. BLAZER: Well, except that there is evidence in this record regarding what that agreement is because we know what that agreement was that's also in this record. So all I ask right now is that MR. LUETKEHANS: What the agreement was that's in this record? I'm sorry, I got lost. Iberdrola is not in this record. Is Iberdrola in this record, that agreement? MR. BLAZER: The terms of that agreement certainly are in this record, yes, they are. MR. LUETKEHANS: What's the exhibit

			January 26, 2015
	Page 1588		Page 1590
1	CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay, counsel has	1	Q. All right. All I'm trying to find out is
2		2	which projects are you talking about other than
3		3	Cayuga Ridge?
4		4	A. Okay, I mentioned the second one that was
5		5	on page 6 that I referred to. There's two. There's
6		6	the Cayuga and there's the Minonk wind farm located
7		7	both in Woodford and Livingston Counties.
8		8	Q. Okay. Now you spoke previously or you
9		9	spoke during your presentation in talking about
10		10	Cayuga Ridge, and you said that jobs in Livingston
11		11	County during the time that Cayuga Ridge was built
12		12	and came online in 2000 around 2009, is that
13		13	correct? That's when it came online?
14		14	<b>MR. LUETKEHANS:</b> The testimony was that it
15		15	came online in March of 2010.
16		16	Q. Right, and it was built in 2009?
17		17	A. Okay, I'll just refer you again
18		18	Q. I'm just asking if you recall your
19		19	testimony.
20		20	A. It's on page 6, too, just in case that
21		21	helps.
22		22	Q. Okay. And you said that jobs in
23		23	Livingston County during that period between 2008
24		24	and 2010 nevertheless declined; is that correct?
	Page 1589		Page 1591
1	-	1	-
1	Page 6 are examples of wind projects that were built	1 2	A. I was let me give me one more
	Page 6 are examples of wind projects that were built in this county previously.		A. I was let me give me one more minute, I'm sorry.
2	<ul><li>Page 6 are examples of wind projects that were built in this county previously.</li><li>Q. So are you are you talking about the</li></ul>	2	A. I was let me give me one more minute, I'm sorry. What I showed is if you look on Table 3 of
2	<ul><li>Page 6 are examples of wind projects that were built in this county previously.</li><li>Q. So are you are you talking about the Cayuga Ridge project?</li></ul>	2 3	A. I was let me give me one more minute, I'm sorry.
2 3 4	<ul> <li>Page 6 are examples of wind projects that were built in this county previously.</li> <li>Q. So are you are you talking about the Cayuga Ridge project?</li> <li>A. Right, the one that was built in 2008 and</li> </ul>	2 3 4	A. I was let me give me one more minute, I'm sorry. What I showed is if you look on Table 3 of our report, the page I was just referring to, is
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Page 6 are examples of wind projects that were built in this county previously.</li> <li>Q. So are you are you talking about the Cayuga Ridge project?</li> <li>A. Right, the one that was built in 2008 and 9 and opened in 2010. There was another one that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	A. I was let me give me one more minute, I'm sorry. What I showed is if you look on Table 3 of our report, the page I was just referring to, is that the number of construction jobs I just want
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Page 6 are examples of wind projects that were built in this county previously.</li> <li>Q. So are you are you talking about the Cayuga Ridge project?</li> <li>A. Right, the one that was built in 2008 and 9 and opened in 2010. There was another one that was in both counties that came on in 2012. I just</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	A. I was let me give me one more minute, I'm sorry. What I showed is if you look on Table 3 of our report, the page I was just referring to, is that the number of construction jobs I just want to be more precise. I say construction jobs
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Page 6 are examples of wind projects that were built in this county previously.</li> <li>Q. So are you are you talking about the Cayuga Ridge project?</li> <li>A. Right, the one that was built in 2008 and 9 and opened in 2010. There was another one that was in both counties that came on in 2012. I just described it in the testimony that's on page 6 here.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	A. I was let me give me one more minute, I'm sorry. What I showed is if you look on Table 3 of our report, the page I was just referring to, is that the number of construction jobs I just want to be more precise. I say construction jobs declined from 2008 to 2010 and then stabilized
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Page 6 are examples of wind projects that were built in this county previously.</li> <li>Q. So are you are you talking about the Cayuga Ridge project?</li> <li>A. Right, the one that was built in 2008 and 9 and opened in 2010. There was another one that was in both counties that came on in 2012. I just described it in the testimony that's on page 6 here.</li> <li>Q. So when you say projects in the quote that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. I was let me give me one more minute, I'm sorry. What I showed is if you look on Table 3 of our report, the page I was just referring to, is that the number of construction jobs I just want to be more precise. I say construction jobs declined from 2008 to 2010 and then stabilized afterwards at the 2010 figures. The actual jobs did
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Page 6 are examples of wind projects that were built in this county previously.</li> <li>Q. So are you are you talking about the Cayuga Ridge project?</li> <li>A. Right, the one that was built in 2008 and 9 and opened in 2010. There was another one that was in both counties that came on in 2012. I just described it in the testimony that's on page 6 here.</li> <li>Q. So when you say projects in the quote that I just read, is the only one you're talking about</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. I was let me give me one more minute, I'm sorry. What I showed is if you look on Table 3 of our report, the page I was just referring to, is that the number of construction jobs I just want to be more precise. I say construction jobs declined from 2008 to 2010 and then stabilized afterwards at the 2010 figures. The actual jobs did decrease as a whole, nonfarm employment, from 2008
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Page 6 are examples of wind projects that were built in this county previously.</li> <li>Q. So are you are you talking about the Cayuga Ridge project?</li> <li>A. Right, the one that was built in 2008 and 9 and opened in 2010. There was another one that was in both counties that came on in 2012. I just described it in the testimony that's on page 6 here.</li> <li>Q. So when you say projects in the quote that I just read, is the only one you're talking about Cayuga Ridge?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. I was let me give me one more minute, I'm sorry. What I showed is if you look on Table 3 of our report, the page I was just referring to, is that the number of construction jobs I just want to be more precise. I say construction jobs declined from 2008 to 2010 and then stabilized afterwards at the 2010 figures. The actual jobs did decrease as a whole, nonfarm employment, from 2008 to the subsequent years, until 2011. So even with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Page 6 are examples of wind projects that were built in this county previously.</li> <li>Q. So are you are you talking about the Cayuga Ridge project?</li> <li>A. Right, the one that was built in 2008 and 9 and opened in 2010. There was another one that was in both counties that came on in 2012. I just described it in the testimony that's on page 6 here.</li> <li>Q. So when you say projects in the quote that I just read, is the only one you're talking about Cayuga Ridge?</li> <li>A. Well, I I'm telling you that there's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. I was let me give me one more minute, I'm sorry. What I showed is if you look on Table 3 of our report, the page I was just referring to, is that the number of construction jobs I just want to be more precise. I say construction jobs declined from 2008 to 2010 and then stabilized afterwards at the 2010 figures. The actual jobs did decrease as a whole, nonfarm employment, from 2008 to the subsequent years, until 2011. So even with the construction activities of the two plants,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Page 6 are examples of wind projects that were built in this county previously.</li> <li>Q. So are you are you talking about the Cayuga Ridge project?</li> <li>A. Right, the one that was built in 2008 and 9 and opened in 2010. There was another one that was in both counties that came on in 2012. I just described it in the testimony that's on page 6 here.</li> <li>Q. So when you say projects in the quote that I just read, is the only one you're talking about Cayuga Ridge?</li> <li>A. Well, I I'm telling you that there's whatever the projects were, it's not transformed the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. I was let me give me one more minute, I'm sorry. What I showed is if you look on Table 3 of our report, the page I was just referring to, is that the number of construction jobs I just want to be more precise. I say construction jobs declined from 2008 to 2010 and then stabilized afterwards at the 2010 figures. The actual jobs did decrease as a whole, nonfarm employment, from 2008 to the subsequent years, until 2011. So even with the construction activities of the two plants, construction jobs declined and overall nonfarm
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Page 6 are examples of wind projects that were built in this county previously.</li> <li>Q. So are you are you talking about the Cayuga Ridge project?</li> <li>A. Right, the one that was built in 2008 and 9 and opened in 2010. There was another one that was in both counties that came on in 2012. I just described it in the testimony that's on page 6 here.</li> <li>Q. So when you say projects in the quote that I just read, is the only one you're talking about Cayuga Ridge?</li> <li>A. Well, I I'm telling you that there's whatever the projects were, it's not transformed the economic base of the county. We looked at the data</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. I was let me give me one more minute, I'm sorry. What I showed is if you look on Table 3 of our report, the page I was just referring to, is that the number of construction jobs I just want to be more precise. I say construction jobs declined from 2008 to 2010 and then stabilized afterwards at the 2010 figures. The actual jobs did decrease as a whole, nonfarm employment, from 2008 to the subsequent years, until 2011. So even with the construction activities of the two plants, construction jobs declined and overall nonfarm employment declined.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Page 6 are examples of wind projects that were built in this county previously.</li> <li>Q. So are you are you talking about the Cayuga Ridge project?</li> <li>A. Right, the one that was built in 2008 and 9 and opened in 2010. There was another one that was in both counties that came on in 2012. I just described it in the testimony that's on page 6 here.</li> <li>Q. So when you say projects in the quote that I just read, is the only one you're talking about Cayuga Ridge?</li> <li>A. Well, I I'm telling you that there's whatever the projects were, it's not transformed the economic base of the county. We looked at the data which is on page let me just show you where I'm</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. I was let me give me one more minute, I'm sorry.</li> <li>What I showed is if you look on Table 3 of our report, the page I was just referring to, is that the number of construction jobs I just want to be more precise. I say construction jobs declined from 2008 to 2010 and then stabilized afterwards at the 2010 figures. The actual jobs did decrease as a whole, nonfarm employment, from 2008 to the subsequent years, until 2011. So even with the construction activities of the two plants, construction jobs declined and overall nonfarm employment declined.</li> <li>Q. Could you go to page 12 of your report?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Page 6 are examples of wind projects that were built in this county previously.</li> <li>Q. So are you are you talking about the Cayuga Ridge project?</li> <li>A. Right, the one that was built in 2008 and 9 and opened in 2010. There was another one that was in both counties that came on in 2012. I just described it in the testimony that's on page 6 here.</li> <li>Q. So when you say projects in the quote that I just read, is the only one you're talking about Cayuga Ridge?</li> <li>A. Well, I I'm telling you that there's whatever the projects were, it's not transformed the economic base of the county. We looked at the data which is on page let me just show you where I'm referring to.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. I was let me give me one more minute, I'm sorry.</li> <li>What I showed is if you look on Table 3 of our report, the page I was just referring to, is that the number of construction jobs I just want to be more precise. I say construction jobs declined from 2008 to 2010 and then stabilized afterwards at the 2010 figures. The actual jobs did decrease as a whole, nonfarm employment, from 2008 to the subsequent years, until 2011. So even with the construction activities of the two plants, construction jobs declined and overall nonfarm employment declined.</li> <li>Q. Could you go to page 12 of your report?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You say here, "Following the advent of the Great Recession, which officially started in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Page 6 are examples of wind projects that were built in this county previously.</li> <li>Q. So are you are you talking about the Cayuga Ridge project?</li> <li>A. Right, the one that was built in 2008 and 9 and opened in 2010. There was another one that was in both counties that came on in 2012. I just described it in the testimony that's on page 6 here.</li> <li>Q. So when you say projects in the quote that I just read, is the only one you're talking about Cayuga Ridge?</li> <li>A. Well, I I'm telling you that there's whatever the projects were, it's not transformed the economic base of the county. We looked at the data which is on page let me just show you where I'm referring to.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. I was let me give me one more minute, I'm sorry.</li> <li>What I showed is if you look on Table 3 of our report, the page I was just referring to, is that the number of construction jobs I just want to be more precise. I say construction jobs declined from 2008 to 2010 and then stabilized afterwards at the 2010 figures. The actual jobs did decrease as a whole, nonfarm employment, from 2008 to the subsequent years, until 2011. So even with the construction activities of the two plants, construction jobs declined and overall nonfarm employment declined.</li> <li>Q. Could you go to page 12 of your report?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You say here, "Following the advent of the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Page 6 are examples of wind projects that were built in this county previously.</li> <li>Q. So are you are you talking about the Cayuga Ridge project?</li> <li>A. Right, the one that was built in 2008 and 9 and opened in 2010. There was another one that was in both counties that came on in 2012. I just described it in the testimony that's on page 6 here.</li> <li>Q. So when you say projects in the quote that I just read, is the only one you're talking about Cayuga Ridge?</li> <li>A. Well, I I'm telling you that there's whatever the projects were, it's not transformed the economic base of the county. We looked at the data which is on page let me just show you where I'm referring to.</li> <li>Starting on page 13, there's historical employment by jobs, by industry in Livingston County, so any projects since 2001 through 2012.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. I was let me give me one more minute, I'm sorry.</li> <li>What I showed is if you look on Table 3 of our report, the page I was just referring to, is that the number of construction jobs I just want to be more precise. I say construction jobs declined from 2008 to 2010 and then stabilized afterwards at the 2010 figures. The actual jobs did decrease as a whole, nonfarm employment, from 2008 to the subsequent years, until 2011. So even with the construction activities of the two plants, construction jobs declined and overall nonfarm employment declined.</li> <li>Q. Could you go to page 12 of your report?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You say here, "Following the advent of the Great Recession, which officially started in December 2007 and ended in June 2009, with lingering high unemployment effects continuing particularly</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 177 18	<ul> <li>Page 6 are examples of wind projects that were built in this county previously.</li> <li>Q. So are you are you talking about the Cayuga Ridge project?</li> <li>A. Right, the one that was built in 2008 and 9 and opened in 2010. There was another one that was in both counties that came on in 2012. I just described it in the testimony that's on page 6 here.</li> <li>Q. So when you say projects in the quote that I just read, is the only one you're talking about Cayuga Ridge?</li> <li>A. Well, I I'm telling you that there's whatever the projects were, it's not transformed the economic base of the county. We looked at the data which is on page let me just show you where I'm referring to.</li> <li>Starting on page 13, there's historical employment by jobs, by industry in Livingston County, so any projects since 2001 through 2012. The ones I'm specifically referring to are the two I</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. I was let me give me one more minute, I'm sorry.</li> <li>What I showed is if you look on Table 3 of our report, the page I was just referring to, is that the number of construction jobs I just want to be more precise. I say construction jobs declined from 2008 to 2010 and then stabilized afterwards at the 2010 figures. The actual jobs did decrease as a whole, nonfarm employment, from 2008 to the subsequent years, until 2011. So even with the construction activities of the two plants, construction jobs declined and overall nonfarm employment declined.</li> <li>Q. Could you go to page 12 of your report?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You say here, "Following the advent of the Great Recession, which officially started in December 2007 and ended in June 2009, with lingering high unemployment rose but has since been</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9	<ul> <li>Page 6 are examples of wind projects that were built in this county previously.</li> <li>Q. So are you are you talking about the Cayuga Ridge project?</li> <li>A. Right, the one that was built in 2008 and 9 and opened in 2010. There was another one that was in both counties that came on in 2012. I just described it in the testimony that's on page 6 here.</li> <li>Q. So when you say projects in the quote that I just read, is the only one you're talking about Cayuga Ridge?</li> <li>A. Well, I I'm telling you that there's whatever the projects were, it's not transformed the economic base of the county. We looked at the data which is on page let me just show you where I'm referring to.</li> <li>Starting on page 13, there's historical employment by jobs, by industry in Livingston County, so any projects since 2001 through 2012. The ones I'm specifically referring to are the two I just cited on page 6 which occurred in the years</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. I was let me give me one more minute, I'm sorry.</li> <li>What I showed is if you look on Table 3 of our report, the page I was just referring to, is that the number of construction jobs I just want to be more precise. I say construction jobs declined from 2008 to 2010 and then stabilized afterwards at the 2010 figures. The actual jobs did decrease as a whole, nonfarm employment, from 2008 to the subsequent years, until 2011. So even with the construction activities of the two plants, construction jobs declined and overall nonfarm employment declined.</li> <li>Q. Could you go to page 12 of your report?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You say here, "Following the advent of the Great Recession, which officially started in December 2007 and ended in June 2009, with lingering high unemployment rose but has since been reduced to less than 6 percent or 1,040 labor force</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Page 6 are examples of wind projects that were built in this county previously.</li> <li>Q. So are you are you talking about the Cayuga Ridge project?</li> <li>A. Right, the one that was built in 2008 and 9 and opened in 2010. There was another one that was in both counties that came on in 2012. I just described it in the testimony that's on page 6 here.</li> <li>Q. So when you say projects in the quote that I just read, is the only one you're talking about Cayuga Ridge?</li> <li>A. Well, I I'm telling you that there's whatever the projects were, it's not transformed the economic base of the county. We looked at the data which is on page let me just show you where I'm referring to.</li> <li>Starting on page 13, there's historical employment by jobs, by industry in Livingston County, so any projects since 2001 through 2012. The ones I'm specifically referring to are the two I just cited on page 6 which occurred in the years that I just cited. And page 13 shows and page 14</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. I was let me give me one more minute, I'm sorry.</li> <li>What I showed is if you look on Table 3 of our report, the page I was just referring to, is that the number of construction jobs I just want to be more precise. I say construction jobs declined from 2008 to 2010 and then stabilized afterwards at the 2010 figures. The actual jobs did decrease as a whole, nonfarm employment, from 2008 to the subsequent years, until 2011. So even with the construction activities of the two plants, construction jobs declined and overall nonfarm employment declined.</li> <li>Q. Could you go to page 12 of your report?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You say here, "Following the advent of the Great Recession, which officially started in December 2007 and ended in June 2009, with lingering high unemployment effects continuing particularly through 2010, unemployment rose but has since been reduced to less than 6 percent or 1,040 labor force members unemployed." Do you see where I was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Page 6 are examples of wind projects that were built in this county previously.</li> <li>Q. So are you are you talking about the Cayuga Ridge project?</li> <li>A. Right, the one that was built in 2008 and 9 and opened in 2010. There was another one that was in both counties that came on in 2012. I just described it in the testimony that's on page 6 here.</li> <li>Q. So when you say projects in the quote that I just read, is the only one you're talking about Cayuga Ridge?</li> <li>A. Well, I I'm telling you that there's whatever the projects were, it's not transformed the economic base of the county. We looked at the data which is on page let me just show you where I'm referring to.</li> <li>Starting on page 13, there's historical employment by jobs, by industry in Livingston County, so any projects since 2001 through 2012. The ones I'm specifically referring to are the two I just cited on page 6 which occurred in the years that I just cited. And page 13 shows and page 14 of the report shows that it did not alter the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. I was let me give me one more minute, I'm sorry.</li> <li>What I showed is if you look on Table 3 of our report, the page I was just referring to, is that the number of construction jobs I just want to be more precise. I say construction jobs declined from 2008 to 2010 and then stabilized afterwards at the 2010 figures. The actual jobs did decrease as a whole, nonfarm employment, from 2008 to the subsequent years, until 2011. So even with the construction activities of the two plants, construction jobs declined and overall nonfarm employment declined.</li> <li>Q. Could you go to page 12 of your report?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You say here, "Following the advent of the Great Recession, which officially started in December 2007 and ended in June 2009, with lingering high unemployment effects continuing particularly through 2010, unemployment rose but has since been reduced to less than 6 percent or 1,040 labor force members unemployed." Do you see where I was reading?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 177 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Page 6 are examples of wind projects that were built in this county previously.</li> <li>Q. So are you are you talking about the Cayuga Ridge project?</li> <li>A. Right, the one that was built in 2008 and 9 and opened in 2010. There was another one that was in both counties that came on in 2012. I just described it in the testimony that's on page 6 here.</li> <li>Q. So when you say projects in the quote that I just read, is the only one you're talking about Cayuga Ridge?</li> <li>A. Well, I I'm telling you that there's whatever the projects were, it's not transformed the economic base of the county. We looked at the data which is on page let me just show you where I'm referring to.</li> <li>Starting on page 13, there's historical employment by jobs, by industry in Livingston County, so any projects since 2001 through 2012. The ones I'm specifically referring to are the two I just cited on page 6 which occurred in the years that I just cited. And page 13 shows and page 14 of the report shows that it did not alter the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. I was let me give me one more minute, I'm sorry.</li> <li>What I showed is if you look on Table 3 of our report, the page I was just referring to, is that the number of construction jobs I just want to be more precise. I say construction jobs declined from 2008 to 2010 and then stabilized afterwards at the 2010 figures. The actual jobs did decrease as a whole, nonfarm employment, from 2008 to the subsequent years, until 2011. So even with the construction activities of the two plants, construction jobs declined and overall nonfarm employment declined.</li> <li>Q. Could you go to page 12 of your report?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You say here, "Following the advent of the Great Recession, which officially started in December 2007 and ended in June 2009, with lingering high unemployment effects continuing particularly through 2010, unemployment rose but has since been reduced to less than 6 percent or 1,040 labor force members unemployed." Do you see where I was</li> </ul>

			January 26, 201
	Page 1592		Page 1594
1	Q. So are you saying that Cayuga Ridge had no	1	using the \$6 million payment to the county from the
2	positive impact during the Great Recession?	2	Cayuga Ridge developer. Local businesses were
3	A. I'm saying it did not alter the economic	3	loaned money to stay open and new jobs were created.
4	base to result in the actual construction sector	4	In addition, there were construction jobs created,
5	growing, and it could have merely displaced other	5	and the article quotes Livingston County Board
6	jobs or those jobs would have been taken up	6	Chairman Bill Fairfield as estimating that for every
7	somewhere else, and that I wouldn't know.	7	ten wind turbines, one full-time maintenance
8	Q. You don't know that.	8	position was created."
9	A. No, but you wouldn't be able to say it had	9	You're not aware of that evidence, sir?
LO	no impact. I'm just pointing out that if you just	10	A. Well, I'm aware from reading this article
11	look at construction, it did not increase	11	that the impacts were not because of the operations
.2	construction jobs, which if it was to have	12	and construction activities of the facility but the
L3	significant impact, you would have expected it to.	13	apparent agreement that you may have been referring
.4	That's the point we're trying to make here. It's	14	to earlier where there was cash given out, but that
.5	not going to significantly alter the structure of	15	wasn't because of the I'm just reading the
.6	the economic base.	16	article, wasn't because of the operations of the
L7	Q. Would you disagree with the statement that	17	construction activity. It sounds like the county
.8	the economic recession during that period of time in	18	board elected to subsidize other businesses with
L9	Livingston County would have been worse without the	19	cash that was related to this I'm looking for the
20	Cayuga Ridge wind farm?	20	word that you mentioned earlier. It wasn't from the
21	A. It's a question of what other alternative	21	operations. It looks like they were just given
22	activities might have occurred in place. So I	22	cash, right?
23	wouldn't I wouldn't necessarily disagree with it,	23	Q. Well, let me read that last line in the
24	but I wouldn't agree with it. It's a function of	24	record again. "In addition, there were construction
	Page 1593		Page 1595
	-		
1	what other jobs either would have occurred or or	1	jobs created, and the article quotes Livingston
2	if jobs moved from one sector to another because of	2	County Board Chairman Bill Fairfield as estimating
3	the short-term thing. What it didn't do was provide	3	that for every ten wind turbines, one full-time
4	any ongoing economic change to the structure of the	4	maintenance position was created."
5	economy. And I wouldn't expect any short-term	-	Do you have any basis for disputing that
6	construction project to do so.	6	statement, sir?
7	Q. Mr. Gruen, I've handed you what's been	7	A. No, but it sounds like it would be less
8	marked as Pleasant Ridge Exhibit 300. Have you ever seen that document before or that article?	8	than one Menards store. How many jobs is one for ten wind turbines? That's
9 10	A. If it's not referred to in my report,	9	MR. BLAZER: Mr. Cornale, if you could
	which I don't believe it is, I'm not sure I have	10 11	I'd ask that you instruct the witness, judge, to
11	seen this. I would have to go back and compare it,	11	answer my question. I didn't
12	but just looking at it, it doesn't ring any bells.		MR. LUETKEHANS: He was.
13	Q. Okay. I'm going to read you something	13	MR. EUET KEHANS. He was. MR. BLAZER: I didn't ask
14 15	that's in the record from Pleasant Ridge Exhibit 41	14 15	MR. LUETKEHANS: He's an expert and he has
15	and I'll ask you a question about it.	15 16	the right
	· ·		e e
L7	"There is evidence that but for the Cayuga Bidge wind form the recession would have been worse	17	CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. MR. LUETKEHANS: to expand on his
18	Ridge wind farm, the recession would have been worse in Livingston County. In an article in September	18	_
19	in Livingston County. In an article in September 2010 by Stephen Graff entitled VP 100: Illinois Wind	19 20	questions. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay.
20	2010 Dy Siednen Gran enuneu y P 100: Innois Wind		VIIAINVIAIN VUNINALE: UKAV.
			-
20 21 22	Farm Breathes New Life Into Businesses, Larry Vaupel, that's V-A-U-P-E-L, director of the	21 22	MR. BLAZER: I didn't ask him anything about a Menards store.

23 Livingston County Economic Development Council, 23 A. I'm putting this in context, which again discusses the success of the loan and grant program **24** one turbine -- one job for every ten turbines may be

24

			January 26, 2015
	Page 1596		Page 1598
1	well less than one, one, one home improvement store	1	that right?
2	jobs employed. It doesn't say how many total jobs	2	A. I have not assessed valuation of changes
3	there are relative to the size of the economy. I'm	3	in any of the amenity or quality-of-life factors,
4	not disagreeing with the statement. I'm just	4	health, safety, recreation, air/noise quality, view
5	pointing out that	5	amenities, or property factors was actually the
6	Q. That's all I wanted to know if	6	fourth paragraph down on that page. I did not
7	A it doesn't put into context what that	7	I'm just pointing out that this report that I was
8	means.	8	asked to review does not cover any of these other
9	Q. All I was asking, whether or not you agree	9	types of impacts.
10	or disagree with that statement or you have any	10	Q. Okay, and neither
11	basis for agreeing or disagreeing with that	11	A. That's all.
12	statement.	12	Q. And neither does yours.
13	MR. LUETKEHANS: And he answered. He	13	A. Absolutely.
14	answered.	14	Q. Okay. You're not an appraiser?
15	MR. BLAZER: I heard a lot about Menards	15	A. I do do I'm a real estate economist so
	and home improvements	16	I do value property, but I did not do any appraisal
16 17	CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, he	16	of or property value assessments for this case.
18	answered.	18	Q. Are you a licensed appraiser in the State
	MR. BLAZER: Okay.	10 19	of Illinois?
19	MR. LUETKEHANS: You weren't listening.	20	A. I actually just told you I'm a real estate
20	BY MR. BLAZER:	20 21	economist; I'm not an appraiser.
21 22	Q. Would information like the information	21 22	Q. Have you ever conducted an analysis of
22	that I just gave you have been important for you to	22	property value impacts from detrimental conditions?
23 24	consider in your assessment of the economic benefits	23 24	A. Yes.
24	consider in your assessment of the economic benefits	24	A. 105.
	Page 1597		Page 1599
	Page 1597		Page 1599
1	of a project like this?	1	Q. How many times?
2	of a project like this? A. No.	2	<ul><li>Q. How many times?</li><li>A. I'd have to count. It's been a number of</li></ul>
2 3	<ul><li>of a project like this?</li><li>A. No.</li><li>Q. Page 1, comments, findings and</li></ul>	2 3	<ul><li>Q. How many times?</li><li>A. I'd have to count. It's been a number of times.</li></ul>
2 3 4	<ul> <li>of a project like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Page 1, comments, findings and conclusions. "Economic impacts do not measure the</li> </ul>	2 3 4	<ul> <li>Q. How many times?</li> <li>A. I'd have to count. It's been a number of times.</li> <li>Q. Okay, how many times where the alleged</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>of a project like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Page 1, comments, findings and conclusions. "Economic impacts do not measure the valuation of changes in amenity or quality-of-life</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. How many times?</li> <li>A. I'd have to count. It's been a number of times.</li> <li>Q. Okay, how many times where the alleged detrimental condition is a wind farm?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>of a project like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Page 1, comments, findings and conclusions. "Economic impacts do not measure the valuation of changes in amenity or quality-of-life factors, such as health, safety, recreation, air and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. How many times?</li> <li>A. I'd have to count. It's been a number of times.</li> <li>Q. Okay, how many times where the alleged detrimental condition is a wind farm?</li> <li>A. None.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>of a project like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Page 1, comments, findings and conclusions. "Economic impacts do not measure the valuation of changes in amenity or quality-of-life factors, such as health, safety, recreation, air and noise quality, or view amenities. The report does</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. How many times?</li> <li>A. I'd have to count. It's been a number of times.</li> <li>Q. Okay, how many times where the alleged detrimental condition is a wind farm?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Changes I think we established this a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of a project like this? A. No. Q. Page 1, comments, findings and conclusions. "Economic impacts do not measure the valuation of changes in amenity or quality-of-life factors, such as health, safety, recreation, air and noise quality, or view amenities. The report does not address changes in such factors that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. How many times?</li> <li>A. I'd have to count. It's been a number of times.</li> <li>Q. Okay, how many times where the alleged detrimental condition is a wind farm?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Changes I think we established this a little while ago. Changes in property valuation</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of a project like this? <b>A. No.</b> Q. Page 1, comments, findings and conclusions. "Economic impacts do not measure the valuation of changes in amenity or quality-of-life factors, such as health, safety, recreation, air and noise quality, or view amenities. The report does not address changes in such factors that the proposed wind energy development may induce."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. How many times?</li> <li>A. I'd have to count. It's been a number of times.</li> <li>Q. Okay, how many times where the alleged detrimental condition is a wind farm?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Changes I think we established this a little while ago. Changes in property valuation would impact the amount of real estate taxes</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	of a project like this? A. No. Q. Page 1, comments, findings and conclusions. "Economic impacts do not measure the valuation of changes in amenity or quality-of-life factors, such as health, safety, recreation, air and noise quality, or view amenities. The report does not address changes in such factors that the proposed wind energy development may induce." Do you see where I was reading that from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. How many times?</li> <li>A. I'd have to count. It's been a number of times.</li> <li>Q. Okay, how many times where the alleged detrimental condition is a wind farm?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Changes I think we established this a little while ago. Changes in property valuation would impact the amount of real estate taxes generated, correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	of a project like this? A. No. Q. Page 1, comments, findings and conclusions. "Economic impacts do not measure the valuation of changes in amenity or quality-of-life factors, such as health, safety, recreation, air and noise quality, or view amenities. The report does not address changes in such factors that the proposed wind energy development may induce." Do you see where I was reading that from your report?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. How many times?</li> <li>A. I'd have to count. It's been a number of times.</li> <li>Q. Okay, how many times where the alleged detrimental condition is a wind farm?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Changes I think we established this a little while ago. Changes in property valuation would impact the amount of real estate taxes generated, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of a project like this? A. No. Q. Page 1, comments, findings and conclusions. "Economic impacts do not measure the valuation of changes in amenity or quality-of-life factors, such as health, safety, recreation, air and noise quality, or view amenities. The report does not address changes in such factors that the proposed wind energy development may induce." Do you see where I was reading that from your report? A. Yes, sir.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. How many times?</li> <li>A. I'd have to count. It's been a number of times.</li> <li>Q. Okay, how many times where the alleged detrimental condition is a wind farm?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Changes I think we established this a little while ago. Changes in property valuation would impact the amount of real estate taxes generated, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So you haven't assessed health factors,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>of a project like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Page 1, comments, findings and conclusions. "Economic impacts do not measure the valuation of changes in amenity or quality-of-life factors, such as health, safety, recreation, air and noise quality, or view amenities. The report does not address changes in such factors that the proposed wind energy development may induce." Do you see where I was reading that from your report?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. All right. What changes in property</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. How many times?</li> <li>A. I'd have to count. It's been a number of times.</li> <li>Q. Okay, how many times where the alleged detrimental condition is a wind farm?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Changes I think we established this a little while ago. Changes in property valuation would impact the amount of real estate taxes generated, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So you haven't assessed health factors, correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of a project like this? A. No. Q. Page 1, comments, findings and conclusions. "Economic impacts do not measure the valuation of changes in amenity or quality-of-life factors, such as health, safety, recreation, air and noise quality, or view amenities. The report does not address changes in such factors that the proposed wind energy development may induce." Do you see where I was reading that from your report? A. Yes, sir. Q. All right. What changes in property valuation are you referring to?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. How many times?</li> <li>A. I'd have to count. It's been a number of times.</li> <li>Q. Okay, how many times where the alleged detrimental condition is a wind farm?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Changes I think we established this a little while ago. Changes in property valuation would impact the amount of real estate taxes generated, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So you haven't assessed health factors, correct?</li> <li>A. As I just said, yes, I've not I've not</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of a project like this? A. No. Q. Page 1, comments, findings and conclusions. "Economic impacts do not measure the valuation of changes in amenity or quality-of-life factors, such as health, safety, recreation, air and noise quality, or view amenities. The report does not address changes in such factors that the proposed wind energy development may induce." Do you see where I was reading that from your report? A. Yes, sir. Q. All right. What changes in property valuation are you referring to? A. I have not have not studied the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. How many times?</li> <li>A. I'd have to count. It's been a number of times.</li> <li>Q. Okay, how many times where the alleged detrimental condition is a wind farm?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Changes I think we established this a little while ago. Changes in property valuation would impact the amount of real estate taxes generated, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So you haven't assessed health factors, correct?</li> <li>A. As I just said, yes, I've not I've not studied any of the factors listed on page 1.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of a project like this? A. No. Q. Page 1, comments, findings and conclusions. "Economic impacts do not measure the valuation of changes in amenity or quality-of-life factors, such as health, safety, recreation, air and noise quality, or view amenities. The report does not address changes in such factors that the proposed wind energy development may induce." Do you see where I was reading that from your report? A. Yes, sir. Q. All right. What changes in property valuation are you referring to? A. I have not have not studied the potential impacts on any of these issues. I'm just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. How many times?</li> <li>A. I'd have to count. It's been a number of times.</li> <li>Q. Okay, how many times where the alleged detrimental condition is a wind farm?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Changes I think we established this a little while ago. Changes in property valuation would impact the amount of real estate taxes generated, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So you haven't assessed health factors, correct?</li> <li>A. As I just said, yes, I've not I've not studied any of the factors listed on page 1.</li> <li>Q. So</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of a project like this? A. No. Q. Page 1, comments, findings and conclusions. "Economic impacts do not measure the valuation of changes in amenity or quality-of-life factors, such as health, safety, recreation, air and noise quality, or view amenities. The report does not address changes in such factors that the proposed wind energy development may induce." Do you see where I was reading that from your report? A. Yes, sir. Q. All right. What changes in property valuation are you referring to? A. I have not have not studied the potential impacts on any of these issues. I'm just referring the point I'm making here is economic	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. How many times?</li> <li>A. I'd have to count. It's been a number of times.</li> <li>Q. Okay, how many times where the alleged detrimental condition is a wind farm?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Changes I think we established this a little while ago. Changes in property valuation would impact the amount of real estate taxes generated, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So you haven't assessed health factors, correct?</li> <li>A. As I just said, yes, I've not I've not studied any of the factors listed on page 1.</li> <li>Q. So</li> <li>A. I just pointed out that the Loomis</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>of a project like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Page 1, comments, findings and conclusions. "Economic impacts do not measure the valuation of changes in amenity or quality-of-life factors, such as health, safety, recreation, air and noise quality, or view amenities. The report does not address changes in such factors that the proposed wind energy development may induce." Do you see where I was reading that from your report?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. All right. What changes in property valuation are you referring to?</li> <li>A. I have not have not studied the potential impacts on any of these issues. I'm just referring the point I'm making here is economic</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. How many times?</li> <li>A. I'd have to count. It's been a number of times.</li> <li>Q. Okay, how many times where the alleged detrimental condition is a wind farm?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Changes I think we established this a little while ago. Changes in property valuation would impact the amount of real estate taxes generated, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So you haven't assessed health factors, correct?</li> <li>A. As I just said, yes, I've not I've not studied any of the factors listed on page 1.</li> <li>Q. So</li> <li>A. I just pointed out that the Loomis report that I'm just pointing out the economic</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	of a project like this? A. No. Q. Page 1, comments, findings and conclusions. "Economic impacts do not measure the valuation of changes in amenity or quality-of-life factors, such as health, safety, recreation, air and noise quality, or view amenities. The report does not address changes in such factors that the proposed wind energy development may induce." Do you see where I was reading that from your report? A. Yes, sir. Q. All right. What changes in property valuation are you referring to? A. I have not have not studied the potential impacts on any of these issues. I'm just referring the point I'm making here is economic impact analysis covers the effects on economic activity in a geographic area, and it does not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. How many times?</li> <li>A. I'd have to count. It's been a number of times.</li> <li>Q. Okay, how many times where the alleged detrimental condition is a wind farm?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Changes I think we established this a little while ago. Changes in property valuation would impact the amount of real estate taxes generated, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So you haven't assessed health factors, correct?</li> <li>A. As I just said, yes, I've not I've not studied any of the factors listed on page 1.</li> <li>Q. So</li> <li>A. I just pointed out that the Loomis report that I'm just pointing out the economic impacts are not the end-all, be-all. There are</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>of a project like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Page 1, comments, findings and conclusions. "Economic impacts do not measure the valuation of changes in amenity or quality-of-life factors, such as health, safety, recreation, air and noise quality, or view amenities. The report does not address changes in such factors that the proposed wind energy development may induce." Do you see where I was reading that from your report?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. All right. What changes in property valuation are you referring to?</li> <li>A. I have not have not studied the potential impacts on any of these issues. I'm just referring the point I'm making here is economic activity in a geographic area, and it does not measure valuation effects of these other factors.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. How many times?</li> <li>A. I'd have to count. It's been a number of times.</li> <li>Q. Okay, how many times where the alleged detrimental condition is a wind farm?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Changes I think we established this a little while ago. Changes in property valuation would impact the amount of real estate taxes generated, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So you haven't assessed health factors, correct?</li> <li>A. As I just said, yes, I've not I've not studied any of the factors listed on page 1.</li> <li>Q. So</li> <li>A. I just pointed out that the Loomis report that I'm just pointing out the economic impacts are not the end-all, be-all. There are other factors to be considered. I'm not and I'll</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of a project like this? A. No. Q. Page 1, comments, findings and conclusions. "Economic impacts do not measure the valuation of changes in amenity or quality-of-life factors, such as health, safety, recreation, air and noise quality, or view amenities. The report does not address changes in such factors that the proposed wind energy development may induce." Do you see where I was reading that from your report? A. Yes, sir. Q. All right. What changes in property valuation are you referring to? A. I have not have not studied the potential impacts on any of these issues. I'm just referring the point I'm making here is economic impact analysis covers the effects on economic activity in a geographic area, and it does not measure valuation effects of these other factors. That's all I'm simply pointing out.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. How many times?</li> <li>A. I'd have to count. It's been a number of times.</li> <li>Q. Okay, how many times where the alleged detrimental condition is a wind farm?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Changes I think we established this a little while ago. Changes in property valuation would impact the amount of real estate taxes generated, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So you haven't assessed health factors, correct?</li> <li>A. As I just said, yes, I've not I've not studied any of the factors listed on page 1.</li> <li>Q. So</li> <li>A. I just pointed out that the Loomis report that I'm just pointing out the economic impacts are not the end-all, be-all. There are other factors to be considered. I'm not and I'll stipulate, again, that I've not studied any of the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>of a project like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Page 1, comments, findings and conclusions. "Economic impacts do not measure the valuation of changes in amenity or quality-of-life factors, such as health, safety, recreation, air and noise quality, or view amenities. The report does not address changes in such factors that the proposed wind energy development may induce." Do you see where I was reading that from your report?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. All right. What changes in property valuation are you referring to?</li> <li>A. I have not have not studied the potential impacts on any of these issues. I'm just referring the point I'm making here is economic activity in a geographic area, and it does not measure valuation effects of these other factors. That's all I'm simply pointing out.</li> <li>Q. But just so I understand the answer to the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. How many times?</li> <li>A. I'd have to count. It's been a number of times.</li> <li>Q. Okay, how many times where the alleged detrimental condition is a wind farm?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Changes I think we established this a little while ago. Changes in property valuation would impact the amount of real estate taxes generated, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So you haven't assessed health factors, correct?</li> <li>A. As I just said, yes, I've not I've not studied any of the factors listed on page 1.</li> <li>Q. So</li> <li>A. I just pointed out that the Loomis report that I'm just pointing out the economic impacts are not the end-all, be-all. There are other factors to be considered. I'm not and I'll stipulate, again, that I've not studied any of the factors listed on page 1 that you're asking about.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>of a project like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Page 1, comments, findings and conclusions. "Economic impacts do not measure the valuation of changes in amenity or quality-of-life factors, such as health, safety, recreation, air and noise quality, or view amenities. The report does not address changes in such factors that the proposed wind energy development may induce." Do you see where I was reading that from your report?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. All right. What changes in property valuation are you referring to?</li> <li>A. I have not have not studied the potential impacts on any of these issues. I'm just referring the point I'm making here is economic activity in a geographic area, and it does not measure valuation effects of these other factors. That's all I'm simply pointing out.</li> <li>Q. But just so I understand the answer to the question I asked you, you haven't assessed any</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. How many times?</li> <li>A. I'd have to count. It's been a number of times.</li> <li>Q. Okay, how many times where the alleged detrimental condition is a wind farm?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Changes I think we established this a little while ago. Changes in property valuation would impact the amount of real estate taxes generated, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So you haven't assessed health factors, correct?</li> <li>A. As I just said, yes, I've not I've not studied any of the factors listed on page 1.</li> <li>Q. So</li> <li>A. I just pointed out that the Loomis report that I'm just pointing out the economic impacts are not the end-all, be-all. There are other factors to be considered. I'm not and I'll stipulate, again, that I've not studied any of the factors listed on page 1, "Nor do</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>of a project like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Page 1, comments, findings and conclusions. "Economic impacts do not measure the valuation of changes in amenity or quality-of-life factors, such as health, safety, recreation, air and noise quality, or view amenities. The report does not address changes in such factors that the proposed wind energy development may induce." Do you see where I was reading that from your report?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. All right. What changes in property valuation are you referring to?</li> <li>A. I have not have not studied the potential impacts on any of these issues. I'm just referring the point I'm making here is economic activity in a geographic area, and it does not measure valuation effects of these other factors. That's all I'm simply pointing out.</li> <li>Q. But just so I understand the answer to the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. How many times?</li> <li>A. I'd have to count. It's been a number of times.</li> <li>Q. Okay, how many times where the alleged detrimental condition is a wind farm?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Changes I think we established this a little while ago. Changes in property valuation would impact the amount of real estate taxes generated, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So you haven't assessed health factors, correct?</li> <li>A. As I just said, yes, I've not I've not studied any of the factors listed on page 1.</li> <li>Q. So</li> <li>A. I just pointed out that the Loomis report that I'm just pointing out the economic impacts are not the end-all, be-all. There are other factors to be considered. I'm not and I'll stipulate, again, that I've not studied any of the factors listed on page 1 that you're asking about.</li> </ul>

			January 26, 2015
	Page 1600		Page 1602
1	changes in government revenues and expenditures.	1	talking about?
2	For example, the proposed wind energy development	2	A. Again, I'm pointing out that the report
3	will increase the demand for public services, e.g.,	3	did not address these issues. Sheriff demands would
4	public works, sheriff, fire, administration and	4	be life safety and its equivalent of police
5	other public services, but the costs to provide	5	services. If there's accidents, if there's
6	these public services are not considered in the	6	construction injuries, if there's equipment stolen,
7	analysis." Do you see where I was reading from?	7	if there's damage done in the course of construction
8	A. Yes.	8	to the property that is not the site of the wind
9	Q. All right. Going back to your statement	9	turbines, these are just standard municipal
10	about fiscal impacts, what public works demands are	10	services, and I'm pointing out the Loomis report
11	you referring to?	11	does not cover that. And I certainly will stipulate
12	A. As I mentioned, the other report mentioned	12	I have not done an analysis of the impacts on
13	there was 60 trucks and vehicles that were serviced.	13	sheriff services.
14	Vehicles and trucks would generate impacts on the	14	Q. How many times have the sheriff or
15	roadway maintenance and the need for replacement.	15	emergency services been called out to the White Oak
16	There might be traffic enforcement and incident	16	wind farm in McLean County?
17	reports that would be generated. There might be	17	A. I don't know.
18	litter that would need to be picked up. These are	18	Q. How about the Grand Ridge project in
19	examples of public services that, again, I'm merely	19	LaSalle County?
20	pointing out that economic impact reports don't	20	A. I do not know.
21	cover. It's a different topic.	21	Q. Bishop Hill project in Henry County?
22	Q. Have you read the Livingston County Wind	22	A. I do not know.
23	Siting Ordinance, the ordinance that governs this	23	Q. What about the Cayuga Ridge project in
24	proceeding?	24	this county?
	Page 1601		Page 1603
1	Page 1601 A. I don't believe I have.	1	Page 1603 A. If it helps, I'll stipulate I don't know
1 2	-	1 2	
	<ul><li>A. I don't believe I have.</li><li>Q. All right. So you don't know if it says anything about roadway impacts?</li></ul>		A. If it helps, I'll stipulate I don't know
2	<ul><li>A. I don't believe I have.</li><li>Q. All right. So you don't know if it says</li></ul>	2	A. If it helps, I'll stipulate I don't know the sheriff costs in any wind energy projects in
2 3	<ul><li>A. I don't believe I have.</li><li>Q. All right. So you don't know if it says anything about roadway impacts?</li></ul>	2 3	A. If it helps, I'll stipulate I don't know the sheriff costs in any wind energy projects in this region you might want to ask about. I've not
2 3 4	<ul> <li>A. I don't believe I have.</li> <li>Q. All right. So you don't know if it says anything about roadway impacts?</li> <li>A. You know, I've managed to sleep at night</li> </ul>	2 3 4	A. If it helps, I'll stipulate I don't know the sheriff costs in any wind energy projects in this region you might want to ask about. I've not checked. I'm merely pointing out that they may
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. I don't believe I have.</li> <li>Q. All right. So you don't know if it says anything about roadway impacts?</li> <li>A. You know, I've managed to sleep at night without reading that.</li> <li>Q. I'm glad you find this comical, Mr. Gruen. MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, argumentative.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. If it helps, I'll stipulate I don't know the sheriff costs in any wind energy projects in this region you might want to ask about. I've not checked. I'm merely pointing out that they may arise and it's a part of municipal services that are impacted.</li> <li>Q. Bottom of page 1, you say, "Given the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. I don't believe I have.</li> <li>Q. All right. So you don't know if it says anything about roadway impacts?</li> <li>A. You know, I've managed to sleep at night without reading that.</li> <li>Q. I'm glad you find this comical, Mr. Gruen. MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, argumentative. I would just ask that he ask a question.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. If it helps, I'll stipulate I don't know the sheriff costs in any wind energy projects in this region you might want to ask about. I've not checked. I'm merely pointing out that they may arise and it's a part of municipal services that are impacted.</li> <li>Q. Bottom of page 1, you say, "Given the relatively small employment impacts predicted by the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. I don't believe I have.</li> <li>Q. All right. So you don't know if it says anything about roadway impacts?</li> <li>A. You know, I've managed to sleep at night without reading that.</li> <li>Q. I'm glad you find this comical, Mr. Gruen. MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, argumentative.</li> <li>I would just ask that he ask a question. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Yeah, let's just move</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. If it helps, I'll stipulate I don't know the sheriff costs in any wind energy projects in this region you might want to ask about. I've not checked. I'm merely pointing out that they may arise and it's a part of municipal services that are impacted.</li> <li>Q. Bottom of page 1, you say, "Given the relatively small employment impacts predicted by the author, less than 1 percent of total existing jobs</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. I don't believe I have.</li> <li>Q. All right. So you don't know if it says anything about roadway impacts?</li> <li>A. You know, I've managed to sleep at night without reading that.</li> <li>Q. I'm glad you find this comical, Mr. Gruen. MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, argumentative.</li> <li>I would just ask that he ask a question.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Yeah, let's just move on. That does apply for both sides though. Please</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. If it helps, I'll stipulate I don't know the sheriff costs in any wind energy projects in this region you might want to ask about. I've not checked. I'm merely pointing out that they may arise and it's a part of municipal services that are impacted.</li> <li>Q. Bottom of page 1, you say, "Given the relatively small employment impacts predicted by the author, less than 1 percent of total existing jobs in the county, the failure to consider social,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. I don't believe I have.</li> <li>Q. All right. So you don't know if it says anything about roadway impacts?</li> <li>A. You know, I've managed to sleep at night without reading that.</li> <li>Q. I'm glad you find this comical, Mr. Gruen. MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, argumentative.</li> <li>I would just ask that he ask a question. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Yeah, let's just move on. That does apply for both sides though. Please just answer the question that's asked.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. If it helps, I'll stipulate I don't know the sheriff costs in any wind energy projects in this region you might want to ask about. I've not checked. I'm merely pointing out that they may arise and it's a part of municipal services that are impacted.</li> <li>Q. Bottom of page 1, you say, "Given the relatively small employment impacts predicted by the author, less than 1 percent of total existing jobs in the county, the failure to consider social, fiscal and property impacts of the proposed</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. I don't believe I have.</li> <li>Q. All right. So you don't know if it says anything about roadway impacts?</li> <li>A. You know, I've managed to sleep at night without reading that.</li> <li>Q. I'm glad you find this comical, Mr. Gruen. MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, argumentative.</li> <li>I would just ask that he ask a question. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Yeah, let's just move on. That does apply for both sides though. Please just answer the question that's asked.</li> <li>BY MR. BLAZER:</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. If it helps, I'll stipulate I don't know the sheriff costs in any wind energy projects in this region you might want to ask about. I've not checked. I'm merely pointing out that they may arise and it's a part of municipal services that are impacted.</li> <li>Q. Bottom of page 1, you say, "Given the relatively small employment impacts predicted by the author, less than 1 percent of total existing jobs in the county, the failure to consider social, fiscal and property impacts of the proposed development, which collectively are likely to be far</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. I don't believe I have.</li> <li>Q. All right. So you don't know if it says anything about roadway impacts?</li> <li>A. You know, I've managed to sleep at night without reading that.</li> <li>Q. I'm glad you find this comical, Mr. Gruen. MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, argumentative.</li> <li>I would just ask that he ask a question.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Yeah, let's just move on. That does apply for both sides though. Please just answer the question that's asked.</li> <li>BY MR. BLAZER:</li> <li>Q. So you have no idea what the status is of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. If it helps, I'll stipulate I don't know the sheriff costs in any wind energy projects in this region you might want to ask about. I've not checked. I'm merely pointing out that they may arise and it's a part of municipal services that are impacted.</li> <li>Q. Bottom of page 1, you say, "Given the relatively small employment impacts predicted by the author, less than 1 percent of total existing jobs in the county, the failure to consider social, fiscal and property impacts of the proposed development, which collectively are likely to be far greater than the predicted economic impacts,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. I don't believe I have.</li> <li>Q. All right. So you don't know if it says anything about roadway impacts?</li> <li>A. You know, I've managed to sleep at night without reading that.</li> <li>Q. I'm glad you find this comical, Mr. Gruen. MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, argumentative.</li> <li>I would just ask that he ask a question. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Yeah, let's just move on. That does apply for both sides though. Please just answer the question that's asked.</li> <li>BY MR. BLAZER:</li> <li>Q. So you have no idea what the status is of any negotiations that may be ongoing with either the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. If it helps, I'll stipulate I don't know the sheriff costs in any wind energy projects in this region you might want to ask about. I've not checked. I'm merely pointing out that they may arise and it's a part of municipal services that are impacted.</li> <li>Q. Bottom of page 1, you say, "Given the relatively small employment impacts predicted by the author, less than 1 percent of total existing jobs in the county, the failure to consider social, fiscal and property impacts of the proposed development, which collectively are likely to be far greater than the predicted economic impacts, constitutes a significant omission of the report."</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. I don't believe I have.</li> <li>Q. All right. So you don't know if it says anything about roadway impacts?</li> <li>A. You know, I've managed to sleep at night without reading that.</li> <li>Q. I'm glad you find this comical, Mr. Gruen. MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, argumentative.</li> <li>I would just ask that he ask a question. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Yeah, let's just move on. That does apply for both sides though. Please just answer the question that's asked.</li> <li>BY MR. BLAZER:</li> <li>Q. So you have no idea what the status is of any negotiations that may be ongoing with either the county or any townships regarding road use</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. If it helps, I'll stipulate I don't know the sheriff costs in any wind energy projects in this region you might want to ask about. I've not checked. I'm merely pointing out that they may arise and it's a part of municipal services that are impacted.</li> <li>Q. Bottom of page 1, you say, "Given the relatively small employment impacts predicted by the author, less than 1 percent of total existing jobs in the county, the failure to consider social, fiscal and property impacts of the proposed development, which collectively are likely to be far greater than the predicted economic impacts, constitutes a significant omission of the report." Do you see where I was reading from?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. I don't believe I have.</li> <li>Q. All right. So you don't know if it says anything about roadway impacts?</li> <li>A. You know, I've managed to sleep at night without reading that.</li> <li>Q. I'm glad you find this comical, Mr. Gruen. MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, argumentative.</li> <li>I would just ask that he ask a question.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Yeah, let's just move on. That does apply for both sides though. Please just answer the question that's asked.</li> <li>BY MR. BLAZER:</li> <li>Q. So you have no idea what the status is of any negotiations that may be ongoing with either the county or any townships regarding road use agreements, correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. If it helps, I'll stipulate I don't know the sheriff costs in any wind energy projects in this region you might want to ask about. I've not checked. I'm merely pointing out that they may arise and it's a part of municipal services that are impacted.</li> <li>Q. Bottom of page 1, you say, "Given the relatively small employment impacts predicted by the author, less than 1 percent of total existing jobs in the county, the failure to consider social, fiscal and property impacts of the proposed development, which collectively are likely to be far greater than the predicted economic impacts, constitutes a significant omission of the report." Do you see where I was reading from?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. I don't believe I have.</li> <li>Q. All right. So you don't know if it says anything about roadway impacts?</li> <li>A. You know, I've managed to sleep at night without reading that.</li> <li>Q. I'm glad you find this comical, Mr. Gruen. MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, argumentative.</li> <li>I would just ask that he ask a question.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Yeah, let's just move on. That does apply for both sides though. Please just answer the question that's asked.</li> <li>BY MR. BLAZER:</li> <li>Q. So you have no idea what the status is of any negotiations that may be ongoing with either the county or any townships regarding road use agreements, correct?</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection. This is the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. If it helps, I'll stipulate I don't know the sheriff costs in any wind energy projects in this region you might want to ask about. I've not checked. I'm merely pointing out that they may arise and it's a part of municipal services that are impacted.</li> <li>Q. Bottom of page 1, you say, "Given the relatively small employment impacts predicted by the author, less than 1 percent of total existing jobs in the county, the failure to consider social, fiscal and property impacts of the proposed development, which collectively are likely to be far greater than the predicted economic impacts, constitutes a significant omission of the report."</li> <li>Do you see where I was reading from?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. Are these social, fiscal and property</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. I don't believe I have.</li> <li>Q. All right. So you don't know if it says anything about roadway impacts?</li> <li>A. You know, I've managed to sleep at night without reading that.</li> <li>Q. I'm glad you find this comical, Mr. Gruen. MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, argumentative.</li> <li>I would just ask that he ask a question. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Yeah, let's just move on. That does apply for both sides though. Please just answer the question that's asked.</li> <li>BY MR. BLAZER:</li> <li>Q. So you have no idea what the status is of any negotiations that may be ongoing with either the county or any townships regarding road use agreements, correct?</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection. This is the same area. We don't have any agreements to look at.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. If it helps, I'll stipulate I don't know the sheriff costs in any wind energy projects in this region you might want to ask about. I've not checked. I'm merely pointing out that they may arise and it's a part of municipal services that are impacted.</li> <li>Q. Bottom of page 1, you say, "Given the relatively small employment impacts predicted by the author, less than 1 percent of total existing jobs in the county, the failure to consider social, fiscal and property impacts of the proposed development, which collectively are likely to be far greater than the predicted economic impacts, constitutes a significant omission of the report." Do you see where I was reading from?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. Are these social, fiscal and property impacts the same ones we have just been going over</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. I don't believe I have.</li> <li>Q. All right. So you don't know if it says anything about roadway impacts?</li> <li>A. You know, I've managed to sleep at night without reading that.</li> <li>Q. I'm glad you find this comical, Mr. Gruen. MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, argumentative.</li> <li>I would just ask that he ask a question.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Yeah, let's just move on. That does apply for both sides though. Please just answer the question that's asked.</li> <li>BY MR. BLAZER:</li> <li>Q. So you have no idea what the status is of any negotiations that may be ongoing with either the county or any townships regarding road use agreements, correct?</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection. This is the same area. We don't have any agreements to look at. I don't I have none of that information either.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. If it helps, I'll stipulate I don't know the sheriff costs in any wind energy projects in this region you might want to ask about. I've not checked. I'm merely pointing out that they may arise and it's a part of municipal services that are impacted.</li> <li>Q. Bottom of page 1, you say, "Given the relatively small employment impacts predicted by the author, less than 1 percent of total existing jobs in the county, the failure to consider social, fiscal and property impacts of the proposed development, which collectively are likely to be far greater than the predicted economic impacts, constitutes a significant omission of the report."</li> <li>Do you see where I was reading from?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. Are these social, fiscal and property impacts the same ones we have just been going over that you haven't specifically assessed?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. I don't believe I have.</li> <li>Q. All right. So you don't know if it says anything about roadway impacts?</li> <li>A. You know, I've managed to sleep at night without reading that.</li> <li>Q. I'm glad you find this comical, Mr. Gruen. MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, argumentative.</li> <li>I would just ask that he ask a question.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Yeah, let's just move on. That does apply for both sides though. Please just answer the question that's asked.</li> <li>BY MR. BLAZER:</li> <li>Q. So you have no idea what the status is of any negotiations that may be ongoing with either the county or any townships regarding road use agreements, correct?</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection. This is the same area. We don't have any agreements to look at. I don't I have none of that information either. MR. BLAZER: I'm just asking if he knows.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. If it helps, I'll stipulate I don't know the sheriff costs in any wind energy projects in this region you might want to ask about. I've not checked. I'm merely pointing out that they may arise and it's a part of municipal services that are impacted.</li> <li>Q. Bottom of page 1, you say, "Given the relatively small employment impacts predicted by the author, less than 1 percent of total existing jobs in the county, the failure to consider social, fiscal and property impacts of the proposed development, which collectively are likely to be far greater than the predicted economic impacts, constitutes a significant omission of the report." Do you see where I was reading from?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. Are these social, fiscal and property impacts the same ones we have just been going over that you haven't specifically assessed?</li> <li>A. They're certainly examples, yes, sir.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. I don't believe I have.</li> <li>Q. All right. So you don't know if it says anything about roadway impacts?</li> <li>A. You know, I've managed to sleep at night without reading that.</li> <li>Q. I'm glad you find this comical, Mr. Gruen. MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, argumentative.</li> <li>I would just ask that he ask a question.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Yeah, let's just move on. That does apply for both sides though. Please just answer the question that's asked.</li> <li>BY MR. BLAZER:</li> <li>Q. So you have no idea what the status is of any negotiations that may be ongoing with either the county or any townships regarding road use agreements, correct?</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection. This is the same area. We don't have any agreements to look at.</li> <li>I don't - I have none of that information either. MR. BLAZER: I'm just asking if he knows.</li> <li>A. I don't. I don't. And, again, I'm just</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. If it helps, I'll stipulate I don't know the sheriff costs in any wind energy projects in this region you might want to ask about. I've not checked. I'm merely pointing out that they may arise and it's a part of municipal services that are impacted.</li> <li>Q. Bottom of page 1, you say, "Given the relatively small employment impacts predicted by the author, less than 1 percent of total existing jobs in the county, the failure to consider social, fiscal and property impacts of the proposed development, which collectively are likely to be far greater than the predicted economic impacts, constitutes a significant omission of the report." Do you see where I was reading from?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. Are these social, fiscal and property impacts the same ones we have just been going over that you haven't specifically assessed?</li> <li>A. They're certainly examples, yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And you haven't quantified any of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. I don't believe I have.</li> <li>Q. All right. So you don't know if it says anything about roadway impacts?</li> <li>A. You know, I've managed to sleep at night without reading that.</li> <li>Q. I'm glad you find this comical, Mr. Gruen. MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, argumentative.</li> <li>I would just ask that he ask a question. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Yeah, let's just move on. That does apply for both sides though. Please just answer the question that's asked.</li> <li>BY MR. BLAZER:</li> <li>Q. So you have no idea what the status is of any negotiations that may be ongoing with either the county or any townships regarding road use agreements, correct?</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection. This is the same area. We don't have any agreements to look at. I don't I have none of that information either. MR. BLAZER: I'm just asking if he knows.</li> <li>A. I don't. I don't. And, again, I'm just pointing out what the economic impact reports do</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. If it helps, I'll stipulate I don't know the sheriff costs in any wind energy projects in this region you might want to ask about. I've not checked. I'm merely pointing out that they may arise and it's a part of municipal services that are impacted.</li> <li>Q. Bottom of page 1, you say, "Given the relatively small employment impacts predicted by the author, less than 1 percent of total existing jobs in the county, the failure to consider social, fiscal and property impacts of the proposed development, which collectively are likely to be far greater than the predicted economic impacts, constitutes a significant omission of the report." Do you see where I was reading from?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. Are these social, fiscal and property impacts the same ones we have just been going over that you haven't specifically assessed?</li> <li>A. They're certainly examples, yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And you haven't quantified any of those.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. I don't believe I have.</li> <li>Q. All right. So you don't know if it says anything about roadway impacts?</li> <li>A. You know, I've managed to sleep at night without reading that.</li> <li>Q. I'm glad you find this comical, Mr. Gruen. MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, argumentative.</li> <li>I would just ask that he ask a question.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Yeah, let's just move on. That does apply for both sides though. Please just answer the question that's asked.</li> <li>BY MR. BLAZER:</li> <li>Q. So you have no idea what the status is of any negotiations that may be ongoing with either the county or any townships regarding road use agreements, correct?</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection. This is the same area. We don't have any agreements to look at.</li> <li>I don't - I have none of that information either. MR. BLAZER: I'm just asking if he knows.</li> <li>A. I don't. I don't. And, again, I'm just</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. If it helps, I'll stipulate I don't know the sheriff costs in any wind energy projects in this region you might want to ask about. I've not checked. I'm merely pointing out that they may arise and it's a part of municipal services that are impacted.</li> <li>Q. Bottom of page 1, you say, "Given the relatively small employment impacts predicted by the author, less than 1 percent of total existing jobs in the county, the failure to consider social, fiscal and property impacts of the proposed development, which collectively are likely to be far greater than the predicted economic impacts, constitutes a significant omission of the report." Do you see where I was reading from?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. Are these social, fiscal and property impacts the same ones we have just been going over that you haven't specifically assessed?</li> <li>A. They're certainly examples, yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And you haven't quantified any of</li> </ul>

			January 26, 2015
	Page 1604		Page 1606
1	greater than the predicted economic impacts?	1	continue.
2	A. Well, it's my experience having done a	2	BY MR. BLAZER:
3	variety of impact analyses that when I look at how	3	Q. Could you turn to page 2 of your report,
4	small the ongoing employment is, 13 jobs, that it's	4	sir? Actually I'll just read it to you. You say at
5	prudent to conclude or reasonable to conclude, given	5	the top, "The economic impacts predicted by the
6	the apparent nature of the these proceedings,	6	author are misleading and overstated." Do you
7	that these other impacts are likely to be far more	7	recall that?
8	significant, you know, and there's certainly	8	A. Yes.
9	examples of alternative energy projects where these	9	Q. And then at the top of page 3 you say,
10	other effects were probably more important than the	10	"The analytical, generally accepted convention is to
11	economic ones.	11	present economic impacts in terms of direct,
12	Q. I think the last three are your resume, so	12	indirect and induced effects." Now, we know now
13	maybe you can help me with it. Is that experience	13	based on your last answer that you don't have any
14	based or is your assertion at all based on your	14	experience in wind projects. I assume this is
15	experience in assessing the impacts of wind farms?	15	something that you gleaned from some of your other
16	A. Well, my experience is based on assessing	16	work in land use or other types of work that you've
17	of other alternatives, including solar farms.	17	done?
18	Q. That wasn't my question, sir. Is your	18	A. I have I've done many economic impact
19	opinion based at all on your experience in assessing	19	analyses and I certainly know the convention for
20	impacts from wind farms?	20	IMPLAN and reading other models that the JEDI
21	A. It is to the extent that I in preparing	21	doesn't comply with. This is referring to the
22	the material, I did review articles on the impacts	22	standard way economic impacts have been presented
23	of wind farms, but I have not done a specific impact	23	since the beginning of doing impact analysis. There
	analysis for a wind farm.	24	is nothing controversial about this statement and
24			
24	v		
24	Page 1605		Page 1607
24		1	Page 1607 it's well-recognized in the literature that the JEDI
	Page 1605	1 2	Page 1607
1	Page 1605 Q. Ever? A. Ever. Q. Page 2 at the top. The economic do you		Page 1607 it's well-recognized in the literature that the JEDI model does not comport with it. Q. Your attorney or excuse me, not your
1 2	Page 1605 Q. Ever? A. Ever.	2	Page 1607 it's well-recognized in the literature that the JEDI model does not comport with it. Q. Your attorney or excuse me, not your attorney, Mr. Luetkehans, handed to me before you
1 2 3	Page 1605 Q. Ever? A. Ever. Q. Page 2 at the top. The economic do you know how many of those assessments Dr. Loomis has done?	2 3	Page 1607 it's well-recognized in the literature that the JEDI model does not comport with it. Q. Your attorney or excuse me, not your attorney, Mr. Luetkehans, handed to me before you started UCLC Exhibit 62, which is entitled The
1 2 3 4	Page 1605 Q. Ever? A. Ever. Q. Page 2 at the top. The economic do you know how many of those assessments Dr. Loomis has done? A. His, his report included his resume, and	2 3 4	Page 1607 it's well-recognized in the literature that the JEDI model does not comport with it. Q. Your attorney or excuse me, not your attorney, Mr. Luetkehans, handed to me before you
1 2 3 4 5	Page 1605 Q. Ever? A. Ever. Q. Page 2 at the top. The economic do you know how many of those assessments Dr. Loomis has done? A. His, his report included his resume, and it looks like he specializes serving the wind	2 3 4 5	Page 1607 it's well-recognized in the literature that the JEDI model does not comport with it. Q. Your attorney or excuse me, not your attorney, Mr. Luetkehans, handed to me before you started UCLC Exhibit 62, which is entitled The Economic and Fiscal Benefits of the Shady Oaks Wind Farm. Is that something you provided?
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 1605 Q. Ever? A. Ever. Q. Page 2 at the top. The economic do you know how many of those assessments Dr. Loomis has done? A. His, his report included his resume, and it looks like he specializes serving the wind industry, so I'm assuming he's done quite a few.	2 3 4 5 6	Page 1607 it's well-recognized in the literature that the JEDI model does not comport with it. Q. Your attorney or excuse me, not your attorney, Mr. Luetkehans, handed to me before you started UCLC Exhibit 62, which is entitled The Economic and Fiscal Benefits of the Shady Oaks Wind Farm. Is that something you provided? A. I didn't write the report. I mentioned
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 1605 Q. Ever? A. Ever. Q. Page 2 at the top. The economic do you know how many of those assessments Dr. Loomis has done? A. His, his report included his resume, and it looks like he specializes serving the wind industry, so I'm assuming he's done quite a few. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, if I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 1607 it's well-recognized in the literature that the JEDI model does not comport with it. Q. Your attorney or excuse me, not your attorney, Mr. Luetkehans, handed to me before you started UCLC Exhibit 62, which is entitled The Economic and Fiscal Benefits of the Shady Oaks Wind Farm. Is that something you provided? A. I didn't write the report. I mentioned finding that and reviewing in researching and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Page 1605</li> <li>Q. Ever?</li> <li>A. Ever.</li> <li>Q. Page 2 at the top. The economic do you know how many of those assessments Dr. Loomis has done?</li> <li>A. His, his report included his resume, and it looks like he specializes serving the wind industry, so I'm assuming he's done quite a few. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, if I stopped you right there, would you be opposed to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Page 1607 it's well-recognized in the literature that the JEDI model does not comport with it. Q. Your attorney or excuse me, not your attorney, Mr. Luetkehans, handed to me before you started UCLC Exhibit 62, which is entitled The Economic and Fiscal Benefits of the Shady Oaks Wind Farm. Is that something you provided? A. I didn't write the report. I mentioned finding that and reviewing in researching and reviewing Dr. Loomis's report.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Page 1605</li> <li>Q. Ever?</li> <li>A. Ever.</li> <li>Q. Page 2 at the top. The economic do you know how many of those assessments Dr. Loomis has done?</li> <li>A. His, his report included his resume, and it looks like he specializes serving the wind industry, so I'm assuming he's done quite a few. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, if I stopped you right there, would you be opposed to taking a ten minute break?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 1607 it's well-recognized in the literature that the JEDI model does not comport with it. Q. Your attorney or excuse me, not your attorney, Mr. Luetkehans, handed to me before you started UCLC Exhibit 62, which is entitled The Economic and Fiscal Benefits of the Shady Oaks Wind Farm. Is that something you provided? A. I didn't write the report. I mentioned finding that and reviewing in researching and reviewing Dr. Loomis's report. Q. I'm just wondering why was it that we were
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Page 1605</li> <li>Q. Ever?</li> <li>A. Ever.</li> <li>Q. Page 2 at the top. The economic do you know how many of those assessments Dr. Loomis has done?</li> <li>A. His, his report included his resume, and it looks like he specializes serving the wind industry, so I'm assuming he's done quite a few. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, if I stopped you right there, would you be opposed to taking a ten minute break?</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: Absolutely not, sir.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 1607 it's well-recognized in the literature that the JEDI model does not comport with it. Q. Your attorney or excuse me, not your attorney, Mr. Luetkehans, handed to me before you started UCLC Exhibit 62, which is entitled The Economic and Fiscal Benefits of the Shady Oaks Wind Farm. Is that something you provided? A. I didn't write the report. I mentioned finding that and reviewing in researching and reviewing Dr. Loomis's report. Q. I'm just wondering why was it that we were given this? What's the point of this?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Page 1605</li> <li>Q. Ever?</li> <li>A. Ever.</li> <li>Q. Page 2 at the top. The economic do you know how many of those assessments Dr. Loomis has done?</li> <li>A. His, his report included his resume, and it looks like he specializes serving the wind industry, so I'm assuming he's done quite a few. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, if I stopped you right there, would you be opposed to taking a ten minute break?</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: Absolutely not, sir. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, so I've got</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 1607 it's well-recognized in the literature that the JEDI model does not comport with it. Q. Your attorney or excuse me, not your attorney, Mr. Luetkehans, handed to me before you started UCLC Exhibit 62, which is entitled The Economic and Fiscal Benefits of the Shady Oaks Wind Farm. Is that something you provided? A. I didn't write the report. I mentioned finding that and reviewing in researching and reviewing Dr. Loomis's report. Q. I'm just wondering why was it that we were given this? What's the point of this? A. It's referred to, in the report I've done,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Page 1605</li> <li>Q. Ever?</li> <li>A. Ever.</li> <li>Q. Page 2 at the top. The economic do you know how many of those assessments Dr. Loomis has done?</li> <li>A. His, his report included his resume, and it looks like he specializes serving the wind industry, so I'm assuming he's done quite a few. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, if I stopped you right there, would you be opposed to taking a ten minute break?</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: Absolutely not, sir. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, so I've got 7:50. Why don't we try to be back by eight o'clock,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 1607 it's well-recognized in the literature that the JEDI model does not comport with it. Q. Your attorney or excuse me, not your attorney, Mr. Luetkehans, handed to me before you started UCLC Exhibit 62, which is entitled The Economic and Fiscal Benefits of the Shady Oaks Wind Farm. Is that something you provided? A. I didn't write the report. I mentioned finding that and reviewing in researching and reviewing Dr. Loomis's report. Q. I'm just wondering why was it that we were given this? What's the point of this? A. It's referred to, in the report I've done, in sources, and I referred to it in the testimony I
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Page 1605</li> <li>Q. Ever?</li> <li>A. Ever.</li> <li>Q. Page 2 at the top. The economic do you know how many of those assessments Dr. Loomis has done?</li> <li>A. His, his report included his resume, and it looks like he specializes serving the wind industry, so I'm assuming he's done quite a few. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, if I stopped you right there, would you be opposed to taking a ten minute break?</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: Absolutely not, sir. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, so I've got 7:50. Why don't we try to be back by eight o'clock, you guys. Thank you.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Page 1607</li> <li>it's well-recognized in the literature that the JEDI model does not comport with it.</li> <li>Q. Your attorney or excuse me, not your attorney, Mr. Luetkehans, handed to me before you started UCLC Exhibit 62, which is entitled The Economic and Fiscal Benefits of the Shady Oaks Wind Farm. Is that something you provided?</li> <li>A. I didn't write the report. I mentioned finding that and reviewing in researching and reviewing Dr. Loomis's report.</li> <li>Q. I'm just wondering why was it that we were given this? What's the point of this?</li> <li>A. It's referred to, in the report I've done, in sources, and I referred to it in the testimony I gave earlier. I have no idea why or you know, it</li> </ul>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 1605 Q. Ever? A. Ever. Q. Page 2 at the top. The economic do you know how many of those assessments Dr. Loomis has done? A. His, his report included his resume, and it looks like he specializes serving the wind industry, so I'm assuming he's done quite a few. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, if I stopped you right there, would you be opposed to taking a ten minute break? MR. BLAZER: Absolutely not, sir. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, so I've got 7:50. Why don't we try to be back by eight o'clock, you guys. Thank you. (Recess at 7:50 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 1607 it's well-recognized in the literature that the JEDI model does not comport with it. Q. Your attorney or excuse me, not your attorney, Mr. Luetkehans, handed to me before you started UCLC Exhibit 62, which is entitled The Economic and Fiscal Benefits of the Shady Oaks Wind Farm. Is that something you provided? A. I didn't write the report. I mentioned finding that and reviewing in researching and reviewing Dr. Loomis's report. Q. I'm just wondering why was it that we were given this? What's the point of this? A. It's referred to, in the report I've done, in sources, and I referred to it in the testimony I gave earlier. I have no idea why or you know, it was a source that was readily available if you
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Page 1605</li> <li>Q. Ever?</li> <li>A. Ever.</li> <li>Q. Page 2 at the top. The economic do you know how many of those assessments Dr. Loomis has done?</li> <li>A. His, his report included his resume, and it looks like he specializes serving the wind industry, so I'm assuming he's done quite a few. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, if I stopped you right there, would you be opposed to taking a ten minute break?</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: Absolutely not, sir. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, so I've got 7:50. Why don't we try to be back by eight o'clock, you guys. Thank you. (Recess at 7:50 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.) CHAIRMAN CORNALE: If we can go ahead and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 1607 it's well-recognized in the literature that the JEDI model does not comport with it. Q. Your attorney or excuse me, not your attorney, Mr. Luetkehans, handed to me before you started UCLC Exhibit 62, which is entitled The Economic and Fiscal Benefits of the Shady Oaks Wind Farm. Is that something you provided? A. I didn't write the report. I mentioned finding that and reviewing in researching and reviewing Dr. Loomis's report. Q. I'm just wondering why was it that we were given this? What's the point of this? A. It's referred to, in the report I've done, in sources, and I referred to it in the testimony I gave earlier. I have no idea why or you know, it was a source that was readily available if you looked at my report.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 1605 Q. Ever? A. Ever. Q. Page 2 at the top. The economic do you know how many of those assessments Dr. Loomis has done? A. His, his report included his resume, and it looks like he specializes serving the wind industry, so I'm assuming he's done quite a few. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, if I stopped you right there, would you be opposed to taking a ten minute break? MR. BLAZER: Absolutely not, sir. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, so I've got 7:50. Why don't we try to be back by eight o'clock, you guys. Thank you. (Recess at 7:50 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.) CHAIRMAN CORNALE: If we can go ahead and get back to our seats, we'll get going. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Page 1607</li> <li>it's well-recognized in the literature that the JEDI model does not comport with it.</li> <li>Q. Your attorney or excuse me, not your attorney, Mr. Luetkehans, handed to me before you started UCLC Exhibit 62, which is entitled The Economic and Fiscal Benefits of the Shady Oaks Wind Farm. Is that something you provided?</li> <li>A. I didn't write the report. I mentioned finding that and reviewing in researching and reviewing Dr. Loomis's report.</li> <li>Q. I'm just wondering why was it that we were given this? What's the point of this?</li> <li>A. It's referred to, in the report I've done, in sources, and I referred to it in the testimony I gave earlier. I have no idea why or you know, it was a source that was readily available if you looked at my report.</li> <li>Q. So you relied on Exhibit 62 in some</li> </ul>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Page 1605</li> <li>Q. Ever?</li> <li>A. Ever.</li> <li>Q. Page 2 at the top. The economic do you know how many of those assessments Dr. Loomis has done?</li> <li>A. His, his report included his resume, and it looks like he specializes serving the wind industry, so I'm assuming he's done quite a few. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, if I stopped you right there, would you be opposed to taking a ten minute break?</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: Absolutely not, sir. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, so I've got 7:50. Why don't we try to be back by eight o'clock, you guys. Thank you. (Recess at 7:50 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.) CHAIRMAN CORNALE: If we can go ahead and get back to our seats, we'll get going. I understand, Mr. Luetkehans, you have another witness</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 1607 it's well-recognized in the literature that the JEDI model does not comport with it. Q. Your attorney or excuse me, not your attorney, Mr. Luetkehans, handed to me before you started UCLC Exhibit 62, which is entitled The Economic and Fiscal Benefits of the Shady Oaks Wind Farm. Is that something you provided? A. I didn't write the report. I mentioned finding that and reviewing in researching and reviewing Dr. Loomis's report. Q. I'm just wondering why was it that we were given this? What's the point of this? A. It's referred to, in the report I've done, in sources, and I referred to it in the testimony I gave earlier. I have no idea why or you know, it was a source that was readily available if you looked at my report. Q. So you relied on Exhibit 62 in some fashion in preparing your report?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 1605 Q. Ever? A. Ever. Q. Page 2 at the top. The economic do you know how many of those assessments Dr. Loomis has done? A. His, his report included his resume, and it looks like he specializes serving the wind industry, so I'm assuming he's done quite a few. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, if I stopped you right there, would you be opposed to taking a ten minute break? MR. BLAZER: Absolutely not, sir. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, so I've got 7:50. Why don't we try to be back by eight o'clock, you guys. Thank you. (Recess at 7:50 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.) CHAIRMAN CORNALE: If we can go ahead and get back to our seats, we'll get going. I understand, Mr. Luetkehans, you have another witness that would like to testify this evening; is that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Page 1607</li> <li>it's well-recognized in the literature that the JEDI model does not comport with it.</li> <li>Q. Your attorney or excuse me, not your attorney, Mr. Luetkehans, handed to me before you started UCLC Exhibit 62, which is entitled The Economic and Fiscal Benefits of the Shady Oaks Wind Farm. Is that something you provided?</li> <li>A. I didn't write the report. I mentioned finding that and reviewing in researching and reviewing Dr. Loomis's report.</li> <li>Q. I'm just wondering why was it that we were given this? What's the point of this?</li> <li>A. It's referred to, in the report I've done, in sources, and I referred to it in the testimony I gave earlier. I have no idea why or you know, it was a source that was readily available if you looked at my report.</li> <li>Q. So you relied on Exhibit 62 in some fashion in preparing your report?</li> <li>A. I did refer to it. That's the</li> </ul>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Page 1605</li> <li>Q. Ever?</li> <li>A. Ever.</li> <li>Q. Page 2 at the top. The economic do you know how many of those assessments Dr. Loomis has done?</li> <li>A. His, his report included his resume, and it looks like he specializes serving the wind industry, so I'm assuming he's done quite a few. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, if I stopped you right there, would you be opposed to taking a ten minute break?</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: Absolutely not, sir. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, so I've got 7:50. Why don't we try to be back by eight o'clock, you guys. Thank you.</li> <li>(Recess at 7:50 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.)</li> <li>CHAIRMAN CORNALE: If we can go ahead and get back to our seats, we'll get going. I understand, Mr. Luetkehans, you have another witness that would like to testify this evening; is that correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Page 1607</li> <li>it's well-recognized in the literature that the JEDI model does not comport with it.</li> <li>Q. Your attorney or excuse me, not your attorney, Mr. Luetkehans, handed to me before you started UCLC Exhibit 62, which is entitled The Economic and Fiscal Benefits of the Shady Oaks Wind Farm. Is that something you provided?</li> <li>A. I didn't write the report. I mentioned finding that and reviewing in researching and reviewing Dr. Loomis's report.</li> <li>Q. I'm just wondering why was it that we were given this? What's the point of this?</li> <li>A. It's referred to, in the report I've done, in sources, and I referred to it in the testimony I gave earlier. I have no idea why or you know, it was a source that was readily available if you looked at my report.</li> <li>Q. So you relied on Exhibit 62 in some fashion in preparing your report?</li> <li>A. I did refer to it. That's the discussion of this report refers to it was done</li> </ul>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Ever?</li> <li>A. Ever.</li> <li>Q. Page 2 at the top. The economic do you know how many of those assessments Dr. Loomis has done?</li> <li>A. His, his report included his resume, and it looks like he specializes serving the wind industry, so I'm assuming he's done quite a few. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, if I stopped you right there, would you be opposed to taking a ten minute break?</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: Absolutely not, sir. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, so I've got 7:50. Why don't we try to be back by eight o'clock, you guys. Thank you. (Recess at 7:50 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.)</li> <li>CHAIRMAN CORNALE: If we can go ahead and get back to our seats, we'll get going. I understand, Mr. Luetkehans, you have another witness that would like to testify this evening; is that correct?</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Page 1607</li> <li>it's well-recognized in the literature that the JEDI model does not comport with it.</li> <li>Q. Your attorney or excuse me, not your attorney, Mr. Luetkehans, handed to me before you started UCLC Exhibit 62, which is entitled The Economic and Fiscal Benefits of the Shady Oaks Wind Farm. Is that something you provided?</li> <li>A. I didn't write the report. I mentioned finding that and reviewing in researching and reviewing Dr. Loomis's report.</li> <li>Q. I'm just wondering why was it that we were given this? What's the point of this?</li> <li>A. It's referred to, in the report I've done, in sources, and I referred to it in the testimony I gave earlier. I have no idea why or you know, it was a source that was readily available if you looked at my report.</li> <li>Q. So you relied on Exhibit 62 in some fashion in preparing your report?</li> <li>A. I did refer to it. That's the discussion of this report refers to it was done after the fact and it refers to where the various</li> </ul>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Page 1605</li> <li>Q. Ever?</li> <li>A. Ever.</li> <li>Q. Page 2 at the top. The economic do you know how many of those assessments Dr. Loomis has done?</li> <li>A. His, his report included his resume, and it looks like he specializes serving the wind industry, so I'm assuming he's done quite a few. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, if I stopped you right there, would you be opposed to taking a ten minute break?</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: Absolutely not, sir. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, so I've got 7:50. Why don't we try to be back by eight o'clock, you guys. Thank you.</li> <li>(Recess at 7:50 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.)</li> <li>CHAIRMAN CORNALE: If we can go ahead and get back to our seats, we'll get going. I understand, Mr. Luetkehans, you have another witness that would like to testify this evening; is that correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Page 1607</li> <li>it's well-recognized in the literature that the JEDI model does not comport with it.</li> <li>Q. Your attorney or excuse me, not your attorney, Mr. Luetkehans, handed to me before you started UCLC Exhibit 62, which is entitled The Economic and Fiscal Benefits of the Shady Oaks Wind Farm. Is that something you provided?</li> <li>A. I didn't write the report. I mentioned finding that and reviewing in researching and reviewing Dr. Loomis's report.</li> <li>Q. I'm just wondering why was it that we were given this? What's the point of this?</li> <li>A. It's referred to, in the report I've done, in sources, and I referred to it in the testimony I gave earlier. I have no idea why or you know, it was a source that was readily available if you looked at my report.</li> <li>Q. So you relied on Exhibit 62 in some fashion in preparing your report?</li> <li>A. I did refer to it. That's the discussion of this report refers to it was done</li> </ul>

			Sandary 20, 2015
	Page 1608		Page 1610
1	with you? I can give you this one, that's okay.	1	Q. Is it consistent with the JEDI model,
2	A. No, I don't need it.	2	which is, as we just established, is the standard in
3	Q. It's okay. It's right here. All right,	3	the wind industry and is thus more useful in
4	as long as you promise to give me mine back.	4	comparing project impacts?
5	A. No, it's just easier. I don't want to	5	MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, form. First
6	forget. This is fine.	6	of all, that wasn't established. All we heard was
7	Q. Okay.	7	it was read out of a report. Did he agree that it
8	A. We're okay.	8	was established? I don't think I heard that.
9	Q. And when you were relying on this report,	9	MR. BLAZER: He relied on this report.
10	did you read it?	10	I'm glad you're
11	A. Yes.	11	MR. LUETKEHANS: So if he relied on
	Q. Could you turn to page 12?		everything in the report, he's got to take it as
12 13	A. Yes.	12	gospel, huh?
		13	
14	Q. At the very top, jobs and economic	14	Q. In any event
15	development impacts. "To measure the overall local and national according impact of the Shady Oaks wind	15	A. If you'd just let me expand, that the
16	and national economic impact of the Shady Oaks wind	16	literature on IMPLAN and REMI and other standard
17	farm project, the Department of Energy's National	17	models for impact analysis is much more developed
18	Renewable Energy Laboratory's Jobs and Economic	18	and much longer in history for quite a few different
19	Development Impact, JEDI, wind energy model was	19	types of uses than the JEDI model which is done to
20	utilized. Table 1 summarizes Shady Oaks project	20	promote wind energy, but the way and has far
21	data. Economic multipliers used within the model	21	fewer projects, and for example, there has been
22	are derived from Minnesota IMPLAN Group's IMPLAN	22	peer-reviewed pieces, but for example, one article
23	professional. The JEDI model is the standard in the	23	only covers 2008 and for a geographic area that
24	wind industry and is thus more useful in comparing	24	doesn't include this area.
	Page 1609		Page 1611
	Page 1609		Page 1611
1	project impacts." Did I read that correctly, sir?	1	So I'm just saying that, yes, they're
1 2	project impacts." Did I read that correctly, sir? A. Yes, you did.	1 2	So I'm just saying that, yes, they're presented but in the format of JEDI, which only for
	<ul><li>project impacts." Did I read that correctly, sir?</li><li>A. Yes, you did.</li><li>Q. All right. Let's go back to let's go</li></ul>		So I'm just saying that, yes, they're presented but in the format of JEDI, which only for wind industry proponents is the JEDI model used.
2	<ul> <li>project impacts." Did I read that correctly, sir?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's go back to let's go to Professor Loomis's report. Well, first page 3</li> </ul>	2	So I'm just saying that, yes, they're presented but in the format of JEDI, which only for wind industry proponents is the JEDI model used. It's not the standard model for doing impact
2 3	<ul> <li>project impacts." Did I read that correctly, sir?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's go back to let's go to Professor Loomis's report. Well, first page 3 of your report, let's go there first, starting with</li> </ul>	2 3	So I'm just saying that, yes, they're presented but in the format of JEDI, which only for wind industry proponents is the JEDI model used.
2 3 4	<ul> <li>project impacts." Did I read that correctly, sir?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's go back to let's go to Professor Loomis's report. Well, first page 3 of your report, let's go there first, starting with the second sentence. "The Loomis report indicates</li> </ul>	2 3 4	So I'm just saying that, yes, they're presented but in the format of JEDI, which only for wind industry proponents is the JEDI model used. It's not the standard model for doing impact
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>project impacts." Did I read that correctly, sir?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's go back to let's go to Professor Loomis's report. Well, first page 3 of your report, let's go there first, starting with the second sentence. "The Loomis report indicates that 34 full-time jobs will result from induced</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	So I'm just saying that, yes, they're presented but in the format of JEDI, which only for wind industry proponents is the JEDI model used. It's not the standard model for doing impact analysis.
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>project impacts." Did I read that correctly, sir?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's go back to let's go to Professor Loomis's report. Well, first page 3 of your report, let's go there first, starting with the second sentence. "The Loomis report indicates that 34 full-time jobs will result from induced effects or, in other words, the effects of personal</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	So I'm just saying that, yes, they're presented but in the format of JEDI, which only for wind industry proponents is the JEDI model used. It's not the standard model for doing impact analysis. Q. Well A. And there are not multiplier effects presented.
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>project impacts." Did I read that correctly, sir?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's go back to let's go to Professor Loomis's report. Well, first page 3 of your report, let's go there first, starting with the second sentence. "The Loomis report indicates that 34 full-time jobs will result from induced effects or, in other words, the effects of personal consumption expenditures made by workers and their</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	So I'm just saying that, yes, they're presented but in the format of JEDI, which only for wind industry proponents is the JEDI model used. It's not the standard model for doing impact analysis. Q. Well A. And there are not multiplier effects presented. Q. Going back to Table 2, which is all I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>project impacts." Did I read that correctly, sir?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's go back to let's go to Professor Loomis's report. Well, first page 3 of your report, let's go there first, starting with the second sentence. "The Loomis report indicates that 34 full-time jobs will result from induced effects or, in other words, the effects of personal consumption expenditures made by workers and their households. The direct and indirect effects of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So I'm just saying that, yes, they're presented but in the format of JEDI, which only for wind industry proponents is the JEDI model used. It's not the standard model for doing impact analysis. Q. Well A. And there are not multiplier effects presented. Q. Going back to Table 2, which is all I'm asking you about, are you aware that the direct jobs
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>project impacts." Did I read that correctly, sir?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's go back to let's go to Professor Loomis's report. Well, first page 3 of your report, let's go there first, starting with the second sentence. "The Loomis report indicates that 34 full-time jobs will result from induced effects or, in other words, the effects of personal consumption expenditures made by workers and their households. The direct and indirect effects of construction activity, however, are not presented."</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So I'm just saying that, yes, they're presented but in the format of JEDI, which only for wind industry proponents is the JEDI model used. It's not the standard model for doing impact analysis. Q. Well A. And there are not multiplier effects presented. Q. Going back to Table 2, which is all I'm asking you about, are you aware that the direct jobs are labeled project development and on-site labor
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>project impacts." Did I read that correctly, sir?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's go back to let's go to Professor Loomis's report. Well, first page 3 of your report, let's go there first, starting with the second sentence. "The Loomis report indicates that 34 full-time jobs will result from induced effects or, in other words, the effects of personal consumption expenditures made by workers and their households. The direct and indirect effects of construction activity, however, are not presented." Do you see where I was reading from?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	So I'm just saying that, yes, they're presented but in the format of JEDI, which only for wind industry proponents is the JEDI model used. It's not the standard model for doing impact analysis. Q. Well A. And there are not multiplier effects presented. Q. Going back to Table 2, which is all I'm asking you about, are you aware that the direct jobs are labeled project development and on-site labor impacts?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>project impacts." Did I read that correctly, sir?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's go back to let's go to Professor Loomis's report. Well, first page 3 of your report, let's go there first, starting with the second sentence. "The Loomis report indicates that 34 full-time jobs will result from induced effects or, in other words, the effects of personal consumption expenditures made by workers and their households. The direct and indirect effects of construction activity, however, are not presented."</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	So I'm just saying that, yes, they're presented but in the format of JEDI, which only for wind industry proponents is the JEDI model used. It's not the standard model for doing impact analysis. Q. Well A. And there are not multiplier effects presented. Q. Going back to Table 2, which is all I'm asking you about, are you aware that the direct jobs are labeled project development and on-site labor impacts? A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>project impacts." Did I read that correctly, sir?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's go back to let's go to Professor Loomis's report. Well, first page 3 of your report, let's go there first, starting with the second sentence. "The Loomis report indicates that 34 full-time jobs will result from induced effects or, in other words, the effects of personal consumption expenditures made by workers and their households. The direct and indirect effects of construction activity, however, are not presented." Do you see where I was reading from?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now, if you could turn to Professor</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So I'm just saying that, yes, they're presented but in the format of JEDI, which only for wind industry proponents is the JEDI model used. It's not the standard model for doing impact analysis. Q. Well A. And there are not multiplier effects presented. Q. Going back to Table 2, which is all I'm asking you about, are you aware that the direct jobs are labeled project development and on-site labor impacts? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And indirect jobs are labeled
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>project impacts." Did I read that correctly, sir?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's go back to let's go to Professor Loomis's report. Well, first page 3 of your report, let's go there first, starting with the second sentence. "The Loomis report indicates that 34 full-time jobs will result from induced effects or, in other words, the effects of personal consumption expenditures made by workers and their households. The direct and indirect effects of construction activity, however, are not presented." Do you see where I was reading from?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now, if you could turn to Professor Loomis's or Professor Loomis's report. Table 2</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So I'm just saying that, yes, they're presented but in the format of JEDI, which only for wind industry proponents is the JEDI model used. It's not the standard model for doing impact analysis. Q. Well A. And there are not multiplier effects presented. Q. Going back to Table 2, which is all I'm asking you about, are you aware that the direct jobs are labeled project development and on-site labor impacts? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And indirect jobs are labeled turbine and supply chain impacts, right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>project impacts." Did I read that correctly, sir?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's go back to let's go to Professor Loomis's report. Well, first page 3 of your report, let's go there first, starting with the second sentence. "The Loomis report indicates that 34 full-time jobs will result from induced effects or, in other words, the effects of personal consumption expenditures made by workers and their households. The direct and indirect effects of construction activity, however, are not presented." Do you see where I was reading from?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now, if you could turn to Professor</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So I'm just saying that, yes, they're presented but in the format of JEDI, which only for wind industry proponents is the JEDI model used. It's not the standard model for doing impact analysis. Q. Well A. And there are not multiplier effects presented. Q. Going back to Table 2, which is all I'm asking you about, are you aware that the direct jobs are labeled project development and on-site labor impacts? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And indirect jobs are labeled
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>project impacts." Did I read that correctly, sir?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's go back to let's go to Professor Loomis's report. Well, first page 3 of your report, let's go there first, starting with the second sentence. "The Loomis report indicates that 34 full-time jobs will result from induced effects or, in other words, the effects of personal consumption expenditures made by workers and their households. The direct and indirect effects of construction activity, however, are not presented." Do you see where I was reading from?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now, if you could turn to Professor Loomis's or Professor Loomis's report. Table 2</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So I'm just saying that, yes, they're presented but in the format of JEDI, which only for wind industry proponents is the JEDI model used. It's not the standard model for doing impact analysis. Q. Well A. And there are not multiplier effects presented. Q. Going back to Table 2, which is all I'm asking you about, are you aware that the direct jobs are labeled project development and on-site labor impacts? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And indirect jobs are labeled turbine and supply chain impacts, right?
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>project impacts." Did I read that correctly, sir?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's go back to let's go to Professor Loomis's report. Well, first page 3 of your report, let's go there first, starting with the second sentence. "The Loomis report indicates that 34 full-time jobs will result from induced effects or, in other words, the effects of personal consumption expenditures made by workers and their households. The direct and indirect effects of construction activity, however, are not presented." Do you see where I was reading from?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now, if you could turn to Professor Loomis's or Professor Loomis's report. Table 2 on page 11. Now, that lists the direct and indirect</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So I'm just saying that, yes, they're presented but in the format of JEDI, which only for wind industry proponents is the JEDI model used. It's not the standard model for doing impact analysis. Q. Well A. And there are not multiplier effects presented. Q. Going back to Table 2, which is all I'm asking you about, are you aware that the direct jobs are labeled project development and on-site labor impacts? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And indirect jobs are labeled turbine and supply chain impacts, right? A. Indirect jobs as defined by the JEDI model, yes. Q. All right. And if you go to pages 9 to 10
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>project impacts." Did I read that correctly, sir?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's go back to let's go to Professor Loomis's report. Well, first page 3 of your report, let's go there first, starting with the second sentence. "The Loomis report indicates that 34 full-time jobs will result from induced effects or, in other words, the effects of personal consumption expenditures made by workers and their households. The direct and indirect effects of construction activity, however, are not presented." Do you see where I was reading from?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now, if you could turn to Professor Loomis's or Professor Loomis's report. Table 2 on page 11. Now, that lists the direct and indirect jobs, right?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So I'm just saying that, yes, they're presented but in the format of JEDI, which only for wind industry proponents is the JEDI model used. It's not the standard model for doing impact analysis. Q. Well A. And there are not multiplier effects presented. Q. Going back to Table 2, which is all I'm asking you about, are you aware that the direct jobs are labeled project development and on-site labor impacts? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And indirect jobs are labeled turbine and supply chain impacts, right? A. Indirect jobs as defined by the JEDI model, yes. Q. All right. And if you go to pages 9 to 10 of Dr. Loomis's report, the definitions for direct,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>project impacts." Did I read that correctly, sir?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's go back to let's go to Professor Loomis's report. Well, first page 3 of your report, let's go there first, starting with the second sentence. "The Loomis report indicates that 34 full-time jobs will result from induced effects or, in other words, the effects of personal consumption expenditures made by workers and their households. The direct and indirect effects of construction activity, however, are not presented." Do you see where I was reading from?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now, if you could turn to Professor Loomis's or Professor Loomis's report. Table 2 on page 11. Now, that lists the direct and indirect jobs, right?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So I'm just saying that, yes, they're presented but in the format of JEDI, which only for wind industry proponents is the JEDI model used. It's not the standard model for doing impact analysis. Q. Well A. And there are not multiplier effects presented. Q. Going back to Table 2, which is all I'm asking you about, are you aware that the direct jobs are labeled project development and on-site labor impacts? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And indirect jobs are labeled turbine and supply chain impacts, right? A. Indirect jobs as defined by the JEDI model, yes. Q. All right. And if you go to pages 9 to 10
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>project impacts." Did I read that correctly, sir?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's go back to let's go to Professor Loomis's report. Well, first page 3 of your report, let's go there first, starting with the second sentence. "The Loomis report indicates that 34 full-time jobs will result from induced effects or, in other words, the effects of personal consumption expenditures made by workers and their households. The direct and indirect effects of construction activity, however, are not presented." Do you see where I was reading from?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now, if you could turn to Professor Loomis's or Professor Loomis's report. Table 2 on page 11. Now, that lists the direct and indirect jobs, right?</li> <li>A. Not consistent with the convention on how IMPLAN and other much more established models than</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So I'm just saying that, yes, they're presented but in the format of JEDI, which only for wind industry proponents is the JEDI model used. It's not the standard model for doing impact analysis. Q. Well A. And there are not multiplier effects presented. Q. Going back to Table 2, which is all I'm asking you about, are you aware that the direct jobs are labeled project development and on-site labor impacts? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And indirect jobs are labeled turbine and supply chain impacts, right? A. Indirect jobs as defined by the JEDI model, yes. Q. All right. And if you go to pages 9 to 10 of Dr. Loomis's report, the definitions for direct,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>project impacts." Did I read that correctly, sir?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's go back to let's go to Professor Loomis's report. Well, first page 3 of your report, let's go there first, starting with the second sentence. "The Loomis report indicates that 34 full-time jobs will result from induced effects or, in other words, the effects of personal consumption expenditures made by workers and their households. The direct and indirect effects of construction activity, however, are not presented." Do you see where I was reading from?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now, if you could turn to Professor Loomis's or Professor Loomis's report. Table 2 on page 11. Now, that lists the direct and indirect jobs, right?</li> <li>A. Not consistent with the convention on how IMPLAN and other much more established models than the JEDI model lists them. It does, but I've tried</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So I'm just saying that, yes, they're presented but in the format of JEDI, which only for wind industry proponents is the JEDI model used. It's not the standard model for doing impact analysis. Q. Well A. And there are not multiplier effects presented. Q. Going back to Table 2, which is all I'm asking you about, are you aware that the direct jobs are labeled project development and on-site labor impacts? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And indirect jobs are labeled turbine and supply chain impacts, right? A. Indirect jobs as defined by the JEDI model, yes. Q. All right. And if you go to pages 9 to 10 of Dr. Loomis's report, the definitions for direct, indirect and induced jobs are given there, correct? A. I'm sorry, tell me the pages again please. Q. 9 to 10.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>project impacts." Did I read that correctly, sir?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's go back to let's go to Professor Loomis's report. Well, first page 3 of your report, let's go there first, starting with the second sentence. "The Loomis report indicates that 34 full-time jobs will result from induced effects or, in other words, the effects of personal consumption expenditures made by workers and their households. The direct and indirect effects of construction activity, however, are not presented." Do you see where I was reading from?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now, if you could turn to Professor Loomis's or Professor Loomis's report. Table 2 on page 11. Now, that lists the direct and indirect jobs, right?</li> <li>A. Not consistent with the convention on how IMPLAN and other much more established models than the JEDI model lists them. It does, but I've tried to explain</li> <li>Q. Well</li> <li>A the way it's defined here is different</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So I'm just saying that, yes, they're presented but in the format of JEDI, which only for wind industry proponents is the JEDI model used. It's not the standard model for doing impact analysis. Q. Well A. And there are not multiplier effects presented. Q. Going back to Table 2, which is all I'm asking you about, are you aware that the direct jobs are labeled project development and on-site labor impacts? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And indirect jobs are labeled turbine and supply chain impacts, right? A. Indirect jobs as defined by the JEDI model, yes. Q. All right. And if you go to pages 9 to 10 of Dr. Loomis's report, the definitions for direct, indirect and induced jobs are given there, correct? A. I'm sorry, tell me the pages again please. Q. 9 to 10. A. Yes, this is the definitions for the JEDI
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>project impacts." Did I read that correctly, sir?</li> <li>A. Yes, you did.</li> <li>Q. All right. Let's go back to let's go to Professor Loomis's report. Well, first page 3 of your report, let's go there first, starting with the second sentence. "The Loomis report indicates that 34 full-time jobs will result from induced effects or, in other words, the effects of personal consumption expenditures made by workers and their households. The direct and indirect effects of construction activity, however, are not presented." Do you see where I was reading from?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now, if you could turn to Professor Loomis's or Professor Loomis's report. Table 2 on page 11. Now, that lists the direct and indirect jobs, right?</li> <li>A. Not consistent with the convention on how IMPLAN and other much more established models than the JEDI model lists them. It does, but I've tried to explain Q. Well</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So I'm just saying that, yes, they're presented but in the format of JEDI, which only for wind industry proponents is the JEDI model used. It's not the standard model for doing impact analysis. Q. Well A. And there are not multiplier effects presented. Q. Going back to Table 2, which is all I'm asking you about, are you aware that the direct jobs are labeled project development and on-site labor impacts? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And indirect jobs are labeled turbine and supply chain impacts, right? A. Indirect jobs as defined by the JEDI model, yes. Q. All right. And if you go to pages 9 to 10 of Dr. Loomis's report, the definitions for direct, indirect and induced jobs are given there, correct? A. I'm sorry, tell me the pages again please. Q. 9 to 10.

_				January 26, 2015
		Page 1612		Page 1614
	1	Q. All right. And do you disagree that those	1	entire firm. In that 44 year period since 1970, has
		efinitions are accurate within the context of the	1	•
		EDI model?	2	anyone in your firm assessed the economic impact or the ich impact or any impact from a wind form?
			3	the job impact or any impact from a wind farm?
		A. I'm sure he's got it right.	4	A. No.
		Q. All right. So is your issue with how the	5	Q. Do you agree that Pontiac is the largest
		bs are classified as direct or indirect?	6	municipality in Livingston County with a population
		A. That's one of the issues, yes, because if	7	of 11,931?
	-	ou don't have standard multipliers that we can look	8	A. Sounds good to me.
		t, if they were what is usually considered	9	Q. Followed by Dwight with 4260?
-		irect is considered direct and what is usually	10	A. Again, I don't have it in front of me, but
-		onsidered indirect is indirect. And if some items	11	that sounds right.
-		at are not usually considered indirect or direct	12	Q. And Fairbury with 3757?
-		eren't in it, it would be much easier to evaluate.	13	A. Right.
:		nd this is how JEDI models are misleading compared	14	Q. All right. Are you are you aware
1	15 to	the conventional models that are much more	15	there's also a village named Forrest in Livingston
1	16 es	stablished.	16	County?
1	17	Q. Do you disagree with the total number of	17	A. I believe so.
2	<b>18</b> jo	bs created?	18	Q. All right. Do you know that or don't you?
1	19	A. I thought I indicated, and I'll say so	19	A. I have a list of every community in the
:	20 ag	gain, that the total jobs are likely to be	20	county. I would think you'd be telling me the truth
:	21 0	verstated and misleading.	21	on this and I'll accept it.
:		Q. Likely to be? Have you actually assessed	22	Q. Would you agree with me that all of those
1		hether they are?	23	communities are fairly close to each other?
		A. It's prospective. Yes, the whole report	24	A. Again, I'll accept your word for it. I
-		Page 1613		Page 1615
		Page 1613		Page 1615
		explaining the reasons why the jobs are likely to	1	have no reason to think you're not telling the
	2 b	explaining the reasons why the jobs are likely to e misleading and overstated because for all the	1 2	have no reason to think you're not telling the truth.
	2 be 3 re	explaining the reasons why the jobs are likely to e misleading and overstated because for all the easons I listed just a few moments ago in the		<ul><li>have no reason to think you're not telling the truth.</li><li>Q. Livingston County, for example, isn't as</li></ul>
	2 be 3 re 4 te	explaining the reasons why the jobs are likely to e misleading and overstated because for all the easons I listed just a few moments ago in the estimony and described in the report. It's the	2	<ul><li>have no reason to think you're not telling the truth.</li><li>Q. Livingston County, for example, isn't as big as the state of Nevada for example, right?</li></ul>
	<ul> <li>2 be</li> <li>3 re</li> <li>4 te</li> <li>5 w</li> </ul>	explaining the reasons why the jobs are likely to e misleading and overstated because for all the easons I listed just a few moments ago in the estimony and described in the report. It's the hole purpose of the report.	2 3	<ul><li>have no reason to think you're not telling the truth.</li><li>Q. Livingston County, for example, isn't as big as the state of Nevada for example, right?</li><li>A. That's right.</li></ul>
	<ol> <li>2 bo</li> <li>3 re</li> <li>4 te</li> <li>5 w</li> <li>6</li> </ol>	explaining the reasons why the jobs are likely to e misleading and overstated because for all the easons I listed just a few moments ago in the estimony and described in the report. It's the hole purpose of the report. Q. Since you say likely to be, I'm trying to	2 3 4	<ul> <li>have no reason to think you're not telling the truth.</li> <li>Q. Livingston County, for example, isn't as big as the state of Nevada for example, right?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you agree that in those cases</li> </ul>
	<ol> <li>2 bo</li> <li>3 re</li> <li>4 te</li> <li>5 w</li> <li>6</li> </ol>	explaining the reasons why the jobs are likely to e misleading and overstated because for all the easons I listed just a few moments ago in the estimony and described in the report. It's the hole purpose of the report.	2 3 4	<ul> <li>have no reason to think you're not telling the truth.</li> <li>Q. Livingston County, for example, isn't as big as the state of Nevada for example, right?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you agree that in those cases where a proposed new economic activity or</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>2 be</li> <li>3 re</li> <li>4 te</li> <li>5 w</li> <li>6 7 fin</li> <li>8 ar</li> </ul>	explaining the reasons why the jobs are likely to e misleading and overstated because for all the easons I listed just a few moments ago in the estimony and described in the report. It's the hole purpose of the report. Q. Since you say likely to be, I'm trying to nd out whether, in fact, you determined if they re overstated.	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>have no reason to think you're not telling the truth.</li> <li>Q. Livingston County, for example, isn't as big as the state of Nevada for example, right?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you agree that in those cases where a proposed new economic activity or construction project is located near other activity</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>2 be</li> <li>3 ree</li> <li>4 tee</li> <li>5 w</li> <li>6</li> <li>7 fin</li> <li>8 are</li> <li>9</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>explaining the reasons why the jobs are likely to e misleading and overstated because for all the easons I listed just a few moments ago in the estimony and described in the report. It's the hole purpose of the report.</li> <li>Q. Since you say likely to be, I'm trying to nd out whether, in fact, you determined if they re overstated.</li> <li>A. There have been no jobs created, so this</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>have no reason to think you're not telling the truth.</li> <li>Q. Livingston County, for example, isn't as big as the state of Nevada for example, right?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you agree that in those cases where a proposed new economic activity or construction project is located near other activity centers, input/output models such as JEDI can be</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>2 be</li> <li>3 re</li> <li>4 te</li> <li>5 w</li> <li>6</li> <li>7 fin</li> <li>8 an</li> <li>9</li> <li>10 is</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>explaining the reasons why the jobs are likely to e misleading and overstated because for all the easons I listed just a few moments ago in the estimony and described in the report. It's the hole purpose of the report.</li> <li>Q. Since you say likely to be, I'm trying to nd out whether, in fact, you determined if they e overstated.</li> <li>A. There have been no jobs created, so this all prospective, and I'm certain that the jobs</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>have no reason to think you're not telling the truth.</li> <li>Q. Livingston County, for example, isn't as big as the state of Nevada for example, right?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you agree that in those cases where a proposed new economic activity or construction project is located near other activity centers, input/output models such as JEDI can be reasonably depended on even when they deal with</li> </ul>
	2 bo 3 re 4 te 5 w 6 7 fin 8 ar 9 10 is 11 th	<ul> <li>explaining the reasons why the jobs are likely to e misleading and overstated because for all the easons I listed just a few moments ago in the estimony and described in the report. It's the hole purpose of the report.</li> <li>Q. Since you say likely to be, I'm trying to nd out whether, in fact, you determined if they re overstated.</li> <li>A. There have been no jobs created, so this all prospective, and I'm certain that the jobs nat are stated as gross jobs are going to overstate</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>have no reason to think you're not telling the truth.</li> <li>Q. Livingston County, for example, isn't as big as the state of Nevada for example, right?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you agree that in those cases where a proposed new economic activity or construction project is located near other activity centers, input/output models such as JEDI can be</li> </ul>
-	2 bo 3 re 4 te 5 w 6 7 fin 8 ar 9 10 is 11 th	<ul> <li>explaining the reasons why the jobs are likely to e misleading and overstated because for all the easons I listed just a few moments ago in the estimony and described in the report. It's the hole purpose of the report.</li> <li>Q. Since you say likely to be, I'm trying to nd out whether, in fact, you determined if they e overstated.</li> <li>A. There have been no jobs created, so this all prospective, and I'm certain that the jobs</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>have no reason to think you're not telling the truth.</li> <li>Q. Livingston County, for example, isn't as big as the state of Nevada for example, right?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you agree that in those cases where a proposed new economic activity or construction project is located near other activity centers, input/output models such as JEDI can be reasonably depended on even when they deal with</li> </ul>
	2 bo 3 re 4 te 5 w 6 7 fin 8 an 9 10 is 11 th 12 th	<ul> <li>explaining the reasons why the jobs are likely to e misleading and overstated because for all the easons I listed just a few moments ago in the estimony and described in the report. It's the hole purpose of the report.</li> <li>Q. Since you say likely to be, I'm trying to nd out whether, in fact, you determined if they re overstated.</li> <li>A. There have been no jobs created, so this all prospective, and I'm certain that the jobs nat are stated as gross jobs are going to overstate</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>have no reason to think you're not telling the truth.</li> <li>Q. Livingston County, for example, isn't as big as the state of Nevada for example, right?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you agree that in those cases where a proposed new economic activity or construction project is located near other activity centers, input/output models such as JEDI can be reasonably depended on even when they deal with areas as small as a single county?</li> </ul>
	2 bo 3 re 4 te 5 w 6 7 fin 8 ar 9 10 is 11 th 12 th 13 al	<ul> <li>explaining the reasons why the jobs are likely to e misleading and overstated because for all the easons I listed just a few moments ago in the estimony and described in the report. It's the hole purpose of the report.</li> <li>Q. Since you say likely to be, I'm trying to and out whether, in fact, you determined if they e overstated.</li> <li>A. There have been no jobs created, so this all prospective, and I'm certain that the jobs and are stated as gross jobs are going to overstate e number of actual jobs created. That I'm certain</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>have no reason to think you're not telling the truth.</li> <li>Q. Livingston County, for example, isn't as big as the state of Nevada for example, right?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you agree that in those cases where a proposed new economic activity or construction project is located near other activity centers, input/output models such as JEDI can be reasonably depended on even when they deal with areas as small as a single county?</li> <li>A. I think that's fundamentally the problem.</li> </ul>
	2 bo 3 re 4 te 5 w 6 7 fin 8 ar 9 10 is 11 th 12 th 13 al 14	<ul> <li>explaining the reasons why the jobs are likely to e misleading and overstated because for all the easons I listed just a few moments ago in the estimony and described in the report. It's the hole purpose of the report.</li> <li>Q. Since you say likely to be, I'm trying to nd out whether, in fact, you determined if they e overstated.</li> <li>A. There have been no jobs created, so this all prospective, and I'm certain that the jobs at are stated as gross jobs are going to overstate e number of actual jobs created. That I'm certain bout and that's what I've tried to describe.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>have no reason to think you're not telling the truth.</li> <li>Q. Livingston County, for example, isn't as big as the state of Nevada for example, right?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you agree that in those cases where a proposed new economic activity or construction project is located near other activity centers, input/output models such as JEDI can be reasonably depended on even when they deal with areas as small as a single county?</li> <li>A. I think that's fundamentally the problem.</li> <li>The smaller, the more rural, the less urban an area,</li> </ul>
	2 bo 3 re 4 te 5 w 6 7 fu 8 ar 9 10 is 11 th 12 th 13 al 14 15 or	<ul> <li>explaining the reasons why the jobs are likely to e misleading and overstated because for all the easons I listed just a few moments ago in the estimony and described in the report. It's the hole purpose of the report.</li> <li>Q. Since you say likely to be, I'm trying to nd out whether, in fact, you determined if they e overstated.</li> <li>A. There have been no jobs created, so this all prospective, and I'm certain that the jobs at are stated as gross jobs are going to overstate e number of actual jobs created. That I'm certain bout and that's what I've tried to describe.</li> <li>Q. I see. But that, again, wouldn't be based</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>have no reason to think you're not telling the truth.</li> <li>Q. Livingston County, for example, isn't as big as the state of Nevada for example, right?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you agree that in those cases where a proposed new economic activity or construction project is located near other activity centers, input/output models such as JEDI can be reasonably depended on even when they deal with areas as small as a single county?</li> <li>A. I think that's fundamentally the problem. The smaller, the more rural, the less urban an area, the more prone to exaggerated effects the JEDI model</li> </ul>
	2 bo 3 re 4 te 5 w 6 7 fin 8 ar 9 10 is 11 th 12 th 13 al 14 15 on 16 do	<ul> <li>explaining the reasons why the jobs are likely to e misleading and overstated because for all the easons I listed just a few moments ago in the estimony and described in the report. It's the hole purpose of the report.</li> <li>Q. Since you say likely to be, I'm trying to and out whether, in fact, you determined if they e overstated.</li> <li>A. There have been no jobs created, so this all prospective, and I'm certain that the jobs at are stated as gross jobs are going to overstate e number of actual jobs created. That I'm certain bout and that's what I've tried to describe.</li> <li>Q. I see. But that, again, wouldn't be based in any experience in the wind industry since you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>have no reason to think you're not telling the truth.</li> <li>Q. Livingston County, for example, isn't as big as the state of Nevada for example, right?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you agree that in those cases where a proposed new economic activity or construction project is located near other activity centers, input/output models such as JEDI can be reasonably depended on even when they deal with areas as small as a single county?</li> <li>A. I think that's fundamentally the problem. The smaller, the more rural, the less urban an area, the more prone to exaggerated effects the JEDI model and, for that matter, any impact model is going to</li> </ul>
	2 bo 3 re 4 te 5 w 6 7 fin 8 ar 9 10 is 11 th 12 th 13 al 14 15 on 16 do	<ul> <li>explaining the reasons why the jobs are likely to e misleading and overstated because for all the easons I listed just a few moments ago in the estimony and described in the report. It's the hole purpose of the report.</li> <li>Q. Since you say likely to be, I'm trying to and out whether, in fact, you determined if they e overstated.</li> <li>A. There have been no jobs created, so this all prospective, and I'm certain that the jobs hat are stated as gross jobs are going to overstate e number of actual jobs created. That I'm certain bout and that's what I've tried to describe.</li> <li>Q. I see. But that, again, wouldn't be based in any experience in the wind industry since you on't have any, right?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>have no reason to think you're not telling the truth.</li> <li>Q. Livingston County, for example, isn't as big as the state of Nevada for example, right?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you agree that in those cases where a proposed new economic activity or construction project is located near other activity centers, input/output models such as JEDI can be reasonably depended on even when they deal with areas as small as a single county?</li> <li>A. I think that's fundamentally the problem. The smaller, the more rural, the less urban an area, the more prone to exaggerated effects the JEDI model and, for that matter, any impact model is going to be, and this is well-established in the academic literature. The multiplier effects leak out more in</li> </ul>
	2 bo 3 re 4 te 5 w 6 7 fin 8 an 9 is 10 is 11 th 12 th 13 al 14 15 on 15 on 16 do	<ul> <li>explaining the reasons why the jobs are likely to e misleading and overstated because for all the easons I listed just a few moments ago in the estimony and described in the report. It's the hole purpose of the report.</li> <li>Q. Since you say likely to be, I'm trying to and out whether, in fact, you determined if they e overstated.</li> <li>A. There have been no jobs created, so this all prospective, and I'm certain that the jobs at are stated as gross jobs are going to overstate e number of actual jobs created. That I'm certain bout and that's what I've tried to describe.</li> <li>Q. I see. But that, again, wouldn't be based an any experience in the wind industry since you on't have any, right?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>have no reason to think you're not telling the truth.</li> <li>Q. Livingston County, for example, isn't as big as the state of Nevada for example, right?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you agree that in those cases where a proposed new economic activity or construction project is located near other activity centers, input/output models such as JEDI can be reasonably depended on even when they deal with areas as small as a single county?</li> <li>A. I think that's fundamentally the problem.</li> <li>The smaller, the more rural, the less urban an area, the more prone to exaggerated effects the JEDI model and, for that matter, any impact model is going to be, and this is well-established in the academic literature. The multiplier effects leak out more in less urban areas. So any model is going to be less</li> </ul>
	2 bo 3 re 4 te 5 w 6 7 fin 8 ar 9 is 10 is 11 th 12 th 13 al 14 0 15 or 16 do 17 18	<ul> <li>explaining the reasons why the jobs are likely to e misleading and overstated because for all the easons I listed just a few moments ago in the estimony and described in the report. It's the hole purpose of the report.</li> <li>Q. Since you say likely to be, I'm trying to and out whether, in fact, you determined if they re overstated.</li> <li>A. There have been no jobs created, so this all prospective, and I'm certain that the jobs are stated as gross jobs are going to overstate e number of actual jobs created. That I'm certain bout and that's what I've tried to describe.</li> <li>Q. I see. But that, again, wouldn't be based an any experience in the wind industry since you on't have any, right?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. Just based on experience since 1970, the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>have no reason to think you're not telling the truth.</li> <li>Q. Livingston County, for example, isn't as big as the state of Nevada for example, right?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you agree that in those cases where a proposed new economic activity or construction project is located near other activity centers, input/output models such as JEDI can be reasonably depended on even when they deal with areas as small as a single county?</li> <li>A. I think that's fundamentally the problem. The smaller, the more rural, the less urban an area, the more prone to exaggerated effects the JEDI model and, for that matter, any impact model is going to be, and this is well-established in the academic literature. The multiplier effects leak out more in less urban areas. So any model is going to be less precise covering a smaller area or a rural area</li> </ul>
	2       bd         3       re         4       te         5       w         6       7         7       fill         8       ar         9       is         10       is         11       th         12       th         13       al         14       01         15       01         16       do         17       18         19       20       fill	<ul> <li>explaining the reasons why the jobs are likely to e misleading and overstated because for all the easons I listed just a few moments ago in the estimony and described in the report. It's the hole purpose of the report.</li> <li>Q. Since you say likely to be, I'm trying to and out whether, in fact, you determined if they e overstated.</li> <li>A. There have been no jobs created, so this all prospective, and I'm certain that the jobs at are stated as gross jobs are going to overstate e number of actual jobs created. That I'm certain bout and that's what I've tried to describe.</li> <li>Q. I see. But that, again, wouldn't be based an any experience in the wind industry since you on't have any, right?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. Just based on experience since 1970, the rm doing economic impact analyses of a wide</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>have no reason to think you're not telling the truth.</li> <li>Q. Livingston County, for example, isn't as big as the state of Nevada for example, right?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you agree that in those cases where a proposed new economic activity or construction project is located near other activity centers, input/output models such as JEDI can be reasonably depended on even when they deal with areas as small as a single county?</li> <li>A. I think that's fundamentally the problem. The smaller, the more rural, the less urban an area, the more prone to exaggerated effects the JEDI model and, for that matter, any impact model is going to be, and this is well-established in the academic literature. The multiplier effects leak out more in less urban areas. So any model is going to be less precise covering a smaller area or a rural area than, say, an urban area with more built-in linkages</li> </ul>
	2       bd         3       re         4       te         5       W         6       7         7       fin         8       ar         9       is         10       is         11       th         12       th         13       al         14       15         15       on         16       do         17       18         19       20       fin         20       fin         21       va	<ul> <li>explaining the reasons why the jobs are likely to e misleading and overstated because for all the easons I listed just a few moments ago in the estimony and described in the report. It's the hole purpose of the report.</li> <li>Q. Since you say likely to be, I'm trying to nd out whether, in fact, you determined if they e overstated.</li> <li>A. There have been no jobs created, so this all prospective, and I'm certain that the jobs at are stated as gross jobs are going to overstate e number of actual jobs created. That I'm certain bout and that's what I've tried to describe.</li> <li>Q. I see. But that, again, wouldn't be based any experience in the wind industry since you on't have any, right?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. Just based on experience since 1970, the rm doing economic impact analyses of a wide ariety of land uses including other types of energy</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>have no reason to think you're not telling the truth.</li> <li>Q. Livingston County, for example, isn't as big as the state of Nevada for example, right?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you agree that in those cases where a proposed new economic activity or construction project is located near other activity centers, input/output models such as JEDI can be reasonably depended on even when they deal with areas as small as a single county?</li> <li>A. I think that's fundamentally the problem. The smaller, the more rural, the less urban an area, the more prone to exaggerated effects the JEDI model and, for that matter, any impact model is going to be, and this is well-established in the academic literature. The multiplier effects leak out more in less urban areas. So any model is going to be less precise covering a smaller area or a rural area than, say, an urban area with more built-in linkages forward and back in the local economy.</li> </ul>
	2 bo 3 re 4 te 5 w 6 7 fin 8 ar 9 is 10 is 11 th 12 th 13 al 14 0 15 or 16 do 17 18 19 20 fin 21 v2 22 pr	<ul> <li>explaining the reasons why the jobs are likely to e misleading and overstated because for all the easons I listed just a few moments ago in the estimony and described in the report. It's the hole purpose of the report.</li> <li>Q. Since you say likely to be, I'm trying to and out whether, in fact, you determined if they to overstated.</li> <li>A. There have been no jobs created, so this all prospective, and I'm certain that the jobs at are stated as gross jobs are going to overstate e number of actual jobs created. That I'm certain bout and that's what I've tried to describe.</li> <li>Q. I see. But that, again, wouldn't be based an any experience in the wind industry since you on't have any, right?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. Just based on experience since 1970, the rm doing economic impact analyses of a wide ariety of land uses including other types of energy rojects, so</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>have no reason to think you're not telling the truth.</li> <li>Q. Livingston County, for example, isn't as big as the state of Nevada for example, right?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you agree that in those cases where a proposed new economic activity or construction project is located near other activity centers, input/output models such as JEDI can be reasonably depended on even when they deal with areas as small as a single county?</li> <li>A. I think that's fundamentally the problem. The smaller, the more rural, the less urban an area, the more prone to exaggerated effects the JEDI model and, for that matter, any impact model is going to be, and this is well-established in the academic literature. The multiplier effects leak out more in less urban areas. So any model is going to be less precise covering a smaller area or a rural area than, say, an urban area with more built-in linkages forward and back in the local economy.</li> <li>Q. So you disagree with the statement I just</li> </ul>
	2       bd         3       re         4       te         5       w         6       7         7       fin         8       ar         9       is         10       is         11       th         12       th         13       al         14       01         15       01         16       do         17       18         19       20         20       fill         21       va         22       p1         23       23	<ul> <li>explaining the reasons why the jobs are likely to e misleading and overstated because for all the easons I listed just a few moments ago in the estimony and described in the report. It's the hole purpose of the report.</li> <li>Q. Since you say likely to be, I'm trying to and out whether, in fact, you determined if they re overstated.</li> <li>A. There have been no jobs created, so this all prospective, and I'm certain that the jobs are stated as gross jobs are going to overstate e number of actual jobs created. That I'm certain bout and that's what I've tried to describe.</li> <li>Q. I see. But that, again, wouldn't be based any experience in the wind industry since you on't have any, right?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. Just based on experience since 1970, the rm doing economic impact analyses of a wide ariety of land uses including other types of energy rojects, so</li> <li>Q. And in that in that 44 year period</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>have no reason to think you're not telling the truth.</li> <li>Q. Livingston County, for example, isn't as big as the state of Nevada for example, right?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you agree that in those cases where a proposed new economic activity or construction project is located near other activity centers, input/output models such as JEDI can be reasonably depended on even when they deal with areas as small as a single county?</li> <li>A. I think that's fundamentally the problem. The smaller, the more rural, the less urban an area, the more prone to exaggerated effects the JEDI model and, for that matter, any impact model is going to be, and this is well-established in the academic literature. The multiplier effects leak out more in less urban areas. So any model is going to be less precise covering a smaller area or a rural area than, say, an urban area with more built-in linkages forward and back in the local economy.</li> <li>Q. So you disagree with the statement I just made?</li> </ul>
	2       bd         3       re         4       te         5       w         6       7         7       fin         8       ar         9       is         10       is         11       th         12       th         13       al         14       01         15       01         16       do         17       18         19       20         20       fill         21       va         22       p1         23       23	<ul> <li>explaining the reasons why the jobs are likely to e misleading and overstated because for all the easons I listed just a few moments ago in the estimony and described in the report. It's the hole purpose of the report.</li> <li>Q. Since you say likely to be, I'm trying to and out whether, in fact, you determined if they to overstated.</li> <li>A. There have been no jobs created, so this all prospective, and I'm certain that the jobs at are stated as gross jobs are going to overstate e number of actual jobs created. That I'm certain bout and that's what I've tried to describe.</li> <li>Q. I see. But that, again, wouldn't be based an any experience in the wind industry since you on't have any, right?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. Just based on experience since 1970, the rm doing economic impact analyses of a wide ariety of land uses including other types of energy rojects, so</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>have no reason to think you're not telling the truth.</li> <li>Q. Livingston County, for example, isn't as big as the state of Nevada for example, right?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you agree that in those cases where a proposed new economic activity or construction project is located near other activity centers, input/output models such as JEDI can be reasonably depended on even when they deal with areas as small as a single county?</li> <li>A. I think that's fundamentally the problem. The smaller, the more rural, the less urban an area, the more prone to exaggerated effects the JEDI model and, for that matter, any impact model is going to be, and this is well-established in the academic literature. The multiplier effects leak out more in less urban areas. So any model is going to be less precise covering a smaller area or a rural area than, say, an urban area with more built-in linkages forward and back in the local economy.</li> <li>Q. So you disagree with the statement I just</li> </ul>

			January 26, 2015
	Page 1616		Page 1618
1	Q. You said Gruen, $G G + A$ , has two offices?	1	these areas would be considered an activity center
2	A. Yes, sir.	2	the way an urban area would be.
3	Q. Does your California office know that you	3	Q. So you don't consider the city of Pontiac
4	disagree with that statement?	4	an activity center?
5	A. I wouldn't know.	5	A. It's very small. It has lots of missing
6	Q. You're aware that your company performed	6	linkages in its economy. It has to have lots of
7	an economic impact analysis for the Hidden Hills	7	inputs brought from outside the economy. It's not a
8	solar project?	8	fully self-contained system the way larger areas,
9	A. I'm aware that we reviewed an economic	9	more urbanized larger areas would be, with all due
10	impact analysis for this project.	10	respect to this community. It's just not an
11	Q. Well, you didn't just review one; you	11	activity center or a major agglomeration.
12	actually did your own or your company did. Are you	12	Q. On this Hidden Hills project, your company
13	aware of that?	13	worked with county departments likely to be
14	A. It was a critical review in which we, as	14	responsible for providing services to the proposed
15	in this case, did an analysis that was used in the	15	project and your company forecast the likely costs
16	original review and	16	to the county of that project; is that right?
17	Q. Well, here, we'll cut to the chase, Mr.	17	A. I'd have to read this again, but actually
18	Gruen. There's no need to struggle. It's page 8,	18	the county staff did work with us. We were
19	second paragraph toward the bottom, where your	19	primarily the source of actually estimating the cost
20	company said, "Simply put, in those cases where a	20	of municipal services.
21	proposed new economic activity or construction	21	Q. Actually, I'll make it easier for you, Mr.
22	project is located near other activity centers,	22	Gruen, rather than having to dig through that
23	input/output models such as JEDI can be reasonably	23	report. This is a page from your website. Do you
24	depended upon even when they deal with areas as	24	recognize that?
	Page 1617		Dave 4040
	Tage 1017		Page 1619
1	-	1	
1	small as a single county."	1	A. I didn't put it on our website, but I
2	small as a single county." Now, that's a statement you disagree with	1 2 3	A. I didn't put it on our website, but I certainly recognize it.
2 3	small as a single county." Now, that's a statement you disagree with now; is that correct?	2	<ul><li>A. I didn't put it on our website, but I certainly recognize it.</li><li>Q. So you'll see that your description of the</li></ul>
2	<ul> <li>small as a single county." Now, that's a statement you disagree with now; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Because you put it out of context.</li> </ul>	2 3	<ul> <li>A. I didn't put it on our website, but I certainly recognize it.</li> <li>Q. So you'll see that your description of the Hidden Hills project from your website says that</li> </ul>
2 3 4	small as a single county." Now, that's a statement you disagree with now; is that correct?	2 3 4	<ul><li>A. I didn't put it on our website, but I certainly recognize it.</li><li>Q. So you'll see that your description of the</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>small as a single county." Now, that's a statement you disagree with now; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Because you put it out of context.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>A. I didn't put it on our website, but I certainly recognize it.</li><li>Q. So you'll see that your description of the Hidden Hills project from your website says that your company worked with the county departments</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>small as a single county." Now, that's a statement you disagree with</li> <li>now; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Because you put it out of context.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. MR. LUETKEHANS: I would ask that the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. I didn't put it on our website, but I certainly recognize it.</li> <li>Q. So you'll see that your description of the Hidden Hills project from your website says that your company worked with the county departments likely to be responsible for</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>small as a single county." Now, that's a statement you disagree with</li> <li>now; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Because you put it out of context.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. MR. LUETKEHANS: I would ask that the</li> <li>expert be allowed to review to read the next</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. I didn't put it on our website, but I certainly recognize it.</li> <li>Q. So you'll see that your description of the Hidden Hills project from your website says that your company worked with the county departments likely to be responsible for</li> <li>A. Right.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>small as a single county." Now, that's a statement you disagree with now; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Because you put it out of context.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. MR. LUETKEHANS: I would ask that the expert be allowed to review to read the next sentence into the record which actually explains that statement.</li> <li>A. Right, you've completely missed taken</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. I didn't put it on our website, but I certainly recognize it.</li> <li>Q. So you'll see that your description of the Hidden Hills project from your website says that your company worked with the county departments likely to be responsible for</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q providing services to the proposed project</li> <li>A. Right.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>small as a single county." Now, that's a statement you disagree with now; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Because you put it out of context.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. MR. LUETKEHANS: I would ask that the expert be allowed to review to read the next sentence into the record which actually explains that statement.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. I didn't put it on our website, but I certainly recognize it.</li> <li>Q. So you'll see that your description of the Hidden Hills project from your website says that your company worked with the county departments likely to be responsible for</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q providing services to the proposed project</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>small as a single county." Now, that's a statement you disagree with now; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Because you put it out of context.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. MR. LUETKEHANS: I would ask that the expert be allowed to review to read the next sentence into the record which actually explains that statement.</li> <li>A. Right, you've completely missed taken this out of context.</li> <li>Q. Well, actually that's my next question.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. I didn't put it on our website, but I certainly recognize it.</li> <li>Q. So you'll see that your description of the Hidden Hills project from your website says that your company worked with the county departments likely to be responsible for</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q providing services to the proposed project</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q and forecast the likely cost to the county of the project, right?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>small as a single county." Now, that's a statement you disagree with now; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Because you put it out of context.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. MR. LUETKEHANS: I would ask that the expert be allowed to review to read the next sentence into the record which actually explains that statement.</li> <li>A. Right, you've completely missed taken this out of context.</li> <li>Q. Well, actually that's my next question. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, Mr. Blazer.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. I didn't put it on our website, but I certainly recognize it.</li> <li>Q. So you'll see that your description of the Hidden Hills project from your website says that your company worked with the county departments likely to be responsible for</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q providing services to the proposed project</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q and forecast the likely cost to the county of the project, right?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>small as a single county." Now, that's a statement you disagree with now; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Because you put it out of context.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. MR. LUETKEHANS: I would ask that the expert be allowed to review to read the next sentence into the record which actually explains that statement.</li> <li>A. Right, you've completely missed taken this out of context.</li> <li>Q. Well, actually that's my next question. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, Mr. Blazer.</li> <li>A. Small area analyses</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. I didn't put it on our website, but I certainly recognize it.</li> <li>Q. So you'll see that your description of the Hidden Hills project from your website says that your company worked with the county departments likely to be responsible for</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q providing services to the proposed project</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q and forecast the likely cost to the county of the project, right?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't do that here, correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>small as a single county." Now, that's a statement you disagree with now; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Because you put it out of context.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. MR. LUETKEHANS: I would ask that the expert be allowed to review to read the next sentence into the record which actually explains that statement.</li> <li>A. Right, you've completely missed taken this out of context.</li> <li>Q. Well, actually that's my next question. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, Mr. Blazer.</li> <li>A. Small area analyses CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Let him finish his</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. I didn't put it on our website, but I certainly recognize it.</li> <li>Q. So you'll see that your description of the Hidden Hills project from your website says that your company worked with the county departments likely to be responsible for</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q providing services to the proposed project</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q and forecast the likely cost to the county of the project, right?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't do that here, correct?</li> <li>A. Right, we did not do that.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>small as a single county." Now, that's a statement you disagree with now; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Because you put it out of context.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. MR. LUETKEHANS: I would ask that the expert be allowed to review to read the next sentence into the record which actually explains that statement.</li> <li>A. Right, you've completely missed taken this out of context.</li> <li>Q. Well, actually that's my next question. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, Mr. Blazer.</li> <li>A. Small area analyses CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Let him finish his A are notorious for overestimating local</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. I didn't put it on our website, but I certainly recognize it.</li> <li>Q. So you'll see that your description of the Hidden Hills project from your website says that your company worked with the county departments likely to be responsible for</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q providing services to the proposed project</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q and forecast the likely cost to the county of the project, right?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't do that here, correct?</li> <li>A. Right, we did not do that.</li> <li>Q. Your company also combined those estimates</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>small as a single county." Now, that's a statement you disagree with</li> <li>now; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Because you put it out of context.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. MR. LUETKEHANS: I would ask that the</li> <li>expert be allowed to review to read the next</li> <li>sentence into the record which actually explains</li> <li>that statement.</li> <li>A. Right, you've completely missed taken</li> <li>this out of context.</li> <li>Q. Well, actually that's my next question. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, Mr. Blazer.</li> <li>A. Small area analyses CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Let him finish his</li> <li>A are notorious for overestimating local</li> <li>impacts. This comment was made by Professor</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. I didn't put it on our website, but I certainly recognize it.</li> <li>Q. So you'll see that your description of the Hidden Hills project from your website says that your company worked with the county departments likely to be responsible for</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q providing services to the proposed project</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q and forecast the likely cost to the county of the project, right?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't do that here, correct?</li> <li>A. Right, we did not do that.</li> <li>Q. Your company also combined those estimates with your prepared estimates of likely revenue to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>small as a single county." Now, that's a statement you disagree with now; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Because you put it out of context.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. MR. LUETKEHANS: I would ask that the expert be allowed to review to read the next sentence into the record which actually explains that statement.</li> <li>A. Right, you've completely missed taken this out of context.</li> <li>Q. Well, actually that's my next question. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, Mr. Blazer.</li> <li>A. Small area analyses CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Let him finish his</li> <li>A are notorious for overestimating local impacts. This comment was made by Professor Hewings, the director of the Regional Economic</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. I didn't put it on our website, but I certainly recognize it.</li> <li>Q. So you'll see that your description of the Hidden Hills project from your website says that your company worked with the county departments likely to be responsible for</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q providing services to the proposed project</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q and forecast the likely cost to the county of the project, right?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't do that here, correct?</li> <li>A. Right, we did not do that.</li> <li>Q. Your company also combined those estimates with your prepared estimates of likely revenue to the county from the project to estimate the net</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>small as a single county." Now, that's a statement you disagree with now; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Because you put it out of context.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. MR. LUETKEHANS: I would ask that the expert be allowed to review to read the next sentence into the record which actually explains that statement.</li> <li>A. Right, you've completely missed taken this out of context.</li> <li>Q. Well, actually that's my next question. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, Mr. Blazer.</li> <li>A. Small area analyses CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Let him finish his A are notorious for overestimating local impacts. This comment was made by Professor Hewings, the director of the Regional Economic Applications Laboratory at the University of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. I didn't put it on our website, but I certainly recognize it.</li> <li>Q. So you'll see that your description of the Hidden Hills project from your website says that your company worked with the county departments likely to be responsible for</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q providing services to the proposed project</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q and forecast the likely cost to the county of the project, right?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't do that here, correct?</li> <li>A. Right, we did not do that.</li> <li>Q. Your company also combined those estimates with your prepared estimates of likely revenue to the county from the project to estimate the net fiscal impact of the project on the county, right?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>small as a single county." Now, that's a statement you disagree with now; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Because you put it out of context.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. MR. LUETKEHANS: I would ask that the expert be allowed to review to read the next sentence into the record which actually explains that statement.</li> <li>A. Right, you've completely missed taken this out of context.</li> <li>Q. Well, actually that's my next question. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, Mr. Blazer.</li> <li>A. Small area analyses CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Let him finish his</li> <li>A are notorious for overestimating local impacts. This comment was made by Professor Hewings, the director of the Regional Economic Applications Laboratory at the University of Illinois.'' That was his, in a nutshell, was much</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. I didn't put it on our website, but I certainly recognize it.</li> <li>Q. So you'll see that your description of the Hidden Hills project from your website says that your company worked with the county departments likely to be responsible for</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q providing services to the proposed project</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q and forecast the likely cost to the county of the project, right?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't do that here, correct?</li> <li>A. Right, we did not do that.</li> <li>Q. Your company also combined those estimates with your prepared estimates of likely revenue to the county from the project to estimate the net fiscal impact of the project on the county, right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>small as a single county." Now, that's a statement you disagree with</li> <li>now; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Because you put it out of context.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. MR. LUETKEHANS: I would ask that the</li> <li>expert be allowed to review to read the next</li> <li>sentence into the record which actually explains</li> <li>that statement.</li> <li>A. Right, you've completely missed taken</li> <li>this out of context.</li> <li>Q. Well, actually that's my next question. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, Mr. Blazer.</li> <li>A. Small area analyses CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Let him finish his</li> <li>A are notorious for overestimating local</li> <li>impacts. This comment was made by Professor</li> <li>Hewings, the director of the Regional Economic</li> <li>Applications Laboratory at the University of</li> <li>Illinois.'' That was his, in a nutshell, was much</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. I didn't put it on our website, but I certainly recognize it.</li> <li>Q. So you'll see that your description of the Hidden Hills project from your website says that your company worked with the county departments likely to be responsible for</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q providing services to the proposed project</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q and forecast the likely cost to the county of the project, right?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't do that here, correct?</li> <li>A. Right, we did not do that.</li> <li>Q. Your company also combined those estimates with your prepared estimates of likely revenue to the county from the project to estimate the net fiscal impact of the project on the county, right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't do that here, correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>small as a single county." Now, that's a statement you disagree with now; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Because you put it out of context.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. MR. LUETKEHANS: I would ask that the expert be allowed to review to read the next sentence into the record which actually explains that statement.</li> <li>A. Right, you've completely missed taken this out of context.</li> <li>Q. Well, actually that's my next question. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, Mr. Blazer.</li> <li>A. Small area analyses CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Let him finish his A are notorious for overestimating local impacts. This comment was made by Professor Hewings, the director of the Regional Economic Applications Laboratory at the University of Illinois.'' That was his, in a nutshell, was much more succinct than what I've been trying to explain. And in the case of the, quote, activity centers you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. I didn't put it on our website, but I certainly recognize it.</li> <li>Q. So you'll see that your description of the Hidden Hills project from your website says that your company worked with the county departments likely to be responsible for</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q providing services to the proposed project</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q and forecast the likely cost to the county of the project, right?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't do that here, correct?</li> <li>A. Right, we did not do that.</li> <li>Q. Your company also combined those estimates with your prepared estimates of likely revenue to the county from the project to estimate the net fiscal impact of the project on the county, right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't do that here, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't do that here, correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>small as a single county." Now, that's a statement you disagree with now; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Because you put it out of context.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. MR. LUETKEHANS: I would ask that the expert be allowed to review to read the next sentence into the record which actually explains that statement.</li> <li>A. Right, you've completely missed taken this out of context.</li> <li>Q. Well, actually that's my next question. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, Mr. Blazer.</li> <li>A. Small area analyses CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Let him finish his A are notorious for overestimating local impacts. This comment was made by Professor Hewings, the director of the Regional Economic Applications Laboratory at the University of Illinois.'' That was his, in a nutshell, was much more succinct than what I've been trying to explain. And in the case of the, quote, activity centers you were suggesting this county has, that's not what is</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. I didn't put it on our website, but I certainly recognize it.</li> <li>Q. So you'll see that your description of the Hidden Hills project from your website says that your company worked with the county departments likely to be responsible for</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q providing services to the proposed project</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q and forecast the likely cost to the county of the project, right?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't do that here, correct?</li> <li>A. Right, we did not do that.</li> <li>Q. Your company also combined those estimates with your prepared estimates of likely revenue to the county from the project to estimate the net fiscal impact of the project on the county, right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't do that here, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't do that here, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't do that here, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't do that here, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't do that here, correct?</li> <li>A. I've already said that, yes.</li> <li>Q. And in that case, your company also</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>small as a single county." Now, that's a statement you disagree with now; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Because you put it out of context.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. MR. LUETKEHANS: I would ask that the expert be allowed to review to read the next sentence into the record which actually explains that statement.</li> <li>A. Right, you've completely missed taken this out of context.</li> <li>Q. Well, actually that's my next question. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, Mr. Blazer.</li> <li>A. Small area analyses CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Let him finish his A are notorious for overestimating local impacts. This comment was made by Professor Hewings, the director of the Regional Economic Applications Laboratory at the University of Illinois.'' That was his, in a nutshell, was much more succinct than what I've been trying to explain. And in the case of the, quote, activity centers you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. I didn't put it on our website, but I certainly recognize it.</li> <li>Q. So you'll see that your description of the Hidden Hills project from your website says that your company worked with the county departments likely to be responsible for</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q providing services to the proposed project</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q and forecast the likely cost to the county of the project, right?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't do that here, correct?</li> <li>A. Right, we did not do that.</li> <li>Q. Your company also combined those estimates with your prepared estimates of likely revenue to the county from the project to estimate the net fiscal impact of the project on the county, right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't do that here, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't do that here, correct?</li> </ul>

	INGSTON COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF ATTEALS		January 26, 2015
	Page 1620		Page 1622
1	the project would generate, right?	1	A. I'm sure he's an honorable man and he said
2	A. Yes.	2	he used IMPLAN. I would have no reason to doubt he
3	Q. Okay. And actually if you go back to 306,	3	didn't use IMPLAN. That's not the issue.
4	the actual report, the assessment of property tax	4	Q. Could you go to his report, page 11,
5	revenue was on pages 6 to 7, correct?	5	second paragraph? He says that here, doesn't he?
6	A. Well, page 6 is referring to the study by	6	"Two separate JEDI models were run to show the
7	the other group that was found to be overstated in	7	economic impact of the Pleasant Ridge wind energy
8	terms of the property tax. And then on page 7 is	8	project. The first JEDI model used the 2012
9	I believe this is the page that shows that the	9	Livingston County multipliers from IMPLAN." Do you
10	property taxes were likely to be much lower than	10	see that?
11	what is represented by the project's proponent.	11	A. I do.
12	Q. And you didn't do anything like that here,	12	Q. Okay. Did you read the portion of and
13	right?	13	you do know that that's data specific to Livingston
14	A. No.	14	County, right?
15	Q. Let's go back to your report. This is the	15	A. The data's specific to Livingston County,
16	bottom of page 3 going to page 4. "Because	16	but the inputs that drive the linkages for the
17	Livingston County represents a relatively small area	17	multiplier effects are the role of the analyst and
18	in terms of building space and nonagricultural	18	that's what's not described in the report and that's
19	activities, the area is missing some economic or	19	what drives the results. If you don't put the
20	industrial sectors present in larger economic	20	inputs in the right categories in the appropriate
21	regions, and therefore we would expect the	21	amounts, you will get different results than if you
22	multipliers to be comparatively low."	22	put them in different locations in the model or
23	Do you see where I was reading from?	23	different amounts.
24	A. I remember saying that. I'm sure I'll	24	Q. And do you have any reason to believe that
	Page 1621		Page 1623
1	find it.	1	he didn't put the inputs in the right places?
2	Q. Okay.	2	A. We don't know what he did. We don't know
3	A. That's what I was just trying to describe	3	what we don't know what percentage of materials
4	to you.	4	and labor were assumed essentially to leak out of
5	Q. All right. Well, but you do know that Dr.	5	the economy versus to stay in. What we do know is
6	Loomis used the Livingston County IMPLAN multipliers	6	compared to the JEDI model defaults, that the
7	in his analysis, correct?	7	expenditures on payroll were adjusted upward to be
8	A. He refers to them. The actual inputs and	8	higher than the default that the JEDI model would
9	what numbers he used and where he used them in the	9	provide, and that the construction dollars were five
10	model wasn't described in the report. It wasn't	10	times higher than the JEDI model default inputs
11	revealed.	11	would produce. And again, that's a question of what
12	Q. Well, do you have any reason to believe	12	the analyst does, and as I understand it, he was
13	that he didn't use the Livingston County IMPLAN	13	relying on information from the developer, none of
14	multipliers?	14	which was described in the report.
15	A. It's a question of where he used them, how	15	Q. But, again, you have no reason to believe
16	he used them, and what adjustments he made or didn't	16	that he didn't accurately input the information.
17	make I wouldn't know. But, you know, I can tell you	17	All you're saying is you don't know.
18	having done these that small changes in assumption	18	A. I don't know whether the information that
19	or local share estimates can have very can	19	he put into the model was right and
20	produce large changes in outputs of the results.	20	Q. And you also don't know that it's wrong.
21	Q. Okay, but that's not my question, sir. My	21	A. I know that the results are higher than
22	question is do you have any reason to believe that	22	you would anticipate given the size and composition
23	Dr. Loomis did not use Livingston County specific	23	of the economy and, given the JEDI default, would
24	IMPLAN multipliers in his study?	24	suggest it should have been lower. So the inference
	· ·	1	

			January 20, 2015
	Page 1624		Page 1626
1	is I'm not suggesting he did anything untoward. I'm	1	analysis, you have to we had to I purchased
2	suggesting that the data from the developer may have	2	the IMPLAN data for specifically Livingston County,
3	provided a higher local share estimate or otherwise	3	and then I took and aggregated all of those
4	skewed the results, not because he didn't put it in	4	different sectors down to how the JEDI model
5	but where he was where it was supposed to be put	5	aggregates different sectors and input that into the
6	into, but that it may have not been the right inputs	6	JEDI model so that we could get a Livingston County
7	to begin with.	7	specific number. So it's using those multipliers
8	Q. There were a lot of may haves in that	8	for this specific county.
9	answer. Just to be clear	9	Did you review that testimony in preparing
10	MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, argumentative.	10	your report?
11	Q you've never worked with a wind farm	11	A. Yes.
12	developer, so you have no idea what information	12	Q. All right. What are the components of the
13	might be generated from an experienced wind farm	13	wind project?
14	developer, correct?	14	A. I mentioned some of them, turbines,
15	A. I've worked with enough developers of	15	blades, cabling, gravel for the roads, concrete and
16	every land use to know that proponents of projects	16	the like.
17	can be tempted to put the most optimistic scenario	17	Q. Is there a local supplier of gravel or
18	as inputs to consultants. I've had plenty that	18	crushed stone in Livingston County?
19	tried to do that with me.	19	A. I testified that likely the concrete would
20	Q. That's not my question, sir. So I would	20	be an example of something supplied locally, so I
21	ask the court reporter to reread my question.	21	will stick with that.
22	(Requested portion of the deposition was	22	Q. How about fuel?
23	read by the court reporter.)	23	A. I know that fuel would be another example
24	A. The first it's two questions in one.		
24	A. The first it's two questions in one.	24	of something that would be local, and in the case of
24	-	24	
24	Page 1625	24	of something that would be local, and in the case of Page 1627
1	-	24	
	- Page 1625		Page 1627
1	Page 1625 The first question, I'll again stipulate I've never	1	Page 1627 the other project, the report said \$35,000 was spent
1 2	Page 1625 The first question, I'll again stipulate I've never worked with a wind farm developer. The second	1 2	Page 1627 the other project, the report said \$35,000 was spent on servicing, fuel and
1 2 3	Page 1625 The first question, I'll again stipulate I've never worked with a wind farm developer. The second question is that therefore I wouldn't know what	1 2 3	Page 1627 the other project, the report said \$35,000 was spent on servicing, fuel and Q. Rebar?
1 2 3 4	Page 1625 The first question, I'll again stipulate I've never worked with a wind farm developer. The second question is that therefore I wouldn't know what information a wind farm developer would provide, and	1 2 3 4	Page 1627 the other project, the report said \$35,000 was spent on servicing, fuel and Q. Rebar? A. Could be.
1 2 3 4 5	Page 1625 The first question, I'll again stipulate I've never worked with a wind farm developer. The second question is that therefore I wouldn't know what information a wind farm developer would provide, and that I do know from having looked at what other studies have provided and as well as Dr. Loomis's report and how he described what he was given	1 2 3 4 5	Page 1627 the other project, the report said \$35,000 was spent on servicing, fuel and Q. Rebar? A. Could be. Q. Steel and aluminum? A. Whether they're in Livingston County? Q. Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 1625 The first question, I'll again stipulate I've never worked with a wind farm developer. The second question is that therefore I wouldn't know what information a wind farm developer would provide, and that I do know from having looked at what other studies have provided and as well as Dr. Loomis's report and how he described what he was given without actually specifying the details.	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 1627 the other project, the report said \$35,000 was spent on servicing, fuel and Q. Rebar? A. Could be. Q. Steel and aluminum? A. Whether they're in Livingston County? Q. Yes. A. And can be provided by the contractor? I
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 1625 The first question, I'll again stipulate I've never worked with a wind farm developer. The second question is that therefore I wouldn't know what information a wind farm developer would provide, and that I do know from having looked at what other studies have provided and as well as Dr. Loomis's report and how he described what he was given without actually specifying the details. Q. We'll look at the other studies in a few	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 1627 the other project, the report said \$35,000 was spent on servicing, fuel and Q. Rebar? A. Could be. Q. Steel and aluminum? A. Whether they're in Livingston County? Q. Yes. A. And can be provided by the contractor? I don't know.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 1625 The first question, I'll again stipulate I've never worked with a wind farm developer. The second question is that therefore I wouldn't know what information a wind farm developer would provide, and that I do know from having looked at what other studies have provided and as well as Dr. Loomis's report and how he described what he was given without actually specifying the details. Q. We'll look at the other studies in a few minutes. You did say you reviewed Dr. Loomis's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 1627 the other project, the report said \$35,000 was spent on servicing, fuel and Q. Rebar? A. Could be. Q. Steel and aluminum? A. Whether they're in Livingston County? Q. Yes. A. And can be provided by the contractor? I don't know. Q. Are there general construction companies
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 1625 The first question, I'll again stipulate I've never worked with a wind farm developer. The second question is that therefore I wouldn't know what information a wind farm developer would provide, and that I do know from having looked at what other studies have provided and as well as Dr. Loomis's report and how he described what he was given without actually specifying the details. Q. We'll look at the other studies in a few minutes. You did say you reviewed Dr. Loomis's testimony in this matter, correct?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 1627 the other project, the report said \$35,000 was spent on servicing, fuel and Q. Rebar? A. Could be. Q. Steel and aluminum? A. Whether they're in Livingston County? Q. Yes. A. And can be provided by the contractor? I don't know. Q. Are there general construction companies in the county?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Page 1625 The first question, I'll again stipulate I've never worked with a wind farm developer. The second question is that therefore I wouldn't know what information a wind farm developer would provide, and that I do know from having looked at what other studies have provided and as well as Dr. Loomis's report and how he described what he was given without actually specifying the details. Q. We'll look at the other studies in a few minutes. You did say you reviewed Dr. Loomis's testimony in this matter, correct? A. Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Page 1627 the other project, the report said \$35,000 was spent on servicing, fuel and Q. Rebar? A. Could be. Q. Steel and aluminum? A. Whether they're in Livingston County? Q. Yes. A. And can be provided by the contractor? I don't know. Q. Are there general construction companies in the county? A. I'm sure there are. They're not ones that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 1625 The first question, I'll again stipulate I've never worked with a wind farm developer. The second question is that therefore I wouldn't know what information a wind farm developer would provide, and that I do know from having looked at what other studies have provided and as well as Dr. Loomis's report and how he described what he was given without actually specifying the details. Q. We'll look at the other studies in a few minutes. You did say you reviewed Dr. Loomis's testimony in this matter, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 1627 the other project, the report said \$35,000 was spent on servicing, fuel and Q. Rebar? A. Could be. Q. Steel and aluminum? A. Whether they're in Livingston County? Q. Yes. A. And can be provided by the contractor? I don't know. Q. Are there general construction companies in the county? A. I'm sure there are. They're not ones that have done a hundred wind energy projects or done the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 1625 The first question, I'll again stipulate I've never worked with a wind farm developer. The second question is that therefore I wouldn't know what information a wind farm developer would provide, and that I do know from having looked at what other studies have provided and as well as Dr. Loomis's report and how he described what he was given without actually specifying the details. Q. We'll look at the other studies in a few minutes. You did say you reviewed Dr. Loomis's testimony in this matter, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. MR. BLAZER: Phil excuse me, I have to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 1627 the other project, the report said \$35,000 was spent on servicing, fuel and Q. Rebar? A. Could be. Q. Steel and aluminum? A. Whether they're in Livingston County? Q. Yes. A. And can be provided by the contractor? I don't know. Q. Are there general construction companies in the county? A. I'm sure there are. They're not ones that have done a hundred wind energy projects or done the kind of projects that typically are hired or
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 1625 The first question, I'll again stipulate I've never worked with a wind farm developer. The second question is that therefore I wouldn't know what information a wind farm developer would provide, and that I do know from having looked at what other studies have provided and as well as Dr. Loomis's report and how he described what he was given without actually specifying the details. Q. We'll look at the other studies in a few minutes. You did say you reviewed Dr. Loomis's testimony in this matter, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. MR. BLAZER: Phil excuse me, I have to use Phil, I can't use Mr. Luetkehans December 9,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 1627 the other project, the report said \$35,000 was spent on servicing, fuel and Q. Rebar? A. Could be. Q. Steel and aluminum? A. Whether they're in Livingston County? Q. Yes. A. And can be provided by the contractor? I don't know. Q. Are there general construction companies in the county? A. I'm sure there are. They're not ones that have done a hundred wind energy projects or done the kind of projects that typically are hired or contractors that are typically hired by major wind
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 1625 The first question, I'll again stipulate I've never worked with a wind farm developer. The second question is that therefore I wouldn't know what information a wind farm developer would provide, and that I do know from having looked at what other studies have provided and as well as Dr. Loomis's report and how he described what he was given without actually specifying the details. Q. We'll look at the other studies in a few minutes. You did say you reviewed Dr. Loomis's testimony in this matter, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. MR. BLAZER: Phil excuse me, I have to use Phil, I can't use Mr. Luetkehans December 9, 2014, starts at page 608, line 24.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 1627 the other project, the report said \$35,000 was spent on servicing, fuel and Q. Rebar? A. Could be. Q. Steel and aluminum? A. Whether they're in Livingston County? Q. Yes. A. And can be provided by the contractor? I don't know. Q. Are there general construction companies in the county? A. I'm sure there are. They're not ones that have done a hundred wind energy projects or done the kind of projects that typically are hired or contractors that are typically hired by major wind farm developers.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Page 1625</li> <li>The first question, I'll again stipulate I've never worked with a wind farm developer. The second question is that therefore I wouldn't know what information a wind farm developer would provide, and that I do know from having looked at what other studies have provided and as well as Dr. Loomis's report and how he described what he was given without actually specifying the details.</li> <li>Q. We'll look at the other studies in a few minutes. You did say you reviewed Dr. Loomis's testimony in this matter, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: Phil excuse me, I have to use Phil, I can't use Mr. Luetkehans December 9, 2014, starts at page 608, line 24.</li> <li>Q. This is Dr. Loomis testifying. Question:</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 1627 the other project, the report said \$35,000 was spent on servicing, fuel and Q. Rebar? A. Could be. Q. Steel and aluminum? A. Whether they're in Livingston County? Q. Yes. A. And can be provided by the contractor? I don't know. Q. Are there general construction companies in the county? A. I'm sure there are. They're not ones that have done a hundred wind energy projects or done the kind of projects that typically are hired or contractors that are typically hired by major wind farm developers. Q. Are you saying that the sole construction
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 1625 The first question, I'll again stipulate I've never worked with a wind farm developer. The second question is that therefore I wouldn't know what information a wind farm developer would provide, and that I do know from having looked at what other studies have provided and as well as Dr. Loomis's report and how he described what he was given without actually specifying the details. Q. We'll look at the other studies in a few minutes. You did say you reviewed Dr. Loomis's testimony in this matter, correct? A. Yes. Q. All right. MR. BLAZER: Phil excuse me, I have to use Phil, I can't use Mr. Luetkehans December 9, 2014, starts at page 608, line 24. Q. This is Dr. Loomis testifying. Question: Did you adjust the IMPLAN data to reflect the local	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Page 1627</li> <li>the other project, the report said \$35,000 was spent on servicing, fuel and <ul> <li>Q. Rebar?</li> <li>A. Could be.</li> <li>Q. Steel and aluminum?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Whether they're in Livingston County?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. And can be provided by the contractor? I don't know.</li> <li>Q. Are there general construction companies in the county?</li> <li>A. I'm sure there are. They're not ones that have done a hundred wind energy projects or done the kind of projects that typically are hired or contractors that are typically hired by major wind farm developers.</li> <li>Q. Are you saying that the sole construction activity in this project will be erection of wind</li> </ul>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Page 1625</li> <li>The first question, I'll again stipulate I've never worked with a wind farm developer. The second question is that therefore I wouldn't know what information a wind farm developer would provide, and that I do know from having looked at what other studies have provided and as well as Dr. Loomis's report and how he described what he was given without actually specifying the details.</li> <li>Q. We'll look at the other studies in a few minutes. You did say you reviewed Dr. Loomis's testimony in this matter, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: Phil excuse me, I have to use Phil, I can't use Mr. Luetkehans December 9, 2014, starts at page 608, line 24.</li> <li>Q. This is Dr. Loomis testifying. Question:</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 1627 the other project, the report said \$35,000 was spent on servicing, fuel and Q. Rebar? A. Could be. Q. Steel and aluminum? A. Whether they're in Livingston County? Q. Yes. A. And can be provided by the contractor? I don't know. Q. Are there general construction companies in the county? A. I'm sure there are. They're not ones that have done a hundred wind energy projects or done the kind of projects that typically are hired or contractors that are typically hired by major wind farm developers. Q. Are you saying that the sole construction

- 21 multipliers, so if you just download the software
- 22 that the National Renewable Energy Lab has, it
- **23** already has built in those IMPLAN multipliers for
- the state. So in order to do a county level

21

22

23

24

general contractors and the --

[Noise interruption.]

Q. I think we just went into outer space.

Are there excavating contractors in Livingston

January	26,	201	5
---------	-----	-----	---

			January 26, 2015
	Page 1628		Page 1630
1	County?	1	Q. Okay. So you're not aware of any
2	A. Again, I would assume so. I haven't I	2	peer-reviewed follow-up studies that were done after
3	would have to look at more data to tell you what	3	the fact to determine whether or not an analysis
4	each firm was, but the main point was that the	4	like the one Dr. Loomis did using the JEDI model is,
5	report did not disclose any of these kinds of	5	in fact, valid?
6	questions on whether local suppliers were going to	6	A. There have been studies, not for, as far
7	be used.	7	as I know, Livingston County and this time frame,
8	Q. You do know that the JEDI model is based	8	but there have been after-the-fact studies that were
9	on and updated using the IMPLAN model, right?	9	really econometric studies looking at county-wide
10	A. I'm not sure I understand your question.	10	impacts of wind energy projects in terms of what was
11	Q. Are you aware of the fact that the JEDI	11	predicted and what what the results were.
12	model is based on the IMPLAN model and when the JEDI	12	Q. Well, what would be relevant to you would
13	model is updated it's based on IMPLAN model updates?	13	be a study that tested Livingston County or similar
14	Are you aware of that?	14	counties to test the JEDI model's accuracy, right?
15	A. It's it does use IMPLAN, but it's its	15	A. It would be more relevant if the actual
16	own model and it's different than the IMPLAN model.	16	if actual projects that were reported in the same
17	Otherwise, the IMPLAN model would just be used.	17	way. So, for example, when the companies report
18	Q. Let's look at	18	jobs, if they were reporting in the same way that
19	MR. BLAZER: This is November 19th, Phil,	19	the jobs are tracked in the JEDI model, that's been
20	starting at page 283, line 23.	20	one of the problems, that would be relevant. Any
21	Q. "My methodology for the economic impact	21	after-the-fact, like the Shady Oaks report that
22	was to use the jobs and economic development impact	22	would provide context, would be helpful.
23	model referred to as the JEDI model. This model was	23	Q. All right. I'm looking at page 4 of your
24	developed by the National Renewable Energy	24	report, second paragraph. One of the questions you
	Page 1629		Page 1631
1	-	1	
1 2	Laboratory, and as you can see the plan number that	1 2	asked is: Has the JEDI model been recently tested
	-		asked is: Has the JEDI model been recently tested in Livingston County or similar counties to gauge
2	Laboratory, and as you can see the plan number that I use there, it is updated and it's based on the	2	asked is: Has the JEDI model been recently tested
2 3	Laboratory, and as you can see the plan number that I use there, it is updated and it's based on the IMPLAN model. IMPLAN is a standard economic impact	2 3	asked is: Has the JEDI model been recently tested in Livingston County or similar counties to gauge its accuracy? Do you see that? A. Yes.
2 3 4	Laboratory, and as you can see the plan number that I use there, it is updated and it's based on the IMPLAN model. IMPLAN is a standard economic impact analysis software. There's two leading brands of	2 3 4	asked is: Has the JEDI model been recently tested in Livingston County or similar counties to gauge its accuracy? Do you see that?
2 3 4 5	Laboratory, and as you can see the plan number that I use there, it is updated and it's based on the IMPLAN model. IMPLAN is a standard economic impact analysis software. There's two leading brands of software, IMPLAN and REMI. IMPLAN happens to be the	2 3 4	<ul> <li>asked is: Has the JEDI model been recently tested in Livingston County or similar counties to gauge its accuracy? Do you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. Again, referring to Dr.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	Laboratory, and as you can see the plan number that I use there, it is updated and it's based on the IMPLAN model. IMPLAN is a standard economic impact analysis software. There's two leading brands of software, IMPLAN and REMI. IMPLAN happens to be the one that is used as the basis or platform for the	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>asked is: Has the JEDI model been recently tested in Livingston County or similar counties to gauge its accuracy? Do you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. Again, referring to Dr.</li> <li>Loomis's testimony. This is December 9, Phil, page</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	Laboratory, and as you can see the plan number that I use there, it is updated and it's based on the IMPLAN model. IMPLAN is a standard economic impact analysis software. There's two leading brands of software, IMPLAN and REMI. IMPLAN happens to be the one that is used as the basis or platform for the JEDI model."	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>asked is: Has the JEDI model been recently tested in Livingston County or similar counties to gauge its accuracy? Do you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. Again, referring to Dr.</li> <li>Loomis's testimony. This is December 9, Phil, page 608, starting at line 6. Question: Have you tested</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Laboratory, and as you can see the plan number that I use there, it is updated and it's based on the IMPLAN model. IMPLAN is a standard economic impact analysis software. There's two leading brands of software, IMPLAN and REMI. IMPLAN happens to be the one that is used as the basis or platform for the JEDI model." And did you read that testimony in preparation for what you did here? Yes? A. I'm sorry, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>asked is: Has the JEDI model been recently tested in Livingston County or similar counties to gauge its accuracy? Do you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. Again, referring to Dr.</li> <li>Loomis's testimony. This is December 9, Phil, page 608, starting at line 6. Question: Have you tested the JEDI model in agricultural-based homes to gauge its accuracy? Answer: The JEDI model has been calibrated or tested. It was it was in,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Laboratory, and as you can see the plan number that I use there, it is updated and it's based on the IMPLAN model. IMPLAN is a standard economic impact analysis software. There's two leading brands of software, IMPLAN and REMI. IMPLAN happens to be the one that is used as the basis or platform for the JEDI model." And did you read that testimony in preparation for what you did here? Yes?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>asked is: Has the JEDI model been recently tested in Livingston County or similar counties to gauge its accuracy? Do you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. Again, referring to Dr.</li> <li>Loomis's testimony. This is December 9, Phil, page 608, starting at line 6. Question: Have you tested the JEDI model in agricultural-based homes to gauge its accuracy? Answer: The JEDI model has been calibrated or tested. It was it was in, actually, a peer-reviewed publication recently where</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Laboratory, and as you can see the plan number that I use there, it is updated and it's based on the IMPLAN model. IMPLAN is a standard economic impact analysis software. There's two leading brands of software, IMPLAN and REMI. IMPLAN happens to be the one that is used as the basis or platform for the JEDI model." And did you read that testimony in preparation for what you did here? Yes? A. I'm sorry, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>asked is: Has the JEDI model been recently tested in Livingston County or similar counties to gauge its accuracy? Do you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. Again, referring to Dr.</li> <li>Loomis's testimony. This is December 9, Phil, page 608, starting at line 6. Question: Have you tested the JEDI model in agricultural-based homes to gauge its accuracy? Answer: The JEDI model has been calibrated or tested. It was it was in, actually, a peer-reviewed publication recently where they did take the JEDI model, looking at those</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Laboratory, and as you can see the plan number that I use there, it is updated and it's based on the IMPLAN model. IMPLAN is a standard economic impact analysis software. There's two leading brands of software, IMPLAN and REMI. IMPLAN happens to be the one that is used as the basis or platform for the JEDI model." And did you read that testimony in preparation for what you did here? Yes? A. I'm sorry, yes. Q. Okay. And you do agree there are two leading brands of impact analysis software, IMPLAN and REMI?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>asked is: Has the JEDI model been recently tested in Livingston County or similar counties to gauge its accuracy? Do you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. Again, referring to Dr.</li> <li>Loomis's testimony. This is December 9, Phil, page 608, starting at line 6. Question: Have you tested the JEDI model in agricultural-based homes to gauge its accuracy? Answer: The JEDI model has been calibrated or tested. It was it was in, actually, a peer-reviewed publication recently where they did take the JEDI model, looking at those input/output sectors, and then, looking at actual</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Laboratory, and as you can see the plan number that I use there, it is updated and it's based on the IMPLAN model. IMPLAN is a standard economic impact analysis software. There's two leading brands of software, IMPLAN and REMI. IMPLAN happens to be the one that is used as the basis or platform for the JEDI model." And did you read that testimony in preparation for what you did here? Yes? <b>A. I'm sorry, yes.</b> Q. Okay. And you do agree there are two leading brands of impact analysis software, IMPLAN and REMI? <b>A. They're two of the leading ones, yes.</b>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>asked is: Has the JEDI model been recently tested in Livingston County or similar counties to gauge its accuracy? Do you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. Again, referring to Dr.</li> <li>Loomis's testimony. This is December 9, Phil, page 608, starting at line 6. Question: Have you tested the JEDI model in agricultural-based homes to gauge its accuracy? Answer: The JEDI model has been calibrated or tested. It was it was in, actually, a peer-reviewed publication recently where they did take the JEDI model, looking at those input/output sectors, and then, looking at actual employment numbers, I believe, from the Bureau of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Laboratory, and as you can see the plan number that I use there, it is updated and it's based on the IMPLAN model. IMPLAN is a standard economic impact analysis software. There's two leading brands of software, IMPLAN and REMI. IMPLAN happens to be the one that is used as the basis or platform for the JEDI model." And did you read that testimony in preparation for what you did here? Yes? A. I'm sorry, yes. Q. Okay. And you do agree there are two leading brands of impact analysis software, IMPLAN and REMI? A. They're two of the leading ones, yes. Q. Okay. Now, you've referred a couple of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>asked is: Has the JEDI model been recently tested in Livingston County or similar counties to gauge its accuracy? Do you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. Again, referring to Dr.</li> <li>Loomis's testimony. This is December 9, Phil, page 608, starting at line 6. Question: Have you tested the JEDI model in agricultural-based homes to gauge its accuracy? Answer: The JEDI model has been calibrated or tested. It was it was in, actually, a peer-reviewed publication recently where they did take the JEDI model, looking at those input/output sectors, and then, looking at actual employment numbers, I believe, from the Bureau of Labor Statistics or state numbers. That was not</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Laboratory, and as you can see the plan number that I use there, it is updated and it's based on the IMPLAN model. IMPLAN is a standard economic impact analysis software. There's two leading brands of software, IMPLAN and REMI. IMPLAN happens to be the one that is used as the basis or platform for the JEDI model." And did you read that testimony in preparation for what you did here? Yes? <b>A. I'm sorry, yes.</b> Q. Okay. And you do agree there are two leading brands of impact analysis software, IMPLAN and REMI? <b>A. They're two of the leading ones, yes.</b> Q. Okay. Now, you've referred a couple of times to peer-reviewed literature and you said, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>asked is: Has the JEDI model been recently tested in Livingston County or similar counties to gauge its accuracy? Do you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. Again, referring to Dr.</li> <li>Loomis's testimony. This is December 9, Phil, page 608, starting at line 6. Question: Have you tested the JEDI model in agricultural-based homes to gauge its accuracy? Answer: The JEDI model has been calibrated or tested. It was it was in, actually, a peer-reviewed publication recently where they did take the JEDI model, looking at those input/output sectors, and then, looking at actual employment numbers, I believe, from the Bureau of Labor Statistics or state numbers. That was not done here in Illinois. But the researchers that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Laboratory, and as you can see the plan number that I use there, it is updated and it's based on the IMPLAN model. IMPLAN is a standard economic impact analysis software. There's two leading brands of software, IMPLAN and REMI. IMPLAN happens to be the one that is used as the basis or platform for the JEDI model." And did you read that testimony in preparation for what you did here? Yes? <b>A. I'm sorry, yes.</b> Q. Okay. And you do agree there are two leading brands of impact analysis software, IMPLAN and REMI? <b>A. They're two of the leading ones, yes.</b> Q. Okay. Now, you've referred a couple of times to peer-reviewed literature and you said, and you were substantially quoting from your report,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>asked is: Has the JEDI model been recently tested in Livingston County or similar counties to gauge its accuracy? Do you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. Again, referring to Dr.</li> <li>Loomis's testimony. This is December 9, Phil, page 608, starting at line 6. Question: Have you tested the JEDI model in agricultural-based homes to gauge its accuracy? Answer: The JEDI model has been calibrated or tested. It was it was in, actually, a peer-reviewed publication recently where they did take the JEDI model, looking at those input/output sectors, and then, looking at actual employment numbers, I believe, from the Bureau of Labor Statistics or state numbers. That was not done here in Illinois. But the researchers that developed the JEDI model did do that. It was in a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Laboratory, and as you can see the plan number that I use there, it is updated and it's based on the IMPLAN model. IMPLAN is a standard economic impact analysis software. There's two leading brands of software, IMPLAN and REMI. IMPLAN happens to be the one that is used as the basis or platform for the JEDI model." And did you read that testimony in preparation for what you did here? Yes? A. I'm sorry, yes. Q. Okay. And you do agree there are two leading brands of impact analysis software, IMPLAN and REMI? A. They're two of the leading ones, yes. Q. Okay. Now, you've referred a couple of times to peer-reviewed literature and you said, and you were substantially quoting from your report, that it is the shortcomings of the JEDI model are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	asked is: Has the JEDI model been recently tested in Livingston County or similar counties to gauge its accuracy? Do you see that? <b>A. Yes.</b> Q. All right. Again, referring to Dr. Loomis's testimony. This is December 9, Phil, page 608, starting at line 6. Question: Have you tested the JEDI model in agricultural-based homes to gauge its accuracy? Answer: The JEDI model has been calibrated or tested. It was it was in, actually, a peer-reviewed publication recently where they did take the JEDI model, looking at those input/output sectors, and then, looking at actual employment numbers, I believe, from the Bureau of Labor Statistics or state numbers. That was not done here in Illinois. But the researchers that developed the JEDI model did do that. It was in a peer-reviewed publication. I believe it was in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Laboratory, and as you can see the plan number that I use there, it is updated and it's based on the IMPLAN model. IMPLAN is a standard economic impact analysis software. There's two leading brands of software, IMPLAN and REMI. IMPLAN happens to be the one that is used as the basis or platform for the JEDI model." And did you read that testimony in preparation for what you did here? Yes? A. I'm sorry, yes. Q. Okay. And you do agree there are two leading brands of impact analysis software, IMPLAN and REMI? A. They're two of the leading ones, yes. Q. Okay. Now, you've referred a couple of times to peer-reviewed literature and you said, and you were substantially quoting from your report, that it is the shortcomings of the JEDI model are well-recognized in the literature. Do you remember	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	asked is: Has the JEDI model been recently tested in Livingston County or similar counties to gauge its accuracy? Do you see that? <b>A. Yes.</b> Q. All right. Again, referring to Dr. Loomis's testimony. This is December 9, Phil, page 608, starting at line 6. Question: Have you tested the JEDI model in agricultural-based homes to gauge its accuracy? Answer: The JEDI model has been calibrated or tested. It was it was in, actually, a peer-reviewed publication recently where they did take the JEDI model, looking at those input/output sectors, and then, looking at actual employment numbers, I believe, from the Bureau of Labor Statistics or state numbers. That was not done here in Illinois. But the researchers that developed the JEDI model did do that. It was in a peer-reviewed publication. I believe it was in Energy Policy and in Energy Economics that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Laboratory, and as you can see the plan number that I use there, it is updated and it's based on the IMPLAN model. IMPLAN is a standard economic impact analysis software. There's two leading brands of software, IMPLAN and REMI. IMPLAN happens to be the one that is used as the basis or platform for the JEDI model." And did you read that testimony in preparation for what you did here? Yes? <b>A. I'm sorry, yes.</b> Q. Okay. And you do agree there are two leading brands of impact analysis software, IMPLAN and REMI? <b>A. They're two of the leading ones, yes.</b> Q. Okay. Now, you've referred a couple of times to peer-reviewed literature and you said, and you were substantially quoting from your report, that it is the shortcomings of the JEDI model are well-recognized in the literature. Do you remember saying that? I tried to write that down carefully,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	asked is: Has the JEDI model been recently tested in Livingston County or similar counties to gauge its accuracy? Do you see that? <b>A. Yes.</b> Q. All right. Again, referring to Dr. Loomis's testimony. This is December 9, Phil, page 608, starting at line 6. Question: Have you tested the JEDI model in agricultural-based homes to gauge its accuracy? Answer: The JEDI model has been calibrated or tested. It was it was in, actually, a peer-reviewed publication recently where they did take the JEDI model, looking at those input/output sectors, and then, looking at actual employment numbers, I believe, from the Bureau of Labor Statistics or state numbers. That was not done here in Illinois. But the researchers that developed the JEDI model did do that. It was in a peer-reviewed publication. I believe it was in Energy Policy and in Energy Economics that the article appeared.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Laboratory, and as you can see the plan number that I use there, it is updated and it's based on the IMPLAN model. IMPLAN is a standard economic impact analysis software. There's two leading brands of software, IMPLAN and REMI. IMPLAN happens to be the one that is used as the basis or platform for the JEDI model." And did you read that testimony in preparation for what you did here? Yes? <b>A. I'm sorry, yes.</b> Q. Okay. And you do agree there are two leading brands of impact analysis software, IMPLAN and REMI? <b>A. They're two of the leading ones, yes.</b> Q. Okay. Now, you've referred a couple of times to peer-reviewed literature and you said, and you were substantially quoting from your report, that it is the shortcomings of the JEDI model are well-recognized in the literature. Do you remember saying that? I tried to write that down carefully, so I think you did say that. Do you remember that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	asked is: Has the JEDI model been recently tested in Livingston County or similar counties to gauge its accuracy? Do you see that? <b>A. Yes.</b> Q. All right. Again, referring to Dr. Loomis's testimony. This is December 9, Phil, page 608, starting at line 6. Question: Have you tested the JEDI model in agricultural-based homes to gauge its accuracy? Answer: The JEDI model has been calibrated or tested. It was it was in, actually, a peer-reviewed publication recently where they did take the JEDI model, looking at those input/output sectors, and then, looking at actual employment numbers, I believe, from the Bureau of Labor Statistics or state numbers. That was not done here in Illinois. But the researchers that developed the JEDI model did do that. It was in a peer-reviewed publication. I believe it was in Energy Policy and in Energy Economics that the article appeared. Do you remember that testimony?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Laboratory, and as you can see the plan number that I use there, it is updated and it's based on the IMPLAN model. IMPLAN is a standard economic impact analysis software. There's two leading brands of software, IMPLAN and REMI. IMPLAN happens to be the one that is used as the basis or platform for the JEDI model." And did you read that testimony in preparation for what you did here? Yes? A. I'm sorry, yes. Q. Okay. And you do agree there are two leading brands of impact analysis software, IMPLAN and REMI? A. They're two of the leading ones, yes. Q. Okay. Now, you've referred a couple of times to peer-reviewed literature and you said, and you were substantially quoting from your report, that it is the shortcomings of the JEDI model are well-recognized in the literature. Do you remember saying that? I tried to write that down carefully, so I think you did say that. Do you remember that? A. I didn't say it exactly like that, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>asked is: Has the JEDI model been recently tested in Livingston County or similar counties to gauge its accuracy? Do you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. Again, referring to Dr.</li> <li>Loomis's testimony. This is December 9, Phil, page 608, starting at line 6. Question: Have you tested the JEDI model in agricultural-based homes to gauge its accuracy? Answer: The JEDI model has been calibrated or tested. It was it was in, actually, a peer-reviewed publication recently where they did take the JEDI model, looking at those input/output sectors, and then, looking at actual employment numbers, I believe, from the Bureau of Labor Statistics or state numbers. That was not done here in Illinois. But the researchers that developed the JEDI model did do that. It was in a peer-reviewed publication. I believe it was in Energy Policy and in Energy Economics that the article appeared.</li> <li>Do you remember that testimony?</li> <li>A. I do, and I also remember looking at that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Laboratory, and as you can see the plan number that I use there, it is updated and it's based on the IMPLAN model. IMPLAN is a standard economic impact analysis software. There's two leading brands of software, IMPLAN and REMI. IMPLAN happens to be the one that is used as the basis or platform for the JEDI model."</li> <li>And did you read that testimony in preparation for what you did here? Yes?</li> <li>A. I'm sorry, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And you do agree there are two leading brands of impact analysis software, IMPLAN and REMI?</li> <li>A. They're two of the leading ones, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now, you've referred a couple of times to peer-reviewed literature and you said, and you were substantially quoting from your report, that it is the shortcomings of the JEDI model are well-recognized in the literature. Do you remember saying that? I tried to write that down carefully, so I think you did say that. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. I didn't say it exactly like that, but Q. Words to that effect?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>asked is: Has the JEDI model been recently tested in Livingston County or similar counties to gauge its accuracy? Do you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. Again, referring to Dr.</li> <li>Loomis's testimony. This is December 9, Phil, page 608, starting at line 6. Question: Have you tested the JEDI model in agricultural-based homes to gauge its accuracy? Answer: The JEDI model has been calibrated or tested. It was it was in, actually, a peer-reviewed publication recently where they did take the JEDI model, looking at those input/output sectors, and then, looking at actual employment numbers, I believe, from the Bureau of Labor Statistics or state numbers. That was not done here in Illinois. But the researchers that developed the JEDI model did do that. It was in a peer-reviewed publication. I believe it was in Energy Policy and in Energy Economics that the article appeared.</li> <li>Do you remember that testimony?</li> <li>A. I do, and I also remember looking at that study and it wasn't if I recall correctly, it</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Laboratory, and as you can see the plan number that I use there, it is updated and it's based on the IMPLAN model. IMPLAN is a standard economic impact analysis software. There's two leading brands of software, IMPLAN and REMI. IMPLAN happens to be the one that is used as the basis or platform for the JEDI model." And did you read that testimony in preparation for what you did here? Yes? A. I'm sorry, yes. Q. Okay. And you do agree there are two leading brands of impact analysis software, IMPLAN and REMI? A. They're two of the leading ones, yes. Q. Okay. Now, you've referred a couple of times to peer-reviewed literature and you said, and you were substantially quoting from your report, that it is the shortcomings of the JEDI model are well-recognized in the literature. Do you remember saying that? I tried to write that down carefully, so I think you did say that. Do you remember that? A. I didn't say it exactly like that, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>asked is: Has the JEDI model been recently tested in Livingston County or similar counties to gauge its accuracy? Do you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. Again, referring to Dr.</li> <li>Loomis's testimony. This is December 9, Phil, page 608, starting at line 6. Question: Have you tested the JEDI model in agricultural-based homes to gauge its accuracy? Answer: The JEDI model has been calibrated or tested. It was it was in, actually, a peer-reviewed publication recently where they did take the JEDI model, looking at those input/output sectors, and then, looking at actual employment numbers, I believe, from the Bureau of Labor Statistics or state numbers. That was not done here in Illinois. But the researchers that developed the JEDI model did do that. It was in a peer-reviewed publication. I believe it was in Energy Policy and in Energy Economics that the article appeared.</li> <li>Do you remember that testimony?</li> <li>A. I do, and I also remember looking at that</li> </ul>

	INGSTON COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS		January 26, 2015
	Page 1632		Page 1634
1	that particular citation, this area or this time.	1	consideration in its development of the jobs and
2	Q. I think you can say we're going to get to	2	economic development impacts, JEDI, wind model used
3	that study in a few minutes	3	by, among others, Lantz, L-A-N-T-Z, and Tegen,
4	A. Okay.	4	T-E-G-E-N, 2008, to perform a sensitivity analysis
5	Q but back to Dr. Loomis's report, page	5	of wind power-related economic development drivers
6	10, last paragraph. "This methodology was been	6	and the economic development benefits from wind."
7	for a college professor was been validated by a	7	So just starting here, just so we can
8	paper in the peer-viewed economics literature. In	8	agree on what this study is looking at, among other
9	the article Ex Post Analysis of Economics Impacts	9	things, it's looking at input/output models like the
10	from Wind Power Development in U.S. Counties, the	10	JEDI model, correct?
11	authors conduct an ex post econometric analysis of	11	A. Yes.
12	the county-level economic development impacts of	12	Q. Okay. Page 1752, the second paragraph
13	wind power installations from 2000 through 2008.	13	under conclusions. Let me know when you're there.
14	They find an aggregate increase in county-level	14	A. Okay. Second paragraph?
15	personal income and employment of approximately	15	Q. Right.
16	\$11,000 and .5 jobs per megawatt of wind power	16	A. Right.
17	capacity which is consistent with the JEDI results	17	Q. "This study is the first that we are aware
18	at the county level." And he cites Brown 2012.	18	of to empirically test for the economic development
19	Do you see that?	19	impacts of wind power installations in U.S. counties
20	A. Right, and that's the study that I'm	20	using an ex post econometric approach. We applied
21	referring to. It's 2000 to 2008 as you just said	21	this method to a large region of the country that
22	and actually covers the Plains and Rocky Mountains,	22	hosts a large number of existing wind power
23	which is not the same geographic area as Livingston	23	projects, mainly in the Great Plains, to test the
24	County which is obviously here in the Midwest, and	24	hypothesis that wind power installations increased
	Page 1633		Page 1635
1	it's for data to 2008. We're obviously in 2014.	1	county-level income and employment growth between
1	And so that's why I didn't think it was as helpful	1	
		2	
2	• -	2	2000 and 2008. The analysis does not address
3	as it would have been had it been more recent and	3	2000 and 2008. The analysis does not address questions concerning state or national net effects
3 4	as it would have been had it been more recent and for this geographic area.	3 4	2000 and 2008. The analysis does not address questions concerning state or national net effects nor does the analysis seek to provide a
3 4 5	<ul><li>as it would have been had it been more recent and for this geographic area.</li><li>Q. Okay, we'll get to that. Since you're a</li></ul>	3 4 5	2000 and 2008. The analysis does not address questions concerning state or national net effects nor does the analysis seek to provide a comprehensive benefit/cost analysis of wind energy
3 4 5 6	<ul><li>as it would have been had it been more recent and for this geographic area.</li><li>Q. Okay, we'll get to that. Since you're a lawyer, I assume you know what ex post means.</li></ul>	3 4 5 6	2000 and 2008. The analysis does not address questions concerning state or national net effects nor does the analysis seek to provide a comprehensive benefit/cost analysis of wind energy of the type that would be desired in making local,
3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>as it would have been had it been more recent and for this geographic area.</li><li>Q. Okay, we'll get to that. Since you're a lawyer, I assume you know what ex post means.</li><li>A. After the fact.</li></ul>	3 4 5 6 7	2000 and 2008. The analysis does not address questions concerning state or national net effects nor does the analysis seek to provide a comprehensive benefit/cost analysis of wind energy of the type that would be desired in making local, state or national policy decisions. Such an
3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>as it would have been had it been more recent and for this geographic area.</li> <li>Q. Okay, we'll get to that. Since you're a lawyer, I assume you know what ex post means.</li> <li>A. After the fact.</li> <li>Q. Or backward looking</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8	2000 and 2008. The analysis does not address questions concerning state or national net effects nor does the analysis seek to provide a comprehensive benefit/cost analysis of wind energy of the type that would be desired in making local, state or national policy decisions. Such an analysis would need to investigate the myriad
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>as it would have been had it been more recent and for this geographic area.</li> <li>Q. Okay, we'll get to that. Since you're a lawyer, I assume you know what ex post means.</li> <li>A. After the fact.</li> <li>Q. Or backward looking</li> <li>A. Right.</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	2000 and 2008. The analysis does not address questions concerning state or national net effects nor does the analysis seek to provide a comprehensive benefit/cost analysis of wind energy of the type that would be desired in making local, state or national policy decisions. Such an analysis would need to investigate the myriad potential costs and benefits of wind energy
3 4 5 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>as it would have been had it been more recent and for this geographic area.</li> <li>Q. Okay, we'll get to that. Since you're a lawyer, I assume you know what ex post means.</li> <li>A. After the fact.</li> <li>Q. Or backward looking</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q right? Exhibit 304 is the study you</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	2000 and 2008. The analysis does not address questions concerning state or national net effects nor does the analysis seek to provide a comprehensive benefit/cost analysis of wind energy of the type that would be desired in making local, state or national policy decisions. Such an analysis would need to investigate the myriad potential costs and benefits of wind energy development. Instead, the present paper provides an
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>as it would have been had it been more recent and for this geographic area.</li> <li>Q. Okay, we'll get to that. Since you're a lawyer, I assume you know what ex post means.</li> <li>A. After the fact.</li> <li>Q. Or backward looking</li> <li>A. Right.</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	2000 and 2008. The analysis does not address questions concerning state or national net effects nor does the analysis seek to provide a comprehensive benefit/cost analysis of wind energy of the type that would be desired in making local, state or national policy decisions. Such an analysis would need to investigate the myriad potential costs and benefits of wind energy development. Instead, the present paper provides an empirical assessment of the net local economic
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>as it would have been had it been more recent and for this geographic area.</li> <li>Q. Okay, we'll get to that. Since you're a lawyer, I assume you know what ex post means.</li> <li>A. After the fact.</li> <li>Q. Or backward looking</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q right? Exhibit 304 is the study you looked at, right?</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	2000 and 2008. The analysis does not address questions concerning state or national net effects nor does the analysis seek to provide a comprehensive benefit/cost analysis of wind energy of the type that would be desired in making local, state or national policy decisions. Such an analysis would need to investigate the myriad potential costs and benefits of wind energy development. Instead, the present paper provides an empirical assessment of the net local economic development impacts while avoiding many of the
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>as it would have been had it been more recent and for this geographic area.</li> <li>Q. Okay, we'll get to that. Since you're a lawyer, I assume you know what ex post means.</li> <li>A. After the fact.</li> <li>Q. Or backward looking</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q right? Exhibit 304 is the study you looked at, right?</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Excuse me?</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	2000 and 2008. The analysis does not address questions concerning state or national net effects nor does the analysis seek to provide a comprehensive benefit/cost analysis of wind energy of the type that would be desired in making local, state or national policy decisions. Such an analysis would need to investigate the myriad potential costs and benefits of wind energy development. Instead, the present paper provides an empirical assessment of the net local economic development impacts while avoiding many of the potential weaknesses of other methods that have been
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>as it would have been had it been more recent and for this geographic area.</li> <li>Q. Okay, we'll get to that. Since you're a lawyer, I assume you know what ex post means.</li> <li>A. After the fact.</li> <li>Q. Or backward looking</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q right? Exhibit 304 is the study you looked at, right?</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	2000 and 2008. The analysis does not address questions concerning state or national net effects nor does the analysis seek to provide a comprehensive benefit/cost analysis of wind energy of the type that would be desired in making local, state or national policy decisions. Such an analysis would need to investigate the myriad potential costs and benefits of wind energy development. Instead, the present paper provides an empirical assessment of the net local economic development impacts while avoiding many of the
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>as it would have been had it been more recent and for this geographic area.</li> <li>Q. Okay, we'll get to that. Since you're a lawyer, I assume you know what ex post means.</li> <li>A. After the fact.</li> <li>Q. Or backward looking</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q right? Exhibit 304 is the study you looked at, right?</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Excuse me?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	2000 and 2008. The analysis does not address questions concerning state or national net effects nor does the analysis seek to provide a comprehensive benefit/cost analysis of wind energy of the type that would be desired in making local, state or national policy decisions. Such an analysis would need to investigate the myriad potential costs and benefits of wind energy development. Instead, the present paper provides an empirical assessment of the net local economic development impacts while avoiding many of the potential weaknesses of other methods that have been used to assess such local impacts."
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>as it would have been had it been more recent and for this geographic area.</li> <li>Q. Okay, we'll get to that. Since you're a lawyer, I assume you know what ex post means.</li> <li>A. After the fact.</li> <li>Q. Or backward looking</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q right? Exhibit 304 is the study you looked at, right?</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Excuse me?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. If you could go to the page number 1746.</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	2000 and 2008. The analysis does not address questions concerning state or national net effects nor does the analysis seek to provide a comprehensive benefit/cost analysis of wind energy of the type that would be desired in making local, state or national policy decisions. Such an analysis would need to investigate the myriad potential costs and benefits of wind energy development. Instead, the present paper provides an empirical assessment of the net local economic development impacts while avoiding many of the potential weaknesses of other methods that have been used to assess such local impacts." And, again, I think we can agree what the
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>as it would have been had it been more recent and for this geographic area.</li> <li>Q. Okay, we'll get to that. Since you're a lawyer, I assume you know what ex post means.</li> <li>A. After the fact.</li> <li>Q. Or backward looking</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q right? Exhibit 304 is the study you looked at, right?</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Excuse me?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. If you could go to the page number 1746.</li> <li>It's the left column, second full paragraph.</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	2000 and 2008. The analysis does not address questions concerning state or national net effects nor does the analysis seek to provide a comprehensive benefit/cost analysis of wind energy of the type that would be desired in making local, state or national policy decisions. Such an analysis would need to investigate the myriad potential costs and benefits of wind energy development. Instead, the present paper provides an empirical assessment of the net local economic development impacts while avoiding many of the potential weaknesses of other methods that have been used to assess such local impacts." And, again, I think we can agree what the study is looking at is the specific local impacts
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>as it would have been had it been more recent and for this geographic area.</li> <li>Q. Okay, we'll get to that. Since you're a lawyer, I assume you know what ex post means.</li> <li>A. After the fact.</li> <li>Q. Or backward looking</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q right? Exhibit 304 is the study you looked at, right?</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Excuse me?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. If you could go to the page number 1746.</li> <li>It's the left column, second full paragraph.</li> <li>"Efforts have been made to overcome these</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	2000 and 2008. The analysis does not address questions concerning state or national net effects nor does the analysis seek to provide a comprehensive benefit/cost analysis of wind energy of the type that would be desired in making local, state or national policy decisions. Such an analysis would need to investigate the myriad potential costs and benefits of wind energy development. Instead, the present paper provides an empirical assessment of the net local economic development impacts while avoiding many of the potential weaknesses of other methods that have been used to assess such local impacts." And, again, I think we can agree what the study is looking at is the specific local impacts using an input/output model like JEDI, correct?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>as it would have been had it been more recent and for this geographic area.</li> <li>Q. Okay, we'll get to that. Since you're a lawyer, I assume you know what ex post means.</li> <li>A. After the fact.</li> <li>Q. Or backward looking</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q right? Exhibit 304 is the study you looked at, right?</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Excuse me?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. If you could go to the page number 1746.</li> <li>It's the left column, second full paragraph.</li> <li>"Efforts have been made to overcome these limitations to input/output models by better</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	2000 and 2008. The analysis does not address questions concerning state or national net effects nor does the analysis seek to provide a comprehensive benefit/cost analysis of wind energy of the type that would be desired in making local, state or national policy decisions. Such an analysis would need to investigate the myriad potential costs and benefits of wind energy development. Instead, the present paper provides an empirical assessment of the net local economic development impacts while avoiding many of the potential weaknesses of other methods that have been used to assess such local impacts." And, again, I think we can agree what the study is looking at is the specific local impacts using an input/output model like JEDI, correct? <b>A. I believe it's actually doing an</b>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>as it would have been had it been more recent and for this geographic area.</li> <li>Q. Okay, we'll get to that. Since you're a lawyer, I assume you know what ex post means.</li> <li>A. After the fact.</li> <li>Q. Or backward looking</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q right? Exhibit 304 is the study you looked at, right?</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Excuse me?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. If you could go to the page number 1746.</li> <li>It's the left column, second full paragraph.</li> <li>"Efforts have been made to overcome these limitations to input/output models by better tailoring their data specifically for the sectors</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	2000 and 2008. The analysis does not address questions concerning state or national net effects nor does the analysis seek to provide a comprehensive benefit/cost analysis of wind energy of the type that would be desired in making local, state or national policy decisions. Such an analysis would need to investigate the myriad potential costs and benefits of wind energy development. Instead, the present paper provides an empirical assessment of the net local economic development impacts while avoiding many of the potential weaknesses of other methods that have been used to assess such local impacts." And, again, I think we can agree what the study is looking at is the specific local impacts using an input/output model like JEDI, correct? <b>A. I believe it's actually doing an</b> econometric analysis of of the Plains area back
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>as it would have been had it been more recent and for this geographic area.</li> <li>Q. Okay, we'll get to that. Since you're a lawyer, I assume you know what ex post means.</li> <li>A. After the fact.</li> <li>Q. Or backward looking</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q right? Exhibit 304 is the study you looked at, right?</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Excuse me?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. If you could go to the page number 1746.</li> <li>It's the left column, second full paragraph.</li> <li>"Efforts have been made to overcome these limitations to input/output models by better tailoring their data specifically for the sectors under analysis and adjusting the local purchase</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	2000 and 2008. The analysis does not address questions concerning state or national net effects nor does the analysis seek to provide a comprehensive benefit/cost analysis of wind energy of the type that would be desired in making local, state or national policy decisions. Such an analysis would need to investigate the myriad potential costs and benefits of wind energy development. Instead, the present paper provides an empirical assessment of the net local economic development impacts while avoiding many of the potential weaknesses of other methods that have been used to assess such local impacts." And, again, I think we can agree what the study is looking at is the specific local impacts using an input/output model like JEDI, correct? <b>A. I believe it's actually doing an</b> <b>econometric analysis of of the Plains area back in 2000 to 2008 and I'm not sure actually was doing</b>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>as it would have been had it been more recent and for this geographic area.</li> <li>Q. Okay, we'll get to that. Since you're a lawyer, I assume you know what ex post means.</li> <li>A. After the fact.</li> <li>Q. Or backward looking</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q right? Exhibit 304 is the study you looked at, right?</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Excuse me?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. If you could go to the page number 1746.</li> <li>It's the left column, second full paragraph.</li> <li>"Efforts have been made to overcome these limitations to input/output models by better tailoring their data specifically for the sectors under analysis and adjusting the local purchase coefficients to more reasonably reflect the available local supply of goods and services for a given project. For example, the National Renewable</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	2000 and 2008. The analysis does not address questions concerning state or national net effects nor does the analysis seek to provide a comprehensive benefit/cost analysis of wind energy of the type that would be desired in making local, state or national policy decisions. Such an analysis would need to investigate the myriad potential costs and benefits of wind energy development. Instead, the present paper provides an empirical assessment of the net local economic development impacts while avoiding many of the potential weaknesses of other methods that have been used to assess such local impacts." And, again, I think we can agree what the study is looking at is the specific local impacts using an input/output model like JEDI, correct? <b>A. I believe it's actually doing an</b> econometric analysis of of the Plains area back in 2000 to 2008 and I'm not sure actually was doing the same kind of specific prospective analysis that <b>Dr. Loomis's report was doing.</b> Q. Well, that's true because this one is
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>as it would have been had it been more recent and for this geographic area.</li> <li>Q. Okay, we'll get to that. Since you're a lawyer, I assume you know what ex post means.</li> <li>A. After the fact.</li> <li>Q. Or backward looking</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q right? Exhibit 304 is the study you looked at, right?</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Excuse me?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. If you could go to the page number 1746.</li> <li>It's the left column, second full paragraph.</li> <li>"Efforts have been made to overcome these limitations to input/output models by better tailoring their data specifically for the sectors under analysis and adjusting the local purchase coefficients to more reasonably reflect the available local supply of goods and services for a</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	2000 and 2008. The analysis does not address questions concerning state or national net effects nor does the analysis seek to provide a comprehensive benefit/cost analysis of wind energy of the type that would be desired in making local, state or national policy decisions. Such an analysis would need to investigate the myriad potential costs and benefits of wind energy development. Instead, the present paper provides an empirical assessment of the net local economic development impacts while avoiding many of the potential weaknesses of other methods that have been used to assess such local impacts." And, again, I think we can agree what the study is looking at is the specific local impacts using an input/output model like JEDI, correct? A. I believe it's actually doing an econometric analysis of of the Plains area back in 2000 to 2008 and I'm not sure actually was doing the same kind of specific prospective analysis that Dr. Loomis's report was doing.

_			January 26, 2015
	Page 1636		Page 1638
1	input/output model, in fact, correlated with actual	1	should be more than one. One study is not a
2	experience, right?	2	sufficient basis of empirical analysis to give any
3	A. In the Great Plains area	3	comfort. I'm not saying they did anything wrong or
4	Q. Right.	4	that that why it was done, to promote the wind
5	A for a period of time that's very	5	energy as I would suspect, but I would feel much
6	different from the period of time today.	6	better if there were more of them. And even if we
7	Q. Okay. Well, let's see what the study	7	take what they've said, it's just a small number.
8	concluded. Page 1753, let me know when you're	8	Q. What did you say you suspect?
9	there, left column, first full paragraph.	9	A. Even if we if this one study turned out
10	"Taking into account the endogen I	10	to be replicated by lots of other studies, it's
11	always have this problem.	11	still a very small number.
12	A. I can	12	Q. No, I thought you said that you suspect
13	Q endogeneity of location decisions of	13	that this study was done to promote wind energy?
14	wind power development, we find an average aggregate	14	A. Well, it's done by the folks who are
15	increase in annual personal income of approximately	15	getting paid to promote the wind energy. I mean,
16	\$11,000 per megawatt of wind power capacity	16	this is the National Renewable Energy Laboratory,
17	installed over the sample period, and an average	17	this is the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.
18	aggregate increase of net county-level employment of	18	These are not economists that don't have that are
19	.5 jobs per megawatt. These figures translate to a	19	independent. They're all getting paid by the wind
20	median increase in total county personal income and	20	energy and the energy commissions.
21	employment of .22 percent and .4 percent respectively for counties with installed wind power	21 22	Q. I see. So A. I would feel better if there were a
22 23	over the 2000 to 2008 period."	22	variety of economists doing these studies for
23 24	Do you disagree with that conclusion?	23 24	different periods for different geographic areas
	Do you disagree whit that conclusion.		unter ent perious for unterent geogruphic ur cus
	Page 1637		Page 1639
1	-	1	
1	A. Well, I would just merely point out that	1	coming up with similar results. I would not on any
2	A. Well, I would just merely point out that that conclusion is consistent with my conclusion	2	coming up with similar results. I would not on any science depend upon one study. And as you've
	A. Well, I would just merely point out that that conclusion is consistent with my conclusion that the jobs and earnings impacts relative to the		coming up with similar results. I would not on any science depend upon one study. And as you've pointed out, this is the first and only econometric
2 3	A. Well, I would just merely point out that that conclusion is consistent with my conclusion that the jobs and earnings impacts relative to the size of the county are rather negligible22 and	2 3	coming up with similar results. I would not on any science depend upon one study. And as you've
2 3 4	A. Well, I would just merely point out that that conclusion is consistent with my conclusion that the jobs and earnings impacts relative to the	2 3 4	coming up with similar results. I would not on any science depend upon one study. And as you've pointed out, this is the first and only econometric analysis. And I would just feel better if there
2 3 4 5	A. Well, I would just merely point out that that conclusion is consistent with my conclusion that the jobs and earnings impacts relative to the size of the county are rather negligible22 and .4 of 1 percent is not significant if significant	2 3 4 5	coming up with similar results. I would not on any science depend upon one study. And as you've pointed out, this is the first and only econometric analysis. And I would just feel better if there were more of them.
2 3 4 5 6	A. Well, I would just merely point out that that conclusion is consistent with my conclusion that the jobs and earnings impacts relative to the size of the county are rather negligible22 and .4 of 1 percent is not significant if significant means altering and increasing the economic base of	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>coming up with similar results. I would not on any science depend upon one study. And as you've pointed out, this is the first and only econometric analysis. And I would just feel better if there were more of them.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to try and make you feel</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Well, I would just merely point out that that conclusion is consistent with my conclusion that the jobs and earnings impacts relative to the size of the county are rather negligible22 and .4 of 1 percent is not significant if significant means altering and increasing the economic base of the region. Those are very modest increases	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>coming up with similar results. I would not on any science depend upon one study. And as you've pointed out, this is the first and only econometric analysis. And I would just feel better if there were more of them.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to try and make you feel better.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Well, I would just merely point out that that conclusion is consistent with my conclusion that the jobs and earnings impacts relative to the size of the county are rather negligible22 and .4 of 1 percent is not significant if significant means altering and increasing the economic base of the region. Those are very modest increases compared to the size of any of of this or other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<pre>coming up with similar results. I would not on any science depend upon one study. And as you've pointed out, this is the first and only econometric analysis. And I would just feel better if there were more of them. Q. Okay. I'm going to try and make you feel better. MR. LUETKEHANS: Move to strike, move to strike. MR. BLAZER: One more thing on page 1753.</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Well, I would just merely point out that that conclusion is consistent with my conclusion that the jobs and earnings impacts relative to the size of the county are rather negligible22 and .4 of 1 percent is not significant if significant means altering and increasing the economic base of the region. Those are very modest increases compared to the size of any of of this or other counties. It's just not a big increase. Q. So are you saying that this study did, in fact, from an ex post perspective validate the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	coming up with similar results. I would not on any science depend upon one study. And as you've pointed out, this is the first and only econometric analysis. And I would just feel better if there were more of them. Q. Okay. I'm going to try and make you feel better. MR. LUETKEHANS: Move to strike, move to strike. MR. BLAZER: One more thing on page 1753. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, how are you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Well, I would just merely point out that that conclusion is consistent with my conclusion that the jobs and earnings impacts relative to the size of the county are rather negligible22 and .4 of 1 percent is not significant if significant means altering and increasing the economic base of the region. Those are very modest increases compared to the size of any of of this or other counties. It's just not a big increase. Q. So are you saying that this study did, in fact, from an ex post perspective validate the results of the input/output modeling that was done?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	coming up with similar results. I would not on any science depend upon one study. And as you've pointed out, this is the first and only econometric analysis. And I would just feel better if there were more of them. Q. Okay. I'm going to try and make you feel better. MR. LUETKEHANS: Move to strike, move to strike. MR. BLAZER: One more thing on page 1753. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, how are you doing with the questions over there?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Well, I would just merely point out that that conclusion is consistent with my conclusion that the jobs and earnings impacts relative to the size of the county are rather negligible22 and .4 of 1 percent is not significant if significant means altering and increasing the economic base of the region. Those are very modest increases compared to the size of any of of this or other counties. It's just not a big increase.</li> <li>Q. So are you saying that this study did, in fact, from an ex post perspective validate the results of the input/output modeling that was done?</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying that the study shows that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	coming up with similar results. I would not on any science depend upon one study. And as you've pointed out, this is the first and only econometric analysis. And I would just feel better if there were more of them. Q. Okay. I'm going to try and make you feel better. MR. LUETKEHANS: Move to strike, move to strike. MR. BLAZER: One more thing on page 1753. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, how are you doing with the questions over there? MR. BLAZER: Probably 20 minutes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Well, I would just merely point out that that conclusion is consistent with my conclusion that the jobs and earnings impacts relative to the size of the county are rather negligible22 and .4 of 1 percent is not significant if significant means altering and increasing the economic base of the region. Those are very modest increases compared to the size of any of of this or other counties. It's just not a big increase.</li> <li>Q. So are you saying that this study did, in fact, from an ex post perspective validate the results of the input/output modeling that was done?</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying that the study shows that the economic impacts of wind energy farms are</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	coming up with similar results. I would not on any science depend upon one study. And as you've pointed out, this is the first and only econometric analysis. And I would just feel better if there were more of them. Q. Okay. I'm going to try and make you feel better. MR. LUETKEHANS: Move to strike, move to strike. MR. BLAZER: One more thing on page 1753. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, how are you doing with the questions over there? MR. BLAZER: Probably 20 minutes. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: 20 minutes more?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Well, I would just merely point out that that conclusion is consistent with my conclusion that the jobs and earnings impacts relative to the size of the county are rather negligible22 and .4 of 1 percent is not significant if significant means altering and increasing the economic base of the region. Those are very modest increases compared to the size of any of of this or other counties. It's just not a big increase. Q. So are you saying that this study did, in fact, from an ex post perspective validate the results of the input/output modeling that was done? A. No, I'm saying that the study shows that the economic impacts of wind energy farms are negligible in terms of if significant, which to me	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<pre>coming up with similar results. I would not on any science depend upon one study. And as you've pointed out, this is the first and only econometric analysis. And I would just feel better if there were more of them. Q. Okay. I'm going to try and make you feel better. MR. LUETKEHANS: Move to strike, move to strike. MR. BLAZER: One more thing on page 1753. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, how are you doing with the questions over there? MR. BLAZER: Probably 20 minutes. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: 20 minutes more? MR. LUETKEHANS: This was supposed to be a</pre>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Well, I would just merely point out that that conclusion is consistent with my conclusion that the jobs and earnings impacts relative to the size of the county are rather negligible22 and .4 of 1 percent is not significant if significant means altering and increasing the economic base of the region. Those are very modest increases compared to the size of any of of this or other counties. It's just not a big increase. Q. So are you saying that this study did, in fact, from an ex post perspective validate the results of the input/output modeling that was done? A. No, I'm saying that the study shows that the economic impacts of wind energy farms are negligible in terms of if significant, which to me means does it change the composition, the structure,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<pre>coming up with similar results. I would not on any science depend upon one study. And as you've pointed out, this is the first and only econometric analysis. And I would just feel better if there were more of them. Q. Okay. I'm going to try and make you feel better. MR. LUETKEHANS: Move to strike, move to strike. MR. BLAZER: One more thing on page 1753. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, how are you doing with the questions over there? MR. BLAZER: Probably 20 minutes. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: 20 minutes more? MR. LUETKEHANS: This was supposed to be a half-hour. I had other witnesses come in for this.</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Well, I would just merely point out that that conclusion is consistent with my conclusion that the jobs and earnings impacts relative to the size of the county are rather negligible22 and .4 of 1 percent is not significant if significant means altering and increasing the economic base of the region. Those are very modest increases compared to the size of any of of this or other counties. It's just not a big increase.</li> <li>Q. So are you saying that this study did, in fact, from an ex post perspective validate the results of the input/output modeling that was done?</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying that the study shows that the economic impacts of wind energy farms are negligible in terms of if significant, which to me means does it change the composition, the structure, improve the economic base.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<pre>coming up with similar results. I would not on any science depend upon one study. And as you've pointed out, this is the first and only econometric analysis. And I would just feel better if there were more of them. Q. Okay. I'm going to try and make you feel better. MR. LUETKEHANS: Move to strike, move to strike. MR. BLAZER: One more thing on page 1753. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, how are you doing with the questions over there? MR. BLAZER: Probably 20 minutes. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: 20 minutes more? MR. LUETKEHANS: This was supposed to be a half-hour. I had other witnesses come in for this. The entire cross was supposed to be for a half-hour.</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Well, I would just merely point out that that conclusion is consistent with my conclusion that the jobs and earnings impacts relative to the size of the county are rather negligible22 and .4 of 1 percent is not significant if significant means altering and increasing the economic base of the region. Those are very modest increases compared to the size of any of of this or other counties. It's just not a big increase.</li> <li>Q. So are you saying that this study did, in fact, from an ex post perspective validate the results of the input/output modeling that was done?</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying that the study shows that the economic impacts of wind energy farms are negligible in terms of if significant, which to me means does it change the composition, the structure, improve the economic base. This is a very, very small percentage. It's less than 1 percent change.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<pre>coming up with similar results. I would not on any science depend upon one study. And as you've pointed out, this is the first and only econometric analysis. And I would just feel better if there were more of them. Q. Okay. I'm going to try and make you feel better. MR. LUETKEHANS: Move to strike, move to strike. MR. BLAZER: One more thing on page 1753. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, how are you doing with the questions over there? MR. BLAZER: Probably 20 minutes. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: 20 minutes more? MR. LUETKEHANS: This was supposed to be a half-hour. I had other witnesses come in for this. The entire cross was supposed to be for a half-hour. I understand that's not the easiest thing to do, but</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Well, I would just merely point out that that conclusion is consistent with my conclusion that the jobs and earnings impacts relative to the size of the county are rather negligible22 and .4 of 1 percent is not significant if significant means altering and increasing the economic base of the region. Those are very modest increases compared to the size of any of of this or other counties. It's just not a big increase. Q. So are you saying that this study did, in fact, from an ex post perspective validate the results of the input/output modeling that was done? A. No, I'm saying that the study shows that the economic impacts of wind energy farms are negligible in terms of if significant, which to me means does it change the composition, the structure, improve the economic base. This is a very, very small percentage. It's less than 1 percent change. And that to me again, I do think it's a problem	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<pre>coming up with similar results. I would not on any science depend upon one study. And as you've pointed out, this is the first and only econometric analysis. And I would just feel better if there were more of them. Q. Okay. I'm going to try and make you feel better. MR. LUETKEHANS: Move to strike, move to strike. MR. BLAZER: One more thing on page 1753. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, how are you doing with the questions over there? MR. BLAZER: Probably 20 minutes. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: 20 minutes more? MR. LUETKEHANS: This was supposed to be a half-hour. I had other witnesses come in for this. The entire cross was supposed to be for a half-hour. I understand that's not the easiest thing to do, but we're now on somewhere about an hour and a half and</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. Well, I would just merely point out that that conclusion is consistent with my conclusion that the jobs and earnings impacts relative to the size of the county are rather negligible22 and .4 of 1 percent is not significant if significant means altering and increasing the economic base of the region. Those are very modest increases compared to the size of any of of this or other counties. It's just not a big increase.</li> <li>Q. So are you saying that this study did, in fact, from an ex post perspective validate the results of the input/output modeling that was done?</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying that the study shows that the economic impacts of wind energy farms are negligible in terms of if significant, which to me means does it change the composition, the structure, improve the economic base. This is a very, very small percentage. It's less than 1 percent change. And that to me again, I do think it's a problem that's econometrics and it was for a different</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>coming up with similar results. I would not on any science depend upon one study. And as you've pointed out, this is the first and only econometric analysis. And I would just feel better if there were more of them. Q. Okay. I'm going to try and make you feel better. MR. LUETKEHANS: Move to strike, move to strike. MR. BLAZER: One more thing on page 1753. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, how are you doing with the questions over there? MR. BLAZER: Probably 20 minutes. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: 20 minutes more? MR. LUETKEHANS: This was supposed to be a half-hour. I had other witnesses come in for this. The entire cross was supposed to be for a half-hour. I understand that's not the easiest thing to do, but we're now on somewhere about an hour and a half and he's still got another 20 minutes?</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Well, I would just merely point out that that conclusion is consistent with my conclusion that the jobs and earnings impacts relative to the size of the county are rather negligible22 and .4 of 1 percent is not significant if significant means altering and increasing the economic base of the region. Those are very modest increases compared to the size of any of of this or other counties. It's just not a big increase.</li> <li>Q. So are you saying that this study did, in fact, from an ex post perspective validate the results of the input/output modeling that was done?</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying that the study shows that the economic impacts of wind energy farms are negligible in terms of if significant, which to me means does it change the composition, the structure, improve the economic base. This is a very, very small percentage. It's less than 1 percent change. And that to me again, I do think it's a problem that's econometrics and it was for a different geographic</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>coming up with similar results. I would not on any science depend upon one study. And as you've pointed out, this is the first and only econometric analysis. And I would just feel better if there were more of them. Q. Okay. I'm going to try and make you feel better. MR. LUETKEHANS: Move to strike, move to strike. MR. BLAZER: One more thing on page 1753. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, how are you doing with the questions over there? MR. BLAZER: Probably 20 minutes. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: 20 minutes more? MR. LUETKEHANS: This was supposed to be a half-hour. I had other witnesses come in for this. The entire cross was supposed to be for a half-hour. I understand that's not the easiest thing to do, but we're now on somewhere about an hour and a half and he's still got another 20 minutes? A. And I frankly had a two hour drive and an</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Well, I would just merely point out that that conclusion is consistent with my conclusion that the jobs and earnings impacts relative to the size of the county are rather negligible22 and .4 of 1 percent is not significant if significant means altering and increasing the economic base of the region. Those are very modest increases compared to the size of any of of this or other counties. It's just not a big increase.</li> <li>Q. So are you saying that this study did, in fact, from an ex post perspective validate the results of the input/output modeling that was done?</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying that the study shows that the economic impacts of wind energy farms are negligible in terms of if significant, which to me means does it change the composition, the structure, improve the economic base. This is a very, very small percentage. It's less than 1 percent change. And that to me again, I do think it's a problem that's econometrics and it was for a different geographic area, and it's one of this is one study, the only</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>coming up with similar results. I would not on any science depend upon one study. And as you've pointed out, this is the first and only econometric analysis. And I would just feel better if there were more of them. Q. Okay. I'm going to try and make you feel better. MR. LUETKEHANS: Move to strike, move to strike. MR. BLAZER: One more thing on page 1753. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, how are you doing with the questions over there? MR. BLAZER: Probably 20 minutes. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: 20 minutes more? MR. LUETKEHANS: This was supposed to be a half-hour. I had other witnesses come in for this. The entire cross was supposed to be for a half-hour. I understand that's not the easiest thing to do, but we're now on somewhere about an hour and a half and he's still got another 20 minutes? A. And I frankly had a two hour drive and an early plane flight to go out of town, so</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Well, I would just merely point out that that conclusion is consistent with my conclusion that the jobs and earnings impacts relative to the size of the county are rather negligible22 and .4 of 1 percent is not significant if significant means altering and increasing the economic base of the region. Those are very modest increases compared to the size of any of of this or other counties. It's just not a big increase.</li> <li>Q. So are you saying that this study did, in fact, from an ex post perspective validate the results of the input/output modeling that was done?</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying that the study shows that the economic impacts of wind energy farms are negligible in terms of if significant, which to me means does it change the composition, the structure, improve the economic base. This is a very, very small percentage. It's less than 1 percent change. And that to me again, I do think it's a problem that's econometrics and it was for a different geographic</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>coming up with similar results. I would not on any science depend upon one study. And as you've pointed out, this is the first and only econometric analysis. And I would just feel better if there were more of them. Q. Okay. I'm going to try and make you feel better. MR. LUETKEHANS: Move to strike, move to strike. MR. BLAZER: One more thing on page 1753. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, how are you doing with the questions over there? MR. BLAZER: Probably 20 minutes. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: 20 minutes more? MR. LUETKEHANS: This was supposed to be a half-hour. I had other witnesses come in for this. The entire cross was supposed to be for a half-hour. I understand that's not the easiest thing to do, but we're now on somewhere about an hour and a half and he's still got another 20 minutes? A. And I frankly had a two hour drive and an</pre>

			January 26, 2015
	Page 1640		Page 1642
1	things and I have a right to cross-examine him.	1	all a basis for concluding that the project is not
2	MR. LUETKEHANS: He said a lot of things	2	market and financially feasible. Otherwise, he
3	in his report.	3	would have put it in the report.
4	CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right. Mr. Blazer,	4	Q. So are you concluding have you
5	you are correct, you do have the right to	5	concluded that this project is likely to not be
6	cross-examine the witness.	6	market and financially feasible?
7	MR. BLAZER: I will move as quickly as I	7	A. I'm saying that his own statement suggests
8	can, Mr. Cornale.	8	and I'm reviewing his report.
9	CHAIRMAN CORNALE: I ask that you expedite	9	Q. And I'm asking for your conclusion. Have
10	the process. I believe we have another witness with	10	you concluded that this project is likely to be
11	Mr. Luetkehans this evening and	11	to not be market and financially feasible?
12	MR. BLAZER: Okay.	12	A. It's not relevant to my it's I don't
13	MR. LUETKEHANS: I wouldn't have brought	13	need to make that conclusion. I need I'm
14	him if I knew this was going to be two hours. I	14	pointing out that if it's not
15	mean that's the problem I have here.	15	MR. BLAZER: Mr. Cornale, would you please
16	<b>CHAIRMAN CORNALE:</b> Right, right. We all	16	direct the witness to answer my question?
17	have drives home and it's bad out there and I want	17	<b>MR. LUETKEHANS:</b> He's done that. He's
18	to get us out of here as soon as we can. So, Mr.	18	trying to answer the question.
19	Blazer, with that, you keep moving.	19	<b>MR. BLAZER:</b> No, he's not. He just
20	MR. BLAZER: Let's see if I can skip	20	said
21	through here.	21	CHAIRMAN CORNALE: He has somewhat
22	BY MR. BLAZER:	22	answered the question. He's just extrapolating a
23	Q. Top of page 5 of your report. "If the	23	little bit more. He needs to shorten up your
24	proposed project is not market and financially	24	answer and we'll you'll help us out too.
	Page 1641		Page 1643
1		1	
1	feasible to implement and conditions are not	1	A. Okay.
2	feasible to implement and conditions are not satisfied, none of the construction or operating	2	A. Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: So yes or no or I don't
2 3	feasible to implement and conditions are not satisfied, none of the construction or operating impacts predicted will materialize. No showing of		A. Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: So yes or no or I don't know are excellent answers.
2 3 4	feasible to implement and conditions are not satisfied, none of the construction or operating impacts predicted will materialize. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the report."	2 3	<ul> <li>A. Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: So yes or no or I don't know are excellent answers.</li> <li>A. I have not reached a conclusion about the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	feasible to implement and conditions are not satisfied, none of the construction or operating impacts predicted will materialize. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the report." What's your experience in the marketing of	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: So yes or no or I don't know are excellent answers.</li> <li>A. I have not reached a conclusion about the market and financial feasibility. No showing of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	feasible to implement and conditions are not satisfied, none of the construction or operating impacts predicted will materialize. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the report." What's your experience in the marketing of electricity from utility-scale wind projects?	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: So yes or no or I don't know are excellent answers.</li> <li>A. I have not reached a conclusion about the market and financial feasibility. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the Loomis</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	feasible to implement and conditions are not satisfied, none of the construction or operating impacts predicted will materialize. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the report." What's your experience in the marketing of electricity from utility-scale wind projects? A. I none.	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: So yes or no or I don't know are excellent answers.</li> <li>A. I have not reached a conclusion about the market and financial feasibility. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the Loomis report.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	feasible to implement and conditions are not satisfied, none of the construction or operating impacts predicted will materialize. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the report." What's your experience in the marketing of electricity from utility-scale wind projects?	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: So yes or no or I don't know are excellent answers.</li> <li>A. I have not reached a conclusion about the market and financial feasibility. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the Loomis</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>feasible to implement and conditions are not satisfied, none of the construction or operating impacts predicted will materialize. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the report." What's your experience in the marketing of electricity from utility-scale wind projects?</li> <li>A. I none.</li> <li>Q. And what is your experience with the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: So yes or no or I don't know are excellent answers.</li> <li>A. I have not reached a conclusion about the market and financial feasibility. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the Loomis report.</li> <li>Q. Are you saying if the project isn't built there won't be any benefits?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>feasible to implement and conditions are not satisfied, none of the construction or operating impacts predicted will materialize. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the report." What's your experience in the marketing of electricity from utility-scale wind projects?</li> <li>A. I none.</li> <li>Q. And what is your experience with the financing of wind projects?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: So yes or no or I don't know are excellent answers.</li> <li>A. I have not reached a conclusion about the market and financial feasibility. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the Loomis report.</li> <li>Q. Are you saying if the project isn't built</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>feasible to implement and conditions are not satisfied, none of the construction or operating impacts predicted will materialize. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the report." What's your experience in the marketing of electricity from utility-scale wind projects?</li> <li>A. I none.</li> <li>Q. And what is your experience with the financing of wind projects?</li> <li>A. None.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: So yes or no or I don't know are excellent answers.</li> <li>A. I have not reached a conclusion about the market and financial feasibility. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the Loomis report.</li> <li>Q. Are you saying if the project isn't built there won't be any benefits?</li> <li>A. There won't be economic impacts.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>feasible to implement and conditions are not satisfied, none of the construction or operating impacts predicted will materialize. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the report." What's your experience in the marketing of electricity from utility-scale wind projects?</li> <li>A. I none.</li> <li>Q. And what is your experience with the financing of wind projects?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Is it your conclusion that this project is</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: So yes or no or I don't know are excellent answers.</li> <li>A. I have not reached a conclusion about the market and financial feasibility. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the Loomis report.</li> <li>Q. Are you saying if the project isn't built there won't be any benefits?</li> <li>A. There won't be economic impacts.</li> <li>Q. If it's not built.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>feasible to implement and conditions are not satisfied, none of the construction or operating impacts predicted will materialize. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the report." What's your experience in the marketing of electricity from utility-scale wind projects?</li> <li>A. I none.</li> <li>Q. And what is your experience with the financing of wind projects?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Is it your conclusion that this project is likely to not be market and financially feasible?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: So yes or no or I don't know are excellent answers.</li> <li>A. I have not reached a conclusion about the market and financial feasibility. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the Loomis report.</li> <li>Q. Are you saying if the project isn't built there won't be any benefits?</li> <li>A. There won't be economic impacts.</li> <li>Q. If it's not built.</li> <li>A. If it's not if there's no construction,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>feasible to implement and conditions are not satisfied, none of the construction or operating impacts predicted will materialize. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the report." What's your experience in the marketing of electricity from utility-scale wind projects?</li> <li>A. I none.</li> <li>Q. And what is your experience with the financing of wind projects?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Is it your conclusion that this project is likely to not be market and financially feasible?</li> <li>A. It's my conclusion that the Loomis report</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: So yes or no or I don't know are excellent answers.</li> <li>A. I have not reached a conclusion about the market and financial feasibility. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the Loomis report.</li> <li>Q. Are you saying if the project isn't built there won't be any benefits?</li> <li>A. There won't be economic impacts.</li> <li>Q. If it's not built.</li> <li>A. If it's not if there's no construction, there will not be any jobs created from the project.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>feasible to implement and conditions are not satisfied, none of the construction or operating impacts predicted will materialize. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the report." What's your experience in the marketing of electricity from utility-scale wind projects?</li> <li>A. I none.</li> <li>Q. And what is your experience with the financing of wind projects?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Is it your conclusion that this project is likely to not be market and financially feasible?</li> <li>A. It's my conclusion that the Loomis report did not provide a showing of market and financial</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: So yes or no or I don't know are excellent answers.</li> <li>A. I have not reached a conclusion about the market and financial feasibility. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the Loomis report.</li> <li>Q. Are you saying if the project isn't built there won't be any benefits?</li> <li>A. There won't be economic impacts.</li> <li>Q. If it's not built.</li> <li>A. If it's not if there's no construction, there will not be any jobs created from the project.</li> <li>Q. Do you know what the value of Invenergy's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>feasible to implement and conditions are not satisfied, none of the construction or operating impacts predicted will materialize. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the report." What's your experience in the marketing of electricity from utility-scale wind projects?</li> <li>A. I none.</li> <li>Q. And what is your experience with the financing of wind projects?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Is it your conclusion that this project is likely to not be market and financially feasible?</li> <li>A. It's my conclusion that the Loomis report did not provide a showing of market and financial feasibility. It's my conclusion that the report</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: So yes or no or I don't know are excellent answers.</li> <li>A. I have not reached a conclusion about the market and financial feasibility. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the Loomis report.</li> <li>Q. Are you saying if the project isn't built there won't be any benefits?</li> <li>A. There won't be economic impacts.</li> <li>Q. If it's not built.</li> <li>A. If it's not if there's no construction, there will not be any jobs created from the project.</li> <li>Q. Do you know what the value of Invenergy's installed projects is?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>feasible to implement and conditions are not satisfied, none of the construction or operating impacts predicted will materialize. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the report." What's your experience in the marketing of electricity from utility-scale wind projects?</li> <li>A. I none.</li> <li>Q. And what is your experience with the financing of wind projects?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Is it your conclusion that this project is likely to not be market and financially feasible?</li> <li>A. It's my conclusion that the Loomis report did not provide a showing of market and financial feasibility. It's my conclusion that the report explained that limited wind energy development has</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: So yes or no or I don't know are excellent answers.</li> <li>A. I have not reached a conclusion about the market and financial feasibility. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the Loomis report.</li> <li>Q. Are you saying if the project isn't built there won't be any benefits?</li> <li>A. There won't be economic impacts.</li> <li>Q. If it's not built.</li> <li>A. If it's not if there's no construction, there will not be any jobs created from the project.</li> <li>Q. Do you know what the value of Invenergy's installed projects is?</li> <li>A. No, not off the top of my head.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>feasible to implement and conditions are not satisfied, none of the construction or operating impacts predicted will materialize. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the report." What's your experience in the marketing of electricity from utility-scale wind projects?</li> <li>A. I none.</li> <li>Q. And what is your experience with the financing of wind projects?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Is it your conclusion that this project is likely to not be market and financially feasible?</li> <li>A. It's my conclusion that the Loomis report did not provide a showing of market and financial feasibility. It's my conclusion that the report explained that limited wind energy development has occurred, and he referred to government subsidies in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: So yes or no or I don't know are excellent answers.</li> <li>A. I have not reached a conclusion about the market and financial feasibility. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the Loomis report.</li> <li>Q. Are you saying if the project isn't built there won't be any benefits?</li> <li>A. There won't be economic impacts.</li> <li>Q. If it's not built.</li> <li>A. If it's not if there's no construction, there will not be any jobs created from the project.</li> <li>Q. Do you know what the value of Invenergy's installed projects is?</li> <li>A. No, not off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Do you know what the value of the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>feasible to implement and conditions are not satisfied, none of the construction or operating impacts predicted will materialize. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the report." What's your experience in the marketing of electricity from utility-scale wind projects?</li> <li>A. I none.</li> <li>Q. And what is your experience with the financing of wind projects?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Is it your conclusion that this project is likely to not be market and financially feasible?</li> <li>A. It's my conclusion that the Loomis report did not provide a showing of market and financial feasibility. It's my conclusion that the report explained that limited wind energy development has occurred, and he referred to government subsidies in the absence of which wind energy and the solar</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: So yes or no or I don't know are excellent answers.</li> <li>A. I have not reached a conclusion about the market and financial feasibility. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the Loomis report.</li> <li>Q. Are you saying if the project isn't built there won't be any benefits?</li> <li>A. There won't be economic impacts.</li> <li>Q. If it's not built.</li> <li>A. If it's not if there's no construction, there will not be any jobs created from the project.</li> <li>Q. Do you know what the value of Invenergy's installed projects is?</li> <li>A. No, not off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Do you know what the value of the company's equity is in those projects?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>feasible to implement and conditions are not satisfied, none of the construction or operating impacts predicted will materialize. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the report." What's your experience in the marketing of electricity from utility-scale wind projects?</li> <li>A. I none.</li> <li>Q. And what is your experience with the financing of wind projects?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Is it your conclusion that this project is likely to not be market and financially feasible?</li> <li>A. It's my conclusion that the Loomis report did not provide a showing of market and financial feasibility. It's my conclusion that the report explained that limited wind energy development has occurred, and he referred to government subsidies in the absence of which wind energy and the solar energy, for that matter, tend not to be financially</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: So yes or no or I don't know are excellent answers.</li> <li>A. I have not reached a conclusion about the market and financial feasibility. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the Loomis report.</li> <li>Q. Are you saying if the project isn't built there won't be any benefits?</li> <li>A. There won't be economic impacts.</li> <li>Q. If it's not built.</li> <li>A. If it's not if there's no construction, there will not be any jobs created from the project.</li> <li>Q. Do you know what the value of Invenergy's installed projects is?</li> <li>A. No, not off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Do you know what the value of the company's equity is in those projects? MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, relevance.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>feasible to implement and conditions are not satisfied, none of the construction or operating impacts predicted will materialize. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the report." What's your experience in the marketing of electricity from utility-scale wind projects?</li> <li>A. I none.</li> <li>Q. And what is your experience with the financing of wind projects?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Is it your conclusion that this project is likely to not be market and financially feasible?</li> <li>A. It's my conclusion that the Loomis report did not provide a showing of market and financial feasibility. It's my conclusion that the report explained that limited wind energy development has occurred, and he referred to government subsidies in the absence of which wind energy and the solar energy, for that matter, tend not to be financially feasible.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: So yes or no or I don't know are excellent answers.</li> <li>A. I have not reached a conclusion about the market and financial feasibility. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the Loomis report.</li> <li>Q. Are you saying if the project isn't built there won't be any benefits?</li> <li>A. There won't be economic impacts.</li> <li>Q. If it's not built.</li> <li>A. If it's not if there's no construction, there will not be any jobs created from the project.</li> <li>Q. Do you know what the value of Invenergy's installed projects is?</li> <li>A. No, not off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Do you know what the value of the company's equity is in those projects? MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, relevance.</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>feasible to implement and conditions are not satisfied, none of the construction or operating impacts predicted will materialize. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the report." What's your experience in the marketing of electricity from utility-scale wind projects?</li> <li>A. I none.</li> <li>Q. And what is your experience with the financing of wind projects?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Is it your conclusion that this project is likely to not be market and financially feasible?</li> <li>A. It's my conclusion that the Loomis report did not provide a showing of market and financial feasibility. It's my conclusion that the report explained that limited wind energy development has occurred, and he referred to government subsidies in the absence of which wind energy and the solar energy, for that matter, tend not to be financially feasible.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: So yes or no or I don't know are excellent answers.</li> <li>A. I have not reached a conclusion about the market and financial feasibility. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the Loomis report.</li> <li>Q. Are you saying if the project isn't built there won't be any benefits?</li> <li>A. There won't be economic impacts.</li> <li>Q. If it's not built.</li> <li>A. If it's not if there's no construction, there will not be any jobs created from the project.</li> <li>Q. Do you know what the value of Invenergy's installed projects is?</li> <li>A. No, not off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Do you know what the value of the company's equity is in those projects? MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, relevance.</li> <li>A. No. MR. BLAZER: He just made a number of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>feasible to implement and conditions are not satisfied, none of the construction or operating impacts predicted will materialize. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the report." What's your experience in the marketing of electricity from utility-scale wind projects?</li> <li>A. I none.</li> <li>Q. And what is your experience with the financing of wind projects?</li> <li>A. None.</li> <li>Q. Is it your conclusion that this project is likely to not be market and financially feasible?</li> <li>A. It's my conclusion that the Loomis report did not provide a showing of market and financial feasibility. It's my conclusion that the report explained that limited wind energy development has occurred, and he referred to government subsidies in the absence of which wind energy and the solar energy, for that matter, tend not to be financially feasible.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: So yes or no or I don't know are excellent answers.</li> <li>A. I have not reached a conclusion about the market and financial feasibility. No showing of feasibility is made by the author in the Loomis report.</li> <li>Q. Are you saying if the project isn't built there won't be any benefits?</li> <li>A. There won't be economic impacts.</li> <li>Q. If it's not built.</li> <li>A. If it's not if there's no construction, there will not be any jobs created from the project.</li> <li>Q. Do you know what the value of Invenergy's installed projects is?</li> <li>A. No, not off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Do you know what the value of the company's equity is in those projects? MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, relevance.</li> <li>A. No. MR. BLAZER: He just made a number of statements regarding the feasibility of this</li> </ul>

	INGSTON COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS		January 26, 201
	Page 1644		Page 1646
1	statements about the feasibility of this project.	1	testified to the value of the project nor the
2	CHAIRMAN CORNALE: We'll sustain the	2	salability of the energy, so you can't ask the
3	objection. We just need to move on.	3	witness nowhere in the record can we find the
4	BY MR. BLAZER:	4	total value nor the salability of the power. You
5	Q. All right. Do you know what the Renewable	5	don't have a contract for that. So you're asking
6	Portfolio Standard is?	6	him to speculate, there again, on unknowns.
7	MR. LUETKEHANS: Same objection.	7	So with that
8	MR. BLAZER: Well, he's talking about	8	AUDIENCE VOICE: Cut him off.
9	feasibility and I can't ask him a question about the	9	CHAIRMAN CORNALE: we need to move on.
.0	Renewable Portfolio Standard just because Mr.	10	You can continue in these questions, but make sure
1	Luetkehans is in a rush?	11	they're valid and they don't infer anything that we
2	MR. LUETKEHANS: I'm not no, that's	12	don't know. We've asked those questions and they
3	that's very improper. The point is he has said a	13	haven't been answered. We've asked we've asked
.4	number of times he didn't do this. He hasn't made	14	the value of individual wind turbines, how much they
5	that analysis. There's no doubt about it, he didn't	15	cost. Mr. Luetkehans has asked that.
.6	make the analysis. He's only testifying to what	16	MR. BLAZER: I'm sorry, Mr. Cornale, but
.7	Loomis did in this regard. We don't have the	17	Mr. Parzyck testified to that last week in response
.8	hundreds of thousands of dollars that Invenergy has	18	to Mr. Griffin's questions.
.9	to do this.	19	CHAIRMAN CORNALE: He did not. There
20	MR. BLAZER: Except for the fact in his	20	is nowhere within the record will it show what
21	report on page 5 he talks about uncertainties	21	the value of each wind turbine is.
22	surrounding wind energy I'll read it into the	22	BY MR. BLAZER:
23	record. Page 5.	23	Q. Still on page 5, Mr. Gruen, you say, "The
24	<b>MR. LUETKEHANS:</b> It's already in the	24	report provides no indication that demand exists for
	Page 1645		Page 1647
1	record.	1	the power or that it will be financially feasible to
2	BY MR. BLAZER:	2	develop and operate the proposed wind energy
3	Q. "In fact, on page 2	3	facility wind energy project," excuse me. Have
4	MR. LUETKEHANS: It's already in the	4	you read any of the testimony in this case regarding
5	record.	5	the financial feasibility of this project?
6	Q of the report the author states:	6	A. No, I was referring to the report here.
7			
	Because of the uncertainties surrounding wind energy	7	Q. Okay. Still on the same paragraph, you
8	policy, the industry only installed 1,087 megawatts	7 8	
8 9			say, "We understand that another wind energy project
9	policy, the industry only installed 1,087 megawatts in 2013. The author does not state that the policy has been changed in 2014 to remove the uncertainty	8	say, "We understand that another wind energy project has been proposed but not constructed in Livingston County suggesting that obtaining power off-take
9 L0	policy, the industry only installed 1,087 megawatts in 2013. The author does not state that the policy has been changed in 2014 to remove the uncertainty that has kept wind energy projects from being	8 9	say, "We understand that another wind energy project has been proposed but not constructed in Livingston County suggesting that obtaining power off-take agreements that make construction and operation
9 LO L1	policy, the industry only installed 1,087 megawatts in 2013. The author does not state that the policy has been changed in 2014 to remove the uncertainty	8 9 10	say, "We understand that another wind energy project has been proposed but not constructed in Livingston County suggesting that obtaining power off-take agreements that make construction and operation feasible to implement is not assured and that
9 LO L1 L2	<ul> <li>policy, the industry only installed 1,087 megawatts in 2013. The author does not state that the policy has been changed in 2014 to remove the uncertainty that has kept wind energy projects from being feasible to build."</li> <li>A. I'm referring to Dr. Loomis's statements</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11	say, "We understand that another wind energy project has been proposed but not constructed in Livingston County suggesting that obtaining power off-take agreements that make construction and operation feasible to implement is not assured and that existing competing supply alternatives will tend to
9 LO L1 L2 L3	<ul> <li>policy, the industry only installed 1,087 megawatts in 2013. The author does not state that the policy has been changed in 2014 to remove the uncertainty that has kept wind energy projects from being feasible to build."</li> <li>A. I'm referring to Dr. Loomis's statements in that section.</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12	say, "We understand that another wind energy project has been proposed but not constructed in Livingston County suggesting that obtaining power off-take agreements that make construction and operation feasible to implement is not assured and that existing competing supply alternatives will tend to hold down attainable prices, which will make clearly
9 L0 L1 L2 L3 L4	<ul> <li>policy, the industry only installed 1,087 megawatts in 2013. The author does not state that the policy has been changed in 2014 to remove the uncertainty that has kept wind energy projects from being feasible to build."</li> <li>A. I'm referring to Dr. Loomis's statements in that section.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you have no independent</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13	say, "We understand that another wind energy project has been proposed but not constructed in Livingston County suggesting that obtaining power off-take agreements that make construction and operation feasible to implement is not assured and that existing competing supply alternatives will tend to hold down attainable prices, which will make clearly the feasibility threshold that much more risky and
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>policy, the industry only installed 1,087 megawatts in 2013. The author does not state that the policy has been changed in 2014 to remove the uncertainty that has kept wind energy projects from being feasible to build."</li> <li>A. I'm referring to Dr. Loomis's statements in that section.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you have no independent knowledge about anything you said there.</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	say, "We understand that another wind energy project has been proposed but not constructed in Livingston County suggesting that obtaining power off-take agreements that make construction and operation feasible to implement is not assured and that existing competing supply alternatives will tend to hold down attainable prices, which will make clearly the feasibility threshold that much more risky and uncertain." Now, that's your statement, right?
9 L0 L1 L2 L3 L4 L5 L6	<ul> <li>policy, the industry only installed 1,087 megawatts in 2013. The author does not state that the policy has been changed in 2014 to remove the uncertainty that has kept wind energy projects from being feasible to build."</li> <li>A. I'm referring to Dr. Loomis's statements in that section.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you have no independent knowledge about anything you said there.</li> <li>A. I'm not</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	say, "We understand that another wind energy project has been proposed but not constructed in Livingston County suggesting that obtaining power off-take agreements that make construction and operation feasible to implement is not assured and that existing competing supply alternatives will tend to hold down attainable prices, which will make clearly the feasibility threshold that much more risky and uncertain." Now, that's your statement, right? That's not a statement from Dr. Loomis's report.
9 110 111 122 113 114 115 116 117 118	<ul> <li>policy, the industry only installed 1,087 megawatts in 2013. The author does not state that the policy has been changed in 2014 to remove the uncertainty that has kept wind energy projects from being feasible to build."</li> <li>A. I'm referring to Dr. Loomis's statements in that section.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you have no independent knowledge about anything you said there.</li> <li>A. I'm not MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, argumentative.</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	say, "We understand that another wind energy project has been proposed but not constructed in Livingston County suggesting that obtaining power off-take agreements that make construction and operation feasible to implement is not assured and that existing competing supply alternatives will tend to hold down attainable prices, which will make clearly the feasibility threshold that much more risky and uncertain." Now, that's your statement, right? That's not a statement from Dr. Loomis's report. <b>A. Right.</b>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>policy, the industry only installed 1,087 megawatts in 2013. The author does not state that the policy has been changed in 2014 to remove the uncertainty that has kept wind energy projects from being feasible to build."</li> <li>A. I'm referring to Dr. Loomis's statements in that section.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you have no independent knowledge about anything you said there.</li> <li>A. I'm not MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, argumentative.</li> <li>A sure I understand your question.</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	say, "We understand that another wind energy project has been proposed but not constructed in Livingston County suggesting that obtaining power off-take agreements that make construction and operation feasible to implement is not assured and that existing competing supply alternatives will tend to hold down attainable prices, which will make clearly the feasibility threshold that much more risky and uncertain." Now, that's your statement, right? That's not a statement from Dr. Loomis's report. <b>A. Right.</b> Q. Okay.
9 L0 L1 L2 L3 L4 L5 L6 L7 L8 L9 20	<ul> <li>policy, the industry only installed 1,087 megawatts in 2013. The author does not state that the policy has been changed in 2014 to remove the uncertainty that has kept wind energy projects from being feasible to build."</li> <li>A. I'm referring to Dr. Loomis's statements in that section.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you have no independent knowledge about anything you said there.</li> <li>A. I'm not MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, argumentative.</li> <li>A sure I understand your question. MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, form.</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>say, "We understand that another wind energy project has been proposed but not constructed in Livingston County suggesting that obtaining power off-take agreements that make construction and operation feasible to implement is not assured and that existing competing supply alternatives will tend to hold down attainable prices, which will make clearly the feasibility threshold that much more risky and uncertain." Now, that's your statement, right? That's not a statement from Dr. Loomis's report.</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And it's referring to the articles and</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>policy, the industry only installed 1,087 megawatts in 2013. The author does not state that the policy has been changed in 2014 to remove the uncertainty that has kept wind energy projects from being feasible to build."</li> <li>A. I'm referring to Dr. Loomis's statements in that section.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you have no independent knowledge about anything you said there.</li> <li>A. I'm not MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, argumentative.</li> <li>A sure I understand your question. MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, form. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, you guys.</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>say, "We understand that another wind energy project has been proposed but not constructed in Livingston County suggesting that obtaining power off-take agreements that make construction and operation feasible to implement is not assured and that existing competing supply alternatives will tend to hold down attainable prices, which will make clearly the feasibility threshold that much more risky and uncertain." Now, that's your statement, right? That's not a statement from Dr. Loomis's report.</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And it's referring to the articles and database on footnote 5, page 5.</li> </ul>
9 L0 L1 L2 L3 L4 L5 L6 L7 L8 L9 20 21 22	<ul> <li>policy, the industry only installed 1,087 megawatts in 2013. The author does not state that the policy has been changed in 2014 to remove the uncertainty that has kept wind energy projects from being feasible to build."</li> <li>A. I'm referring to Dr. Loomis's statements in that section.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you have no independent knowledge about anything you said there.</li> <li>A. I'm not MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, argumentative.</li> <li>A sure I understand your question. MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, form. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, you guys.</li> <li>A. Can you restate it?</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>say, "We understand that another wind energy project has been proposed but not constructed in Livingston County suggesting that obtaining power off-take agreements that make construction and operation feasible to implement is not assured and that existing competing supply alternatives will tend to hold down attainable prices, which will make clearly the feasibility threshold that much more risky and uncertain." Now, that's your statement, right? That's not a statement from Dr. Loomis's report.</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And it's referring to the articles and database on footnote 5, page 5.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know what company that was</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>policy, the industry only installed 1,087 megawatts in 2013. The author does not state that the policy has been changed in 2014 to remove the uncertainty that has kept wind energy projects from being feasible to build."</li> <li>A. I'm referring to Dr. Loomis's statements in that section.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you have no independent knowledge about anything you said there.</li> <li>A. I'm not MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, argumentative.</li> <li>A sure I understand your question. MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, form. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, you guys.</li> <li>A. Can you restate it? CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Hold on. There's too</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>say, "We understand that another wind energy project has been proposed but not constructed in Livingston County suggesting that obtaining power off-take agreements that make construction and operation feasible to implement is not assured and that existing competing supply alternatives will tend to hold down attainable prices, which will make clearly the feasibility threshold that much more risky and uncertain." Now, that's your statement, right? That's not a statement from Dr. Loomis's report.</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And it's referring to the articles and database on footnote 5, page 5.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know what company that was that you're referring to?</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>policy, the industry only installed 1,087 megawatts in 2013. The author does not state that the policy has been changed in 2014 to remove the uncertainty that has kept wind energy projects from being feasible to build."</li> <li>A. I'm referring to Dr. Loomis's statements in that section.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you have no independent knowledge about anything you said there.</li> <li>A. I'm not MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, argumentative.</li> <li>A sure I understand your question. MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, form. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, you guys.</li> <li>A. Can you restate it?</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>say, "We understand that another wind energy project has been proposed but not constructed in Livingston County suggesting that obtaining power off-take agreements that make construction and operation feasible to implement is not assured and that existing competing supply alternatives will tend to hold down attainable prices, which will make clearly the feasibility threshold that much more risky and uncertain." Now, that's your statement, right? That's not a statement from Dr. Loomis's report.</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And it's referring to the articles and database on footnote 5, page 5.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know what company that was</li> </ul>

-			January 20, 2015
	Page 1648		Page 1650
1	Q. All right. And have you spoken with	1	Loomis's report.
2	anyone from Iberdrola	2	Q. Well, are you saying that because a county
3	A. No.	3	resident stops working, let's say, as a machine
4	Q to find out why the project wasn't	4	operator at Donnelley or an electrician at
5	built?	5	Caterpillar to become a wind turbine technician,
6	A. No.	6	that machine operator job or that electrician job
7	Q. Do you know whether that had something to	7	will disappear?
8	do with energy policy or another reason?	8	A. I'm saying that it would not be a net new
9	A. It refers to the article I read said	9	job by moving over to the wind energy project, and
10	they were having trouble finding a buyer for the	10	whether the job disappears or not depends on a host
11	project. "We generally look for a long-term	11	of factors including whether by the new power
12	contract before we begin construction but not	12	facility taking labor, whether it raises prices
13	always. We don't have a long-term buyer for that	13	beyond what the other employers would be able to
14	project and that speaks to market condition of	14	pay. So there's a bunch of factors. And whether
15	prospective developments." And that's what I'm	15	they use that opportunity to automate or otherwise
16	familiar with from the article. I'm not familiar	16	become more efficient and not replace that job I
17	with other issues unless it's referred to in the	17	really can't tell you, but it wouldn't be considered
18	article.	18	a new or net job if one, if they left one job for
19	Q. And what year are you referring to for	19	another, it's considered no net new the way the
20	those market conditions?	20	models work.
21	A. Well, it was an August 28, 2014, issue of	21	Q. Even if Donnelley replaces that machine
22	the paper.	22	operator or Cat replaces that electrician?
23	Q. Okay. And do you know when that project	23	A. If it replaces it and then this new the
24	was permitted?	24	new job stays, then there would be a gain of one.
	1		
	Page 1649		Page 1651
-	-	1	
1	A. Well, it said, according to the article,	1	Q. Natural gas right now is at pretty low
2	A. Well, it said, according to the article, I'm again just reading from page 5, ''In 2009 it	2	Q. Natural gas right now is at pretty low prices, right?
2 3	A. Well, it said, according to the article, I'm again just reading from page 5, "In 2009 it received a special use permit to construct 100 wind	2 3	<ul><li>Q. Natural gas right now is at pretty low prices, right?</li><li>A. Yes.</li></ul>
2 3 4	A. Well, it said, according to the article, I'm again just reading from page 5, "In 2009 it received a special use permit to construct 100 wind turbines." So I'm assuming 2009.	2 3 4	<ul> <li>Q. Natural gas right now is at pretty low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Historically low.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. Well, it said, according to the article,</li> <li>I'm again just reading from page 5, "In 2009 it received a special use permit to construct 100 wind turbines." So I'm assuming 2009.</li> <li>Q. All right. And do you know when that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. Natural gas right now is at pretty low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Historically low.</li> <li>A. I don't follow natural gas prices over</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. Well, it said, according to the article,</li> <li>I'm again just reading from page 5, "In 2009 it received a special use permit to construct 100 wind turbines." So I'm assuming 2009.</li> <li>Q. All right. And do you know when that project was withdrawn?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. Natural gas right now is at pretty low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Historically low.</li> <li>A. I don't follow natural gas prices over time.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. Well, it said, according to the article,</li> <li>I'm again just reading from page 5, "In 2009 it received a special use permit to construct 100 wind turbines." So I'm assuming 2009.</li> <li>Q. All right. And do you know when that project was withdrawn?</li> <li>A. Not not off the top of my head.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Natural gas right now is at pretty low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Historically low.</li> <li>A. I don't follow natural gas prices over time.</li> <li>Q. Wholesale electricity is also at low</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. Well, it said, according to the article,</li> <li>I'm again just reading from page 5, "In 2009 it received a special use permit to construct 100 wind turbines." So I'm assuming 2009.</li> <li>Q. All right. And do you know when that project was withdrawn?</li> <li>A. Not not off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. If I told you 2010, would you have any</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Natural gas right now is at pretty low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Historically low.</li> <li>A. I don't follow natural gas prices over time.</li> <li>Q. Wholesale electricity is also at low prices, right?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Well, it said, according to the article,</li> <li>I'm again just reading from page 5, "In 2009 it received a special use permit to construct 100 wind turbines." So I'm assuming 2009.</li> <li>Q. All right. And do you know when that project was withdrawn?</li> <li>A. Not not off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. If I told you 2010, would you have any reason to disagree with me?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Natural gas right now is at pretty low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Historically low.</li> <li>A. I don't follow natural gas prices over time.</li> <li>Q. Wholesale electricity is also at low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Again, I believe prices are low in all the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. Well, it said, according to the article,</li> <li>I'm again just reading from page 5, "In 2009 it received a special use permit to construct 100 wind turbines." So I'm assuming 2009.</li> <li>Q. All right. And do you know when that project was withdrawn?</li> <li>A. Not not off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. If I told you 2010, would you have any reason to disagree with me?</li> <li>A. You can tell me anything. I'd have no</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. Natural gas right now is at pretty low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Historically low.</li> <li>A. I don't follow natural gas prices over time.</li> <li>Q. Wholesale electricity is also at low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Again, I believe prices are low in all the utilities.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. Well, it said, according to the article,</li> <li>I'm again just reading from page 5, "In 2009 it received a special use permit to construct 100 wind turbines." So I'm assuming 2009.</li> <li>Q. All right. And do you know when that project was withdrawn?</li> <li>A. Not not off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. If I told you 2010, would you have any reason to disagree with me?</li> <li>A. You can tell me anything. I'd have no reason to disagree with you on this.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Natural gas right now is at pretty low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Historically low.</li> <li>A. I don't follow natural gas prices over time.</li> <li>Q. Wholesale electricity is also at low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Again, I believe prices are low in all the utilities.</li> <li>Q. Has any wind farm in Illinois that's been</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. Well, it said, according to the article,</li> <li>I'm again just reading from page 5, "In 2009 it received a special use permit to construct 100 wind turbines." So I'm assuming 2009.</li> <li>Q. All right. And do you know when that project was withdrawn?</li> <li>A. Not not off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. If I told you 2010, would you have any reason to disagree with me?</li> <li>A. You can tell me anything. I'd have no reason to disagree with you on this.</li> <li>Q. All right. Page 6 of your report, second</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Natural gas right now is at pretty low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Historically low.</li> <li>A. I don't follow natural gas prices over time.</li> <li>Q. Wholesale electricity is also at low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Again, I believe prices are low in all the utilities.</li> <li>Q. Has any wind farm in Illinois that's been built ceased to operate as of today?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Well, it said, according to the article,</li> <li>I'm again just reading from page 5, "In 2009 it received a special use permit to construct 100 wind turbines." So I'm assuming 2009.</li> <li>Q. All right. And do you know when that project was withdrawn?</li> <li>A. Not not off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. If I told you 2010, would you have any reason to disagree with me?</li> <li>A. You can tell me anything. I'd have no reason to disagree with you on this.</li> <li>Q. All right. Page 6 of your report, second paragraph, "The gross job estimates presented in the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Natural gas right now is at pretty low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Historically low.</li> <li>A. I don't follow natural gas prices over time.</li> <li>Q. Wholesale electricity is also at low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Again, I believe prices are low in all the utilities.</li> <li>Q. Has any wind farm in Illinois that's been built ceased to operate as of today?</li> <li>A. I don't know.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Well, it said, according to the article,</li> <li>I'm again just reading from page 5, "In 2009 it received a special use permit to construct 100 wind turbines." So I'm assuming 2009.</li> <li>Q. All right. And do you know when that project was withdrawn?</li> <li>A. Not not off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. If I told you 2010, would you have any reason to disagree with me?</li> <li>A. You can tell me anything. I'd have no reason to disagree with you on this.</li> <li>Q. All right. Page 6 of your report, second paragraph, "The gross job estimates presented in the report do not take into account net effects on jobs,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Natural gas right now is at pretty low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Historically low.</li> <li>A. I don't follow natural gas prices over time.</li> <li>Q. Wholesale electricity is also at low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Again, I believe prices are low in all the utilities.</li> <li>Q. Has any wind farm in Illinois that's been built ceased to operate as of today?</li> <li>A. I don't know.</li> <li>Q. You said before when we were talking about</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Well, it said, according to the article, I'm again just reading from page 5, "In 2009 it received a special use permit to construct 100 wind turbines." So I'm assuming 2009.</li> <li>Q. All right. And do you know when that project was withdrawn?</li> <li>A. Not not off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. If I told you 2010, would you have any reason to disagree with me?</li> <li>A. You can tell me anything. I'd have no reason to disagree with you on this.</li> <li>Q. All right. Page 6 of your report, second paragraph, "The gross job estimates presented in the report do not take into account net effects on jobs, such as displacement of other jobs by the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Natural gas right now is at pretty low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Historically low.</li> <li>A. I don't follow natural gas prices over time.</li> <li>Q. Wholesale electricity is also at low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Again, I believe prices are low in all the utilities.</li> <li>Q. Has any wind farm in Illinois that's been built ceased to operate as of today?</li> <li>A. I don't know.</li> <li>Q. You said before when we were talking about the peer-reviewed study that actual projects</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. Well, it said, according to the article,</li> <li>I'm again just reading from page 5, "In 2009 it received a special use permit to construct 100 wind turbines." So I'm assuming 2009.</li> <li>Q. All right. And do you know when that project was withdrawn?</li> <li>A. Not not off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. If I told you 2010, would you have any reason to disagree with me?</li> <li>A. You can tell me anything. I'd have no reason to disagree with you on this.</li> <li>Q. All right. Page 6 of your report, second paragraph, "The gross job estimates presented in the report do not take into account net effects on jobs, such as displacement of other jobs by the construction of the proposed wind energy project or</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Natural gas right now is at pretty low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Historically low.</li> <li>A. I don't follow natural gas prices over time.</li> <li>Q. Wholesale electricity is also at low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Again, I believe prices are low in all the utilities.</li> <li>Q. Has any wind farm in Illinois that's been built ceased to operate as of today?</li> <li>A. I don't know.</li> <li>Q. You said before when we were talking about the peer-reviewed study that actual projects reported would be relevant. Do you remember saying</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Well, it said, according to the article,</li> <li>I'm again just reading from page 5, "In 2009 it received a special use permit to construct 100 wind turbines." So I'm assuming 2009.</li> <li>Q. All right. And do you know when that project was withdrawn?</li> <li>A. Not not off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. If I told you 2010, would you have any reason to disagree with me?</li> <li>A. You can tell me anything. I'd have no reason to disagree with you on this.</li> <li>Q. All right. Page 6 of your report, second paragraph, "The gross job estimates presented in the report do not take into account net effects on jobs, such as displacement of other jobs by the construction of the proposed wind energy project or the impacts of potentially changing electricity or</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Natural gas right now is at pretty low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Historically low.</li> <li>A. I don't follow natural gas prices over time.</li> <li>Q. Wholesale electricity is also at low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Again, I believe prices are low in all the utilities.</li> <li>Q. Has any wind farm in Illinois that's been built ceased to operate as of today?</li> <li>A. I don't know.</li> <li>Q. You said before when we were talking about the peer-reviewed study that actual projects reported would be relevant. Do you remember saying that a few moments ago?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Well, it said, according to the article, I'm again just reading from page 5, "In 2009 it received a special use permit to construct 100 wind turbines." So I'm assuming 2009.</li> <li>Q. All right. And do you know when that project was withdrawn?</li> <li>A. Not not off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. If I told you 2010, would you have any reason to disagree with me?</li> <li>A. You can tell me anything. I'd have no reason to disagree with you on this.</li> <li>Q. All right. Page 6 of your report, second paragraph, "The gross job estimates presented in the report do not take into account net effects on jobs, such as displacement of other jobs by the construction of the proposed wind energy project or the impacts of potentially changing electricity or fuel prices that could change the demand for workers</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Natural gas right now is at pretty low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Historically low.</li> <li>A. I don't follow natural gas prices over time.</li> <li>Q. Wholesale electricity is also at low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Again, I believe prices are low in all the utilities.</li> <li>Q. Has any wind farm in Illinois that's been built ceased to operate as of today?</li> <li>A. I don't know.</li> <li>Q. You said before when we were talking about the peer-reviewed study that actual projects reported would be relevant. Do you remember saying that a few moments ago?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Well, it said, according to the article, I'm again just reading from page 5, "In 2009 it received a special use permit to construct 100 wind turbines." So I'm assuming 2009.</li> <li>Q. All right. And do you know when that project was withdrawn?</li> <li>A. Not not off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. If I told you 2010, would you have any reason to disagree with me?</li> <li>A. You can tell me anything. I'd have no reason to disagree with you on this.</li> <li>Q. All right. Page 6 of your report, second paragraph, "The gross job estimates presented in the report do not take into account net effects on jobs, such as displacement of other jobs by the construction of the proposed wind energy project or the impacts of potentially changing electricity or fuel prices that could change the demand for workers and services associated with the plan." Are you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Natural gas right now is at pretty low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Historically low.</li> <li>A. I don't follow natural gas prices over time.</li> <li>Q. Wholesale electricity is also at low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Again, I believe prices are low in all the utilities.</li> <li>Q. Has any wind farm in Illinois that's been built ceased to operate as of today?</li> <li>A. I don't know.</li> <li>Q. You said before when we were talking about the peer-reviewed study that actual projects reported would be relevant. Do you remember saying that a few moments ago?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. I've handed you what's been marked as</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Well, it said, according to the article, I'm again just reading from page 5, "In 2009 it received a special use permit to construct 100 wind turbines." So I'm assuming 2009.</li> <li>Q. All right. And do you know when that project was withdrawn?</li> <li>A. Not not off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. If I told you 2010, would you have any reason to disagree with me?</li> <li>A. You can tell me anything. I'd have no reason to disagree with you on this.</li> <li>Q. All right. Page 6 of your report, second paragraph, "The gross job estimates presented in the report do not take into account net effects on jobs, such as displacement of other jobs by the construction of the proposed wind energy project or the impacts of potentially changing electricity or fuel prices that could change the demand for workers</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Natural gas right now is at pretty low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Historically low.</li> <li>A. I don't follow natural gas prices over time.</li> <li>Q. Wholesale electricity is also at low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Again, I believe prices are low in all the utilities.</li> <li>Q. Has any wind farm in Illinois that's been built ceased to operate as of today?</li> <li>A. I don't know.</li> <li>Q. You said before when we were talking about the peer-reviewed study that actual projects reported would be relevant. Do you remember saying that a few moments ago?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. Well, it said, according to the article, I'm again just reading from page 5, "In 2009 it received a special use permit to construct 100 wind turbines." So I'm assuming 2009.</li> <li>Q. All right. And do you know when that project was withdrawn?</li> <li>A. Not not off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. If I told you 2010, would you have any reason to disagree with me?</li> <li>A. You can tell me anything. I'd have no reason to disagree with you on this.</li> <li>Q. All right. Page 6 of your report, second paragraph, "The gross job estimates presented in the report do not take into account net effects on jobs, such as displacement of other jobs by the construction of the proposed wind energy project or the impacts of potentially changing electricity or fuel prices that could change the demand for workers and services associated with the plan." Are you talking here about employees or about jobs?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Natural gas right now is at pretty low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Historically low.</li> <li>A. I don't follow natural gas prices over time.</li> <li>Q. Wholesale electricity is also at low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Again, I believe prices are low in all the utilities.</li> <li>Q. Has any wind farm in Illinois that's been built ceased to operate as of today?</li> <li>A. I don't know.</li> <li>Q. You said before when we were talking about the peer-reviewed study that actual projects reported would be relevant. Do you remember saying that a few moments ago?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. I've handed you what's been marked as Pleasant Ridge Exhibit 124, Wind Energy Development</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Well, it said, according to the article, I'm again just reading from page 5, "In 2009 it received a special use permit to construct 100 wind turbines." So I'm assuming 2009.</li> <li>Q. All right. And do you know when that project was withdrawn?</li> <li>A. Not not off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. If I told you 2010, would you have any reason to disagree with me?</li> <li>A. You can tell me anything. I'd have no reason to disagree with you on this.</li> <li>Q. All right. Page 6 of your report, second paragraph, "The gross job estimates presented in the report do not take into account net effects on jobs, such as displacement of other jobs by the construction of the proposed wind energy project or the impacts of potentially changing electricity or fuel prices that could change the demand for workers and services associated with the plan." Are you talking here about employees or about jobs?</li> <li>A. Well, the nature of the analysis presented</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Natural gas right now is at pretty low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Historically low.</li> <li>A. I don't follow natural gas prices over time.</li> <li>Q. Wholesale electricity is also at low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Again, I believe prices are low in all the utilities.</li> <li>Q. Has any wind farm in Illinois that's been built ceased to operate as of today?</li> <li>A. I don't know.</li> <li>Q. You said before when we were talking about the peer-reviewed study that actual projects reported would be relevant. Do you remember saying that a few moments ago?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. I've handed you what's been marked as Pleasant Ridge Exhibit 124, Wind Energy Development in Illinois, June 2012. And you'll note it's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Well, it said, according to the article, I'm again just reading from page 5, "In 2009 it received a special use permit to construct 100 wind turbines." So I'm assuming 2009.</li> <li>Q. All right. And do you know when that project was withdrawn?</li> <li>A. Not not off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. If I told you 2010, would you have any reason to disagree with me?</li> <li>A. You can tell me anything. I'd have no reason to disagree with you on this.</li> <li>Q. All right. Page 6 of your report, second paragraph, "The gross job estimates presented in the report do not take into account net effects on jobs, such as displacement of other jobs by the construction of the proposed wind energy project or the impacts of potentially changing electricity or fuel prices that could change the demand for workers and services associated with the plan." Are you talking here about employees or about jobs?</li> <li>A. Well, the nature of the analysis presented are both. If you have fewer employees, you're going</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Natural gas right now is at pretty low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Historically low.</li> <li>A. I don't follow natural gas prices over time.</li> <li>Q. Wholesale electricity is also at low prices, right?</li> <li>A. Again, I believe prices are low in all the utilities.</li> <li>Q. Has any wind farm in Illinois that's been built ceased to operate as of today?</li> <li>A. I don't know.</li> <li>Q. You said before when we were talking about the peer-reviewed study that actual projects reported would be relevant. Do you remember saying that a few moments ago?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. I've handed you what's been marked as Pleasant Ridge Exhibit 124, Wind Energy Development in Illinois, June 2012. And you'll note it's page 4, footnote 4 of your report. This is this</li> </ul>

			January 20, 2013
	Page 1652		Page 1654
1	You say June 2010. Looks like you looked at an	1	Q. Okay. Could you go to page 6 of Exhibit
2	older one, huh?	2	124, the economic the Wind Energy Development in
3	A. Apparently.	3	Illinois, June 2012, the one I handed you a few
4	Q. All right. Have you read this one?	4	moments ago. Could you go to page 6?
5	A. Frankly I don't recall.	5	A. Yes.
6	Q. All right. Page 8, third paragraph of	6	Q. Now, you do acknowledge that this is a
7	your report you say, "We suspect that the induced	7	retrospective report, it's backward-looking?
8	economic impact estimates presented for construction	8	A. Since I don't recall reading this
9	and ongoing operations may be overstated if the	9	particular one, again, I'm not going I'll take
10	author assumed that 100 percent of the wage payroll	10	your word for it.
11	expenditures will remain within the county."	11	Q. Okay.
12	If I told you that Dr. Loomis did not	12	A. I'm not going to spend the time to read
13	assume 100 percent of expenditures will remain	13	it, but
14	within the county, would that address your	14	Q. I'm only going to ask you I'm only
15	suspicion?	15	going to ask you about one part of it.
16	A. It would depend on the amount by which he	16	A. Okay.
17	assumed it would not stay, but it would depend on	17	Q. It's I guess you would call it the
18	the actual number. It wasn't provided in the	18	third full paragraph on page 6.
19	report.	19	CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, the witness
20	Q. What percentage would you assume?	20	can't testify to this. He hasn't read it, so he
21	A. I'm not in a position to tell you.	21	can't answer questions regarding it. We don't he
22	Q. On page 11 you talk about the fact that	22	hasn't seen it. He stated that he hasn't seen it.
23	the projected impacts are not significant. Do you	23	No questions from this.
24	see where I'm referring to? Page 11 of your report.	24	Q. Do you know how many full-time equivalent
	Page 1653		Page 1655
	Page 1653		Page 1655
1	A. Yes.	1	jobs have been created by the wind industry in
2	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. How many jobs would a new industry need to</li></ul>	2	jobs have been created by the wind industry in Illinois?
2 3	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. How many jobs would a new industry need to bring to Livingston County for you to consider it</li></ul>	2 3	<ul><li>jobs have been created by the wind industry in Illinois?</li><li>A. According to page 6, 19,000 jobs.</li></ul>
2 3 4	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. How many jobs would a new industry need to bring to Livingston County for you to consider it significant?</li></ul>	2 3 4	<ul> <li>jobs have been created by the wind industry in Illinois?</li> <li>A. According to page 6, 19,000 jobs.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any reason to doubt that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. How many jobs would a new industry need to bring to Livingston County for you to consider it significant?</li> <li>A. More than one-half of 1 percent.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>jobs have been created by the wind industry in Illinois?</li><li>A. According to page 6, 19,000 jobs.</li><li>Q. Do you have any reason to doubt that number?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. How many jobs would a new industry need to bring to Livingston County for you to consider it significant?</li> <li>A. More than one-half of 1 percent.</li> <li>Q. Is there a threshold?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>jobs have been created by the wind industry in Illinois?</li> <li>A. According to page 6, 19,000 jobs.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any reason to doubt that number?</li> <li>A. Don't have any reason to accept it or</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. How many jobs would a new industry need to bring to Livingston County for you to consider it significant?</li> <li>A. More than one-half of 1 percent.</li> <li>Q. Is there a threshold?</li> <li>A. After I'd need to do a little more</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>jobs have been created by the wind industry in Illinois?</li> <li>A. According to page 6, 19,000 jobs.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any reason to doubt that number?</li> <li>A. Don't have any reason to accept it or doubt it. I haven't studied it.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. How many jobs would a new industry need to bring to Livingston County for you to consider it significant?</li> <li>A. More than one-half of 1 percent.</li> <li>Q. Is there a threshold?</li> <li>A. After I'd need to do a little more studying after this long a time here, but you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>jobs have been created by the wind industry in Illinois?</li> <li>A. According to page 6, 19,000 jobs.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any reason to doubt that number?</li> <li>A. Don't have any reason to accept it or doubt it. I haven't studied it.</li> <li>Q. Okay, you don't know. You don't know</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. How many jobs would a new industry need to bring to Livingston County for you to consider it significant?</li> <li>A. More than one-half of 1 percent.</li> <li>Q. Is there a threshold?</li> <li>A. After I'd need to do a little more studying after this long a time here, but you know, sort of how one of the Supreme Court Justices</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>jobs have been created by the wind industry in Illinois?</li> <li>A. According to page 6, 19,000 jobs.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any reason to doubt that number?</li> <li>A. Don't have any reason to accept it or doubt it. I haven't studied it.</li> <li>Q. Okay, you don't know. You don't know whether any of the information in this report is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. How many jobs would a new industry need to bring to Livingston County for you to consider it significant?</li> <li>A. More than one-half of 1 percent.</li> <li>Q. Is there a threshold?</li> <li>A. After I'd need to do a little more studying after this long a time here, but you know, sort of how one of the Supreme Court Justices defined pornography, they know it when they see it,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>jobs have been created by the wind industry in Illinois?</li> <li>A. According to page 6, 19,000 jobs.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any reason to doubt that number?</li> <li>A. Don't have any reason to accept it or doubt it. I haven't studied it.</li> <li>Q. Okay, you don't know. You don't know whether any of the information in this report is accurate, correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. How many jobs would a new industry need to bring to Livingston County for you to consider it significant?</li> <li>A. More than one-half of 1 percent.</li> <li>Q. Is there a threshold?</li> <li>A. After I'd need to do a little more studying after this long a time here, but you know, sort of how one of the Supreme Court Justices</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>jobs have been created by the wind industry in Illinois?</li> <li>A. According to page 6, 19,000 jobs.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any reason to doubt that number?</li> <li>A. Don't have any reason to accept it or doubt it. I haven't studied it.</li> <li>Q. Okay, you don't know. You don't know whether any of the information in this report is accurate, correct?</li> <li>A. Again, I'm going to tell you I don't</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. How many jobs would a new industry need to bring to Livingston County for you to consider it significant?</li> <li>A. More than one-half of 1 percent.</li> <li>Q. Is there a threshold?</li> <li>A. After I'd need to do a little more studying after this long a time here, but you know, sort of how one of the Supreme Court Justices defined pornography, they know it when they see it, and I know that one-half of 1 percent is not seeing it.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>jobs have been created by the wind industry in Illinois?</li> <li>A. According to page 6, 19,000 jobs.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any reason to doubt that number?</li> <li>A. Don't have any reason to accept it or doubt it. I haven't studied it.</li> <li>Q. Okay, you don't know. You don't know whether any of the information in this report is accurate, correct?</li> <li>A. Again, I'm going to tell you I don't recall this report. I looked at an earlier report</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. How many jobs would a new industry need to bring to Livingston County for you to consider it significant?</li> <li>A. More than one-half of 1 percent.</li> <li>Q. Is there a threshold?</li> <li>A. After I'd need to do a little more studying after this long a time here, but you know, sort of how one of the Supreme Court Justices defined pornography, they know it when they see it, and I know that one-half of 1 percent is not seeing it.</li> <li>Q. Does it vary by type of project?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>jobs have been created by the wind industry in Illinois?</li> <li>A. According to page 6, 19,000 jobs.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any reason to doubt that number?</li> <li>A. Don't have any reason to accept it or doubt it. I haven't studied it.</li> <li>Q. Okay, you don't know. You don't know whether any of the information in this report is accurate, correct?</li> <li>A. Again, I'm going to tell you I don't recall this report. I looked at an earlier report apparently, and I've not focused on aggregate data</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. How many jobs would a new industry need to bring to Livingston County for you to consider it significant?</li> <li>A. More than one-half of 1 percent.</li> <li>Q. Is there a threshold?</li> <li>A. After I'd need to do a little more studying after this long a time here, but you know, sort of how one of the Supreme Court Justices defined pornography, they know it when they see it, and I know that one-half of 1 percent is not seeing it.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>jobs have been created by the wind industry in Illinois?</li> <li>A. According to page 6, 19,000 jobs.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any reason to doubt that number?</li> <li>A. Don't have any reason to accept it or doubt it. I haven't studied it.</li> <li>Q. Okay, you don't know. You don't know whether any of the information in this report is accurate, correct?</li> <li>A. Again, I'm going to tell you I don't recall this report. I looked at an earlier report apparently, and I've not focused on aggregate data because I was looking at a specific report for a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. How many jobs would a new industry need to bring to Livingston County for you to consider it significant?</li> <li>A. More than one-half of 1 percent.</li> <li>Q. Is there a threshold?</li> <li>A. After I'd need to do a little more studying after this long a time here, but you know, sort of how one of the Supreme Court Justices defined pornography, they know it when they see it, and I know that one-half of 1 percent is not seeing it.</li> <li>Q. Does it vary by type of project?</li> <li>A. It certainly would vary by type of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>jobs have been created by the wind industry in Illinois?</li> <li>A. According to page 6, 19,000 jobs.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any reason to doubt that number?</li> <li>A. Don't have any reason to accept it or doubt it. I haven't studied it.</li> <li>Q. Okay, you don't know. You don't know whether any of the information in this report is accurate, correct?</li> <li>A. Again, I'm going to tell you I don't recall this report. I looked at an earlier report apparently, and I've not focused on aggregate data</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. How many jobs would a new industry need to bring to Livingston County for you to consider it significant?</li> <li>A. More than one-half of 1 percent.</li> <li>Q. Is there a threshold?</li> <li>A. After I'd need to do a little more studying after this long a time here, but you know, sort of how one of the Supreme Court Justices defined pornography, they know it when they see it, and I know that one-half of 1 percent is not seeing it.</li> <li>Q. Does it vary by type of project?</li> <li>A. It certainly would vary by type of project. So, for example, we recently did a study</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>jobs have been created by the wind industry in Illinois?</li> <li>A. According to page 6, 19,000 jobs.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any reason to doubt that number?</li> <li>A. Don't have any reason to accept it or doubt it. I haven't studied it.</li> <li>Q. Okay, you don't know. You don't know whether any of the information in this report is accurate, correct?</li> <li>A. Again, I'm going to tell you I don't recall this report. I looked at an earlier report apparently, and I've not focused on aggregate data because I was looking at a specific report for a specific project not statewide impacts as a whole,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. How many jobs would a new industry need to bring to Livingston County for you to consider it significant?</li> <li>A. More than one-half of 1 percent.</li> <li>Q. Is there a threshold?</li> <li>A. After I'd need to do a little more studying after this long a time here, but you know, sort of how one of the Supreme Court Justices defined pornography, they know it when they see it, and I know that one-half of 1 percent is not seeing it.</li> <li>Q. Does it vary by type of project?</li> <li>A. It certainly would vary by type of project. So, for example, we recently did a study for a research and development engineering use in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>jobs have been created by the wind industry in Illinois?</li> <li>A. According to page 6, 19,000 jobs.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any reason to doubt that number?</li> <li>A. Don't have any reason to accept it or doubt it. I haven't studied it.</li> <li>Q. Okay, you don't know. You don't know whether any of the information in this report is accurate, correct?</li> <li>A. Again, I'm going to tell you I don't recall this report. I looked at an earlier report apparently, and I've not focused on aggregate data because I was looking at a specific report for a specific project not statewide impacts as a whole, which is a different question than the impacts on</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. How many jobs would a new industry need to bring to Livingston County for you to consider it significant?</li> <li>A. More than one-half of 1 percent.</li> <li>Q. Is there a threshold?</li> <li>A. After I'd need to do a little more studying after this long a time here, but you know, sort of how one of the Supreme Court Justices defined pornography, they know it when they see it, and I know that one-half of 1 percent is not seeing it.</li> <li>Q. Does it vary by type of project?</li> <li>A. It certainly would vary by type of project. So, for example, we recently did a study for a research and development engineering use in Cook County and the average salary was \$95,000 and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>jobs have been created by the wind industry in Illinois?</li> <li>A. According to page 6, 19,000 jobs.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any reason to doubt that number?</li> <li>A. Don't have any reason to accept it or doubt it. I haven't studied it.</li> <li>Q. Okay, you don't know. You don't know whether any of the information in this report is accurate, correct?</li> <li>A. Again, I'm going to tell you I don't recall this report. I looked at an earlier report apparently, and I've not focused on aggregate data because I was looking at a specific report for a specific project not statewide impacts as a whole, which is a different question than the impacts on the local community.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. How many jobs would a new industry need to bring to Livingston County for you to consider it significant?</li> <li>A. More than one-half of 1 percent.</li> <li>Q. Is there a threshold?</li> <li>A. After I'd need to do a little more studying after this long a time here, but you know, sort of how one of the Supreme Court Justices defined pornography, they know it when they see it, and I know that one-half of 1 percent is not seeing it.</li> <li>Q. Does it vary by type of project?</li> <li>A. It certainly would vary by type of project. So, for example, we recently did a study for a research and development engineering use in Cook County and the average salary was \$95,000 and it was a significant research organization buying</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>jobs have been created by the wind industry in Illinois?</li> <li>A. According to page 6, 19,000 jobs.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any reason to doubt that number?</li> <li>A. Don't have any reason to accept it or doubt it. I haven't studied it.</li> <li>Q. Okay, you don't know. You don't know whether any of the information in this report is accurate, correct?</li> <li>A. Again, I'm going to tell you I don't recall this report. I looked at an earlier report apparently, and I've not focused on aggregate data because I was looking at a specific report for a specific project not statewide impacts as a whole, which is a different question than the impacts on the local community.</li> <li>Q. So you're looking for a specific report on</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. How many jobs would a new industry need to bring to Livingston County for you to consider it significant?</li> <li>A. More than one-half of 1 percent.</li> <li>Q. Is there a threshold?</li> <li>A. After I'd need to do a little more studying after this long a time here, but you know, sort of how one of the Supreme Court Justices defined pornography, they know it when they see it, and I know that one-half of 1 percent is not seeing it.</li> <li>Q. Does it vary by type of project?</li> <li>A. It certainly would vary by type of project. So, for example, we recently did a study for a research and development engineering use in Cook County and the average salary was \$95,000 and it was a significant research organization buying inputs from within the county in which it was</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>jobs have been created by the wind industry in Illinois?</li> <li>A. According to page 6, 19,000 jobs.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any reason to doubt that number?</li> <li>A. Don't have any reason to accept it or doubt it. I haven't studied it.</li> <li>Q. Okay, you don't know. You don't know whether any of the information in this report is accurate, correct?</li> <li>A. Again, I'm going to tell you I don't recall this report. I looked at an earlier report apparently, and I've not focused on aggregate data because I was looking at a specific report for a specific project not statewide impacts as a whole, which is a different question than the impacts on the local community.</li> <li>Q. So you're looking for a specific report on a specific project?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. How many jobs would a new industry need to bring to Livingston County for you to consider it significant?</li> <li>A. More than one-half of 1 percent.</li> <li>Q. Is there a threshold?</li> <li>A. After I'd need to do a little more studying after this long a time here, but you know, sort of how one of the Supreme Court Justices defined pornography, they know it when they see it, and I know that one-half of 1 percent is not seeing it.</li> <li>Q. Does it vary by type of project?</li> <li>A. It certainly would vary by type of project. So, for example, we recently did a study for a research and development engineering use in Cook County and the average salary was \$95,000 and it was a significant research organization buying inputs from within the county in which it was located and that did have relatively high multiplier</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>jobs have been created by the wind industry in Illinois?</li> <li>A. According to page 6, 19,000 jobs.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any reason to doubt that number?</li> <li>A. Don't have any reason to accept it or doubt it. I haven't studied it.</li> <li>Q. Okay, you don't know. You don't know whether any of the information in this report is accurate, correct?</li> <li>A. Again, I'm going to tell you I don't recall this report. I looked at an earlier report apparently, and I've not focused on aggregate data because I was looking at a specific report for a specific project not statewide impacts as a whole, which is a different question than the impacts on the local community.</li> <li>Q. So you're looking for a specific report on a specific project?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. How many jobs would a new industry need to bring to Livingston County for you to consider it significant?</li> <li>A. More than one-half of 1 percent.</li> <li>Q. Is there a threshold?</li> <li>A. After I'd need to do a little more studying after this long a time here, but you know, sort of how one of the Supreme Court Justices defined pornography, they know it when they see it, and I know that one-half of 1 percent is not seeing it.</li> <li>Q. Does it vary by type of project?</li> <li>A. It certainly would vary by type of project. So, for example, we recently did a study for a research and development engineering use in Cook County and the average salary was \$95,000 and it was a significant research organization buying inputs from within the county in which it was located and that did have relatively high multiplier effects as a result. So yes, the type of business</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>jobs have been created by the wind industry in Illinois?</li> <li>A. According to page 6, 19,000 jobs.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any reason to doubt that number?</li> <li>A. Don't have any reason to accept it or doubt it. I haven't studied it.</li> <li>Q. Okay, you don't know. You don't know whether any of the information in this report is accurate, correct?</li> <li>A. Again, I'm going to tell you I don't recall this report. I looked at an earlier report apparently, and I've not focused on aggregate data because I was looking at a specific report for a specific project not statewide impacts as a whole, which is a different question than the impacts on the local community.</li> <li>Q. So you're looking for a specific report on a specific project for a specific project?</li> <li>A. That's what Dr. Loomis's report was about, a specific project for a specific county. This one.</li> </ul>

24 jobs.

24 actual data from an actual project to see what the

January 26, 2015

			January 26, 2015
	Page 1656		Page 1658
-	aconomic impacts wara	-	objection pending.
1	economic impacts were.	1	
2	A. That would have put his report in better	2	CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, Mr. Blazer,
3	context.	3	it is beyond the scope of the witness. Again, his
4	Q. Okay. Mr. Gruen, this is a report dated	4	role I believe from everything I understand was to
5	November 2014 reflecting economic impacts from the	5	look at Dr. Loomis's report and decide whether in
6	California Ridge wind project that began operations	6	his expert opinion it was a valid report or not.
7	in January 2013.	7	BY MR. BLAZER:
8	MR. LUETKEHANS: A report or an article?	8	Q. You remember, Mr. Gruen, we talked earlier
9	MR. BLAZER: It's an article reporting	9	about the statement on page 1 of your report, that
10	information provided by the units of government	10	economics impacts do not measure the valuation of
11	impacted by that project.	11	changes in amenities or quality-of-life factors,
12	Q. Dr. Loomis also talked about this in his	12	such as health, safety, recreation, air or noise
13	testimony, do you remember that?	13	quality, et cetera?
14	A. I believe this article is referring to the	14	A. Yes, sir.
	-		
15	impacts on schools, and I did not have any comments	15	Q. Okay. This document I've just given you,
16	on his report about school effects.	16	Exhibit 301, is just a summary of installed wind
17	Q. Why not?	17	capacity in Illinois. I just want to ask you one
18	A. Didn't have any comments, didn't I	18	question about it and then I think I'm going to be
19	assumed he followed the procedures and the rules	19	done. It's a section on the in this document on
20	provided for valuing taxes for schools. Have no	20	environmental benefits in the context of what you
21	reason to think he wouldn't have done that properly.	21	said about environmental impacts.
22	Q. So as far as you know, the benefits from	22	This says, Generating wind power creates
23	this project for the Prairie Central School District	23	no emissions and uses virtually no water. Annual
24	that are reflected in Dr. Loomis's report are	24	state water consumption savings: 2,092,000,000
	Page 1657		Page 1659
_	-		
1	accurate?	1	gallons. The equivalent number of water bottles
2	accurate? A. As far as I know.	2	gallons. The equivalent number of water bottles saved: 22,350,000,000 actually, I'm sorry, that
2 3	<ul><li>accurate?</li><li>A. As far as I know.</li><li>Q. And if you just glance through this</li></ul>	2 3	gallons. The equivalent number of water bottles saved: 22,350,000,000 actually, I'm sorry, that is 2 trillion 92 billion
2 3 4	<ul><li>accurate?</li><li>A. As far as I know.</li><li>Q. And if you just glance through this article, Pleasant Ridge 123, do you have any reason</li></ul>	2 3 4	gallons. The equivalent number of water bottles saved: 22,350,000,000 actually, I'm sorry, that is 2 trillion 92 billion <b>MR. LUETKEHANS:</b> I guess the first
2 3	<ul><li>accurate?</li><li>A. As far as I know.</li><li>Q. And if you just glance through this article, Pleasant Ridge 123, do you have any reason to doubt the accuracy of the statements by these</li></ul>	2 3	gallons. The equivalent number of water bottles saved: 22,350,000,000 actually, I'm sorry, that is 2 trillion 92 billion <b>MR. LUETKEHANS:</b> I guess the first question is has he ever seen this?
2 3 4	<ul> <li>accurate?</li> <li>A. As far as I know.</li> <li>Q. And if you just glance through this article, Pleasant Ridge 123, do you have any reason to doubt the accuracy of the statements by these school officials regarding</li> </ul>	2 3 4	<ul> <li>gallons. The equivalent number of water bottles saved: 22,350,000,000 actually, I'm sorry, that is 2 trillion 92 billion</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: I guess the first question is has he ever seen this?</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: No, I'm just I'm going to</li> </ul>
2 3 4	<ul><li>accurate?</li><li>A. As far as I know.</li><li>Q. And if you just glance through this article, Pleasant Ridge 123, do you have any reason to doubt the accuracy of the statements by these</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	gallons. The equivalent number of water bottles saved: 22,350,000,000 actually, I'm sorry, that is 2 trillion 92 billion <b>MR. LUETKEHANS:</b> I guess the first question is has he ever seen this?
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>accurate?</li> <li>A. As far as I know.</li> <li>Q. And if you just glance through this article, Pleasant Ridge 123, do you have any reason to doubt the accuracy of the statements by these school officials regarding</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>gallons. The equivalent number of water bottles saved: 22,350,000,000 actually, I'm sorry, that is 2 trillion 92 billion</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: I guess the first question is has he ever seen this?</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: No, I'm just I'm going to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>accurate?</li> <li>A. As far as I know.</li> <li>Q. And if you just glance through this article, Pleasant Ridge 123, do you have any reason to doubt the accuracy of the statements by these school officials regarding</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>gallons. The equivalent number of water bottles saved: 22,350,000,000 actually, I'm sorry, that is 2 trillion 92 billion</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: I guess the first question is has he ever seen this?</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: No, I'm just I'm going to ask him a question about it.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>accurate?</li> <li>A. As far as I know.</li> <li>Q. And if you just glance through this article, Pleasant Ridge 123, do you have any reason to doubt the accuracy of the statements by these school officials regarding</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q the economic benefits to these</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>gallons. The equivalent number of water bottles saved: 22,350,000,000 actually, I'm sorry, that is 2 trillion 92 billion MR. LUETKEHANS: I guess the first question is has he ever seen this? MR. BLAZER: No, I'm just I'm going to ask him a question about it.</li> <li>Q. Carbon dioxide emissions avoided:</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>accurate?</li> <li>A. As far as I know.</li> <li>Q. And if you just glance through this article, Pleasant Ridge 123, do you have any reason to doubt the accuracy of the statements by these school officials regarding</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q the economic benefits to these particular school districts?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>gallons. The equivalent number of water bottles saved: 22,350,000,000 actually, I'm sorry, that is 2 trillion 92 billion</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: I guess the first question is has he ever seen this?</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: No, I'm just I'm going to ask him a question about it.</li> <li>Q. Carbon dioxide emissions avoided: 5,690,000 metric tons. Equivalent number of cars</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>accurate?</li> <li>A. As far as I know.</li> <li>Q. And if you just glance through this article, Pleasant Ridge 123, do you have any reason to doubt the accuracy of the statements by these school officials regarding</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q the economic benefits to these particular school districts?</li> <li>A. They're fiscal benefits, they're not</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>gallons. The equivalent number of water bottles saved: 22,350,000,000 actually, I'm sorry, that is 2 trillion 92 billion</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: I guess the first question is has he ever seen this?</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: No, I'm just I'm going to ask him a question about it.</li> <li>Q. Carbon dioxide emissions avoided:</li> <li>5,690,000 metric tons. Equivalent number of cars taken off the road: 1,003,527 cars.</li> <li>Do you consider those factors a negative</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>accurate?</li> <li>A. As far as I know.</li> <li>Q. And if you just glance through this article, Pleasant Ridge 123, do you have any reason to doubt the accuracy of the statements by these school officials regarding</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q the economic benefits to these particular school districts?</li> <li>A. They're fiscal benefits, they're not economic benefits, but assuming you mean fiscal, I have no reason at all.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>gallons. The equivalent number of water bottles saved: 22,350,000,000 actually, I'm sorry, that is 2 trillion 92 billion</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: I guess the first question is has he ever seen this?</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: No, I'm just I'm going to ask him a question about it.</li> <li>Q. Carbon dioxide emissions avoided: 5,690,000 metric tons. Equivalent number of cars taken off the road: 1,003,527 cars.</li> <li>Do you consider those factors a negative impact on qualify-of-life factors such as health,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>accurate?</li> <li>A. As far as I know.</li> <li>Q. And if you just glance through this article, Pleasant Ridge 123, do you have any reason to doubt the accuracy of the statements by these school officials regarding</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q the economic benefits to these particular school districts?</li> <li>A. They're fiscal benefits, they're not economic benefits, but assuming you mean fiscal, I have no reason at all.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know anything about the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>gallons. The equivalent number of water bottles saved: 22,350,000,000 actually, I'm sorry, that is 2 trillion 92 billion</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: I guess the first question is has he ever seen this?</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: No, I'm just I'm going to ask him a question about it.</li> <li>Q. Carbon dioxide emissions avoided: 5,690,000 metric tons. Equivalent number of cars taken off the road: 1,003,527 cars.</li> <li>Do you consider those factors a negative impact on qualify-of-life factors such as health, safety, recreation, air or noise quality?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>accurate?</li> <li>A. As far as I know.</li> <li>Q. And if you just glance through this article, Pleasant Ridge 123, do you have any reason to doubt the accuracy of the statements by these school officials regarding</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q the economic benefits to these particular school districts?</li> <li>A. They're fiscal benefits, they're not economic benefits, but assuming you mean fiscal, I have no reason at all.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know anything about the financial condition of the Prairie Central School</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>gallons. The equivalent number of water bottles saved: 22,350,000,000 actually, I'm sorry, that is 2 trillion 92 billion</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: I guess the first question is has he ever seen this?</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: No, I'm just I'm going to ask him a question about it.</li> <li>Q. Carbon dioxide emissions avoided:</li> <li>5,690,000 metric tons. Equivalent number of cars taken off the road: 1,003,527 cars.</li> <li>Do you consider those factors a negative impact on qualify-of-life factors such as health, safety, recreation, air or noise quality?</li> <li>A. I'm not an environmental economist and I'm</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>accurate?</li> <li>A. As far as I know.</li> <li>Q. And if you just glance through this article, Pleasant Ridge 123, do you have any reason to doubt the accuracy of the statements by these school officials regarding</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q the economic benefits to these particular school districts?</li> <li>A. They're fiscal benefits, they're not economic benefits, but assuming you mean fiscal, I have no reason at all.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know anything about the financial condition of the Prairie Central School District?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>gallons. The equivalent number of water bottles saved: 22,350,000,000 actually, I'm sorry, that is 2 trillion 92 billion</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: I guess the first question is has he ever seen this?</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: No, I'm just I'm going to ask him a question about it.</li> <li>Q. Carbon dioxide emissions avoided:</li> <li>5,690,000 metric tons. Equivalent number of cars taken off the road: 1,003,527 cars.</li> <li>Do you consider those factors a negative impact on qualify-of-life factors such as health, safety, recreation, air or noise quality?</li> <li>A. I'm not an environmental economist and I'm not an expert on environmental benefits. And I also</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>accurate?</li> <li>A. As far as I know.</li> <li>Q. And if you just glance through this article, Pleasant Ridge 123, do you have any reason to doubt the accuracy of the statements by these school officials regarding</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q the economic benefits to these particular school districts?</li> <li>A. They're fiscal benefits, they're not economic benefits, but assuming you mean fiscal, I have no reason at all.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know anything about the financial condition of the Prairie Central School District?</li> <li>A. I haven't studied the financial condition</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>gallons. The equivalent number of water bottles saved: 22,350,000,000 actually, I'm sorry, that is 2 trillion 92 billion MR. LUETKEHANS: I guess the first question is has he ever seen this? MR. BLAZER: No, I'm just I'm going to ask him a question about it.</li> <li>Q. Carbon dioxide emissions avoided: 5,690,000 metric tons. Equivalent number of cars taken off the road: 1,003,527 cars. Do you consider those factors a negative impact on qualify-of-life factors such as health, safety, recreation, air or noise quality?</li> <li>A. I'm not an environmental benefits. And I also had not seen this report, so I really have nothing</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>accurate?</li> <li>A. As far as I know.</li> <li>Q. And if you just glance through this article, Pleasant Ridge 123, do you have any reason to doubt the accuracy of the statements by these school officials regarding</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q the economic benefits to these particular school districts?</li> <li>A. They're fiscal benefits, they're not economic benefits, but assuming you mean fiscal, I have no reason at all.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know anything about the financial condition of the Prairie Central School District?</li> <li>A. I haven't studied the financial condition of the school district.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>gallons. The equivalent number of water bottles saved: 22,350,000,000 actually, I'm sorry, that is 2 trillion 92 billion</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: I guess the first question is has he ever seen this?</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: No, I'm just I'm going to ask him a question about it.</li> <li>Q. Carbon dioxide emissions avoided:</li> <li>5,690,000 metric tons. Equivalent number of cars taken off the road: 1,003,527 cars.</li> <li>Do you consider those factors a negative impact on qualify-of-life factors such as health, safety, recreation, air or noise quality?</li> <li>A. I'm not an environmental benefits. And I also had not seen this report, so I really have nothing to add about it. It's not I was merely</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>accurate?</li> <li>A. As far as I know.</li> <li>Q. And if you just glance through this article, Pleasant Ridge 123, do you have any reason to doubt the accuracy of the statements by these school officials regarding</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q the economic benefits to these particular school districts?</li> <li>A. They're fiscal benefits, they're not economic benefits, but assuming you mean fiscal, I have no reason at all.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know anything about the financial condition of the Prairie Central School District?</li> <li>A. I haven't studied the financial condition of the school district.</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, this is beyond</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>gallons. The equivalent number of water bottles saved: 22,350,000,000 actually, I'm sorry, that is 2 trillion 92 billion</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: I guess the first question is has he ever seen this?</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: No, I'm just I'm going to ask him a question about it.</li> <li>Q. Carbon dioxide emissions avoided:</li> <li>5,690,000 metric tons. Equivalent number of cars taken off the road: 1,003,527 cars.</li> <li>Do you consider those factors a negative impact on qualify-of-life factors such as health, safety, recreation, air or noise quality?</li> <li>A. I'm not an environmental economist and I'm not an expert on environmental benefits. And I also had not seen this report, so I really have nothing to add about it. It's not I was merely pointing that the reason I was I'm not an environmental benefits.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>accurate?</li> <li>A. As far as I know.</li> <li>Q. And if you just glance through this article, Pleasant Ridge 123, do you have any reason to doubt the accuracy of the statements by these school officials regarding</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q the economic benefits to these particular school districts?</li> <li>A. They're fiscal benefits, they're not economic benefits, but assuming you mean fiscal, I have no reason at all.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know anything about the financial condition of the Prairie Central School District?</li> <li>A. I haven't studied the financial condition of the school district.</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, this is beyond the scope. He's already testified he was not</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>gallons. The equivalent number of water bottles saved: 22,350,000,000 actually, I'm sorry, that is 2 trillion 92 billion MR. LUETKEHANS: I guess the first question is has he ever seen this? MR. BLAZER: No, I'm just I'm going to ask him a question about it.</li> <li>Q. Carbon dioxide emissions avoided: 5,690,000 metric tons. Equivalent number of cars taken off the road: 1,003,527 cars. Do you consider those factors a negative impact on qualify-of-life factors such as health, safety, recreation, air or noise quality?</li> <li>A. I'm not an environmental economist and I'm not an expert on environmental benefits. And I also had not seen this report, so I really have nothing to add about it. It's not I was merely pointing that the reason I was I'm not an environmental benefits. I'm just</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>accurate?</li> <li>A. As far as I know.</li> <li>Q. And if you just glance through this article, Pleasant Ridge 123, do you have any reason to doubt the accuracy of the statements by these school officials regarding</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q the economic benefits to these particular school districts?</li> <li>A. They're fiscal benefits, they're not economic benefits, but assuming you mean fiscal, I have no reason at all.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know anything about the financial condition of the Prairie Central School District?</li> <li>A. I haven't studied the financial condition of the school district.</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, this is beyond the scope. He's already testified he was not looking at this.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>gallons. The equivalent number of water bottles saved: 22,350,000,000 actually, I'm sorry, that is 2 trillion 92 billion MR. LUETKEHANS: I guess the first question is has he ever seen this? MR. BLAZER: No, I'm just I'm going to ask him a question about it.</li> <li>Q. Carbon dioxide emissions avoided: 5,690,000 metric tons. Equivalent number of cars taken off the road: 1,003,527 cars. Do you consider those factors a negative impact on qualify-of-life factors such as health, safety, recreation, air or noise quality?</li> <li>A. I'm not an environmental benefits. And I also had not seen this report, so I really have nothing to add about it. It's not I was merely pointing that the reason I was I'm not here to testify about environmental benefits. I'm just merely pointing out that the economic impact</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>accurate?</li> <li>A. As far as I know.</li> <li>Q. And if you just glance through this article, Pleasant Ridge 123, do you have any reason to doubt the accuracy of the statements by these school officials regarding</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q the economic benefits to these particular school districts?</li> <li>A. They're fiscal benefits, they're not economic benefits, but assuming you mean fiscal, I have no reason at all.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know anything about the financial condition of the Prairie Central School District?</li> <li>A. I haven't studied the financial condition of the school district.</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, this is beyond the scope. He's already testified he was not looking at this.</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: He just answered the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>gallons. The equivalent number of water bottles saved: 22,350,000,000 actually, I'm sorry, that is 2 trillion 92 billion</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: I guess the first question is has he ever seen this?</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: No, I'm just I'm going to ask him a question about it.</li> <li>Q. Carbon dioxide emissions avoided:</li> <li>5,690,000 metric tons. Equivalent number of cars taken off the road: 1,003,527 cars.</li> <li>Do you consider those factors a negative impact on qualify-of-life factors such as health, safety, recreation, air or noise quality?</li> <li>A. I'm not an environmental benefits. And I also had not seen this report, so I really have nothing to add about it. It's not I was merely pointing that the reason I was I'm not here to testify about environmental benefits. I'm just merely pointing out that the economic impact analysis did not describe environmental benefits or</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>accurate?</li> <li>A. As far as I know.</li> <li>Q. And if you just glance through this article, Pleasant Ridge 123, do you have any reason to doubt the accuracy of the statements by these school officials regarding</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q the economic benefits to these particular school districts?</li> <li>A. They're fiscal benefits, they're not economic benefits, but assuming you mean fiscal, I have no reason at all.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know anything about the financial condition of the Prairie Central School District?</li> <li>A. I haven't studied the financial condition of the school district.</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, this is beyond the scope. He's already testified he was not looking at this.</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: He just answered the question. He said he has no idea. That's fine with</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>gallons. The equivalent number of water bottles saved: 22,350,000,000 actually, I'm sorry, that is 2 trillion 92 billion</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: I guess the first question is has he ever seen this?</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: No, I'm just I'm going to ask him a question about it.</li> <li>Q. Carbon dioxide emissions avoided:</li> <li>5,690,000 metric tons. Equivalent number of cars taken off the road: 1,003,527 cars.</li> <li>Do you consider those factors a negative impact on qualify-of-life factors such as health, safety, recreation, air or noise quality?</li> <li>A. I'm not an environmental economist and I'm not an expert on environmental benefits. And I also had not seen this report, so I really have nothing to add about it. It's not I was merely pointing that the reason I was I'm not here to testify about environmental benefits. I'm just merely pointing out that the economic impact analysis did not describe environmental benefits or costs.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>accurate?</li> <li>A. As far as I know.</li> <li>Q. And if you just glance through this article, Pleasant Ridge 123, do you have any reason to doubt the accuracy of the statements by these school officials regarding</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q the economic benefits to these particular school districts?</li> <li>A. They're fiscal benefits, they're not economic benefits, but assuming you mean fiscal, I have no reason at all.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know anything about the financial condition of the Prairie Central School District?</li> <li>A. I haven't studied the financial condition of the school district.</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, this is beyond the scope. He's already testified he was not looking at this.</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: He just answered the question. He said he has no idea. That's fine with me.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>gallons. The equivalent number of water bottles saved: 22,350,000,000 actually, I'm sorry, that is 2 trillion 92 billion</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: I guess the first question is has he ever seen this?</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: No, I'm just I'm going to ask him a question about it.</li> <li>Q. Carbon dioxide emissions avoided:</li> <li>5,690,000 metric tons. Equivalent number of cars taken off the road: 1,003,527 cars.</li> <li>Do you consider those factors a negative impact on qualify-of-life factors such as health, safety, recreation, air or noise quality?</li> <li>A. I'm not an environmental benefits. And I also had not seen this report, so I really have nothing to add about it. It's not I was merely pointing that the reason I was I'm not here to testify about environmental benefits. I'm just merely pointing out that the economic impact analysis did not describe environmental benefits or costs.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>accurate?</li> <li>A. As far as I know.</li> <li>Q. And if you just glance through this article, Pleasant Ridge 123, do you have any reason to doubt the accuracy of the statements by these school officials regarding</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q the economic benefits to these particular school districts?</li> <li>A. They're fiscal benefits, they're not economic benefits, but assuming you mean fiscal, I have no reason at all.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know anything about the financial condition of the Prairie Central School District?</li> <li>A. I haven't studied the financial condition of the school district.</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: Objection, this is beyond the scope. He's already testified he was not looking at this.</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: He just answered the question. He said he has no idea. That's fine with</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>gallons. The equivalent number of water bottles saved: 22,350,000,000 actually, I'm sorry, that is 2 trillion 92 billion</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: I guess the first question is has he ever seen this?</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: No, I'm just I'm going to ask him a question about it.</li> <li>Q. Carbon dioxide emissions avoided:</li> <li>5,690,000 metric tons. Equivalent number of cars taken off the road: 1,003,527 cars.</li> <li>Do you consider those factors a negative impact on qualify-of-life factors such as health, safety, recreation, air or noise quality?</li> <li>A. I'm not an environmental economist and I'm not an expert on environmental benefits. And I also had not seen this report, so I really have nothing to add about it. It's not I was merely pointing that the reason I was I'm not here to testify about environmental benefits. I'm just merely pointing out that the economic impact analysis did not describe environmental benefits or costs.</li> </ul>

	Page 1660		Page 1662
_	-	_	a duanta as 2
1	MR. BLAZER: That's all I have.	1	advantage?
2	CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Thank you. AUDIENCE VOICE: About time.	2	A. Again, that was for a different area and a different in a geographic area and a different time.
3	CHAIRMAN CORNALE: We'll take some	3	different a geographic area and a different time, but even if it was to be relevant, my main point is
4		4	that's not going to change your economic base in any
5	questions from the audience. Interested parties not represented by counsel, anybody out there?	5 6	significant way. The number of jobs the reason I
6 7	All right, I'm going to throw one question	7	mentioned the Menards store is that the number of
8	in here and this is from me. Actually I've got two.	8	jobs we're talking about are the equivalent of one
9	Yeah, Carolyn, come on up.	9	large discount store and I don't think that would
10	QUESTIONS BY	10	change the economic position of the county.
11	CHAIRMAN CORNALE:	11	CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay, thank you. Okay,
12	Q. The gist of your report is you believe	12	Carolyn, go ahead.
13	that the Loomis report is overstated. Can you	13	QUESTIONS BY
14	single-handedly percentage-wise say how much you	14	MS. GERWIN:
15	might believe? Is it 30 percent overstated? Is it	15	Q. All right. Okay, thanks so much. My name
16	25 percent? Is it put it into a perspective that	16	is Carolyn Gerwin. I live here in Pontiac. I have
17	all of us in the audience can understand.	17	a couple questions about the looking-back study that
18	A. I don't know if I'm that smart without	18	was done at Shady Oaks. Was there any study done of
19	having been able to do the seeing the data. I	19	whether the money that was paid was actually spent
20	would just say it's significantly overstated.	20	or just saved or just spent elsewhere? Was that
21	Q. Okay. We've heard several questions	21	actually I wasn't clear from what you said
22	directed at your, I'll say, inexperience with wind	22	whether that was part of that study.
23	projects. Do you believe that there may be any	23	A. Right. The question is whether the money
24	single-handedly exclusive features to a wind project	24	that was generated was spent within the county or
	Page 1661		Page 1663
1	that they may have added in that we're not aware of	1	just saved, and I'd have to look through it again.
2	that could generate the net results that they've	2	I don't believe it was that specific. What I did do
3	shown?	3	was made a comparison of economic impacts from the
4	A. Frankly there's we've done, as I have	4	Shady Oaks project as reported to the proposed
5	mentioned, every conceivable land use. The models	5	project as reported and presented the full-time jobs
6	are describing they take inputs of investment or	6	for each and then the jobs as a function of per
7	stimulus to an economy and it's like a black box.	7	megawatt of capacity. And the Pleasant Ridge jobs
8	It produces output, and the output is only as good	8	per megawatt was at 1.21 preconstruction versus .63
9	as the inputs that go into it. There's nothing	9	for Shady Oaks actual, and proposed .56 versus
10	unique to a wind farm project that would have unique	10	actual or ongoing of .23 for Shady Oaks. So it does
11	multiplier effects. It's all a function of dollars	11	suggest that at least in the Shady Oaks case the
12	spent and then re-spent. And so whatever those	12	impacts weren't as robust as predicted in the Loomis
13	dollars are that are spent locally are what creates	13	report.
14	the ripple effect. So there's nothing unique about	14	Q. Did the report for Streator Cayuga Ridge,
15	wind or any other project that you need to know to	15	did that talk at all the Iberdrola project, did
16	evaluate economic impact analyses.	16	it compare what was the direct comparison between what the IEDI model forecast for full time jobs was
17	Q. Okay, so and this is my last question.	17	what the JEDI model forecast for full-time jobs was
18	As presented in the 304 exhibit by the Lawrence Berkeley National Lab and the NREL, they end up	18	compared to the actual? A. Frankly, I think I'm losing track of which
19 20	concluding that the wind project generates a .22 to	19 20	ones. I think you're referring that the JEDI model
20 21	.4 percent increase in the economy.	20 21	was the authors of that report said that the JEDI
<u> </u>			construction jobs are known to be to be
	A. Right.	22	
22	<b>A. Right.</b> O. In your opinion, is that is that what	22 23	
	<ul> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. In your opinion, is that is that what</li> <li>the county could reasonably conclude will be the</li> </ul>	22 23 24	exaggerated, but I said it more precisely previously.

	Page 1664		Page 1666
			-
1	Q. Do you know of any study where there was	1	it's in the record, but for purposes of my question,
2	like a control area that was looked at that maybe	2	I'd like to assume that the Iberdrola project got
3	said no to wind that could be looked at in 5, 10,	3	\$170 million in federal grants.
4	20, 30 years? I mean out in California they've been	4	MR. BLAZER: I'll object. First of all,
5	out there for like 30 years.	5	it assumes facts not in evidence. Second, it's
6	A. Right.	6	beyond the scope of this witness's report and
7	Q. So is wind energy there's that burst of	7	testimony.
8	activity and so on, but how does that compare to an	8	MR. LUETKEHANS: I don't think that's your
9	area how does that impact an area's future	9	objection. That's my objection to make. It's my
10	development of other types of industry?	10	witness not Mr. Blazer's.
11	A. Yeah, one of the things that impact	11	CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right. I'm not
12	analysis does not do is identify what economists	12	sure how opportunity costs and grants go together.
13	call opportunity costs or what would happen, in	13	I don't think there's a correlation between that.
14	other words, in the absence of a wind energy	14	And there again, we're we're not clear whether
15	project. So, for example, so to the extent that	15	they're getting grants or not. So can you answer
16	there's a wind energy project, it by definition will	16	the question that she's posed? Is there any
17	preclude some alternative use that may or may not	17	BY MS. GERWIN:
18	have higher or greater economic impacts. So that is	18	Q. I guess my question is if the grants are
19	sort of the same concept of, you know, control	19	coming from the federal government or tax subsidies
20	experiments, which are hard to do in social science	20	which require other taxpayers to make up the
21	as opposed to, you know, physical science, but I'm	21	difference, that is money that is then not spent by
22	not off the top of my head familiar with the details	22	that taxpayer, correct?
23	of studies that looked at what happened for	23	MR. BLAZER: Objection. It's beyond the
24	communities that, say, did not have a wind energy	24	scope of his report, beyond the scope of his
	D (007		
	Page 1665		Page 1667
1	-	1	-
1	project built, but it's because of that there was	1	testimony. I was already precluded from asking
2	project built, but it's because of that there was some alternative use built. There's probably cases	2	testimony. I was already precluded from asking about the Renewable Portfolio Standard, about the
2 3	project built, but it's because of that there was some alternative use built. There's probably cases out there. I just don't know them off the top of my	2 3	testimony. I was already precluded from asking about the Renewable Portfolio Standard, about the production of tax credit. This is exactly the type
2 3 4	project built, but it's because of that there was some alternative use built. There's probably cases out there. I just don't know them off the top of my head.	2	testimony. I was already precluded from asking about the Renewable Portfolio Standard, about the
2 3	<ul> <li>project built, but it's because of that there was some alternative use built. There's probably cases out there. I just don't know them off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Do you have expertise in compatibility of</li> </ul>	2 3 4	testimony. I was already precluded from asking about the Renewable Portfolio Standard, about the production of tax credit. This is exactly the type of area that I was precluded from questioning him
2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>project built, but it's because of that there was some alternative use built. There's probably cases out there. I just don't know them off the top of my head.</li><li>Q. Do you have expertise in compatibility of different kinds of development?</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	testimony. I was already precluded from asking about the Renewable Portfolio Standard, about the production of tax credit. This is exactly the type of area that I was precluded from questioning him on. <b>MR. LUETKEHANS:</b> This is my
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>project built, but it's because of that there was some alternative use built. There's probably cases out there. I just don't know them off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Do you have expertise in compatibility of different kinds of development?</li> <li>A. As real estate and land use policy</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	testimony. I was already precluded from asking about the Renewable Portfolio Standard, about the production of tax credit. This is exactly the type of area that I was precluded from questioning him on. MR. LUETKEHANS: This is my CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, you're
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>project built, but it's because of that there was some alternative use built. There's probably cases out there. I just don't know them off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Do you have expertise in compatibility of different kinds of development?</li> <li>A. As real estate and land use policy analysts, we certainly have a great deal of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	testimony. I was already precluded from asking about the Renewable Portfolio Standard, about the production of tax credit. This is exactly the type of area that I was precluded from questioning him on. MR. LUETKEHANS: This is my CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, you're correct. Okay, Carolyn
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>project built, but it's because of that there was some alternative use built. There's probably cases out there. I just don't know them off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Do you have expertise in compatibility of different kinds of development?</li> <li>A. As real estate and land use policy</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	testimony. I was already precluded from asking about the Renewable Portfolio Standard, about the production of tax credit. This is exactly the type of area that I was precluded from questioning him on. MR. LUETKEHANS: This is my CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>project built, but it's because of that there was some alternative use built. There's probably cases out there. I just don't know them off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Do you have expertise in compatibility of different kinds of development?</li> <li>A. As real estate and land use policy analysts, we certainly have a great deal of experience looking at issues of compatibility and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	testimony. I was already precluded from asking about the Renewable Portfolio Standard, about the production of tax credit. This is exactly the type of area that I was precluded from questioning him on. MR. LUETKEHANS: This is my CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, you're correct. Okay, Carolyn MR. LUETKEHANS: He can't object to my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>project built, but it's because of that there was some alternative use built. There's probably cases out there. I just don't know them off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Do you have expertise in compatibility of different kinds of development?</li> <li>A. As real estate and land use policy analysts, we certainly have a great deal of experience looking at issues of compatibility and how one use might either help or hurt the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	testimony. I was already precluded from asking about the Renewable Portfolio Standard, about the production of tax credit. This is exactly the type of area that I was precluded from questioning him on. <b>MR. LUETKEHANS:</b> This is my <b>CHAIRMAN CORNALE:</b> Mr. Blazer, you're correct. Okay, Carolyn <b>MR. LUETKEHANS:</b> He can't object to my witness.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>project built, but it's because of that there was some alternative use built. There's probably cases out there. I just don't know them off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Do you have expertise in compatibility of different kinds of development?</li> <li>A. As real estate and land use policy analysts, we certainly have a great deal of experience looking at issues of compatibility and how one use might either help or hurt the development of alternative uses.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	testimony. I was already precluded from asking about the Renewable Portfolio Standard, about the production of tax credit. This is exactly the type of area that I was precluded from questioning him on. MR. LUETKEHANS: This is my CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, you're correct. Okay, Carolyn MR. LUETKEHANS: He can't object to my witness. MR. BLAZER: I just did.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>project built, but it's because of that there was some alternative use built. There's probably cases out there. I just don't know them off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Do you have expertise in compatibility of different kinds of development?</li> <li>A. As real estate and land use policy analysts, we certainly have a great deal of experience looking at issues of compatibility and how one use might either help or hurt the development of alternative uses.</li> <li>Q. So it would be possible to get a report</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	testimony. I was already precluded from asking about the Renewable Portfolio Standard, about the production of tax credit. This is exactly the type of area that I was precluded from questioning him on. MR. LUETKEHANS: This is my CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, you're correct. Okay, Carolyn MR. LUETKEHANS: He can't object to my witness. MR. BLAZER: I just did. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: I just object to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>project built, but it's because of that there was some alternative use built. There's probably cases out there. I just don't know them off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Do you have expertise in compatibility of different kinds of development?</li> <li>A. As real estate and land use policy analysts, we certainly have a great deal of experience looking at issues of compatibility and how one use might either help or hurt the development of alternative uses.</li> <li>Q. So it would be possible to get a report that would analyze the impact on some of the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	testimony. I was already precluded from asking about the Renewable Portfolio Standard, about the production of tax credit. This is exactly the type of area that I was precluded from questioning him on. MR. LUETKEHANS: This is my CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, you're correct. Okay, Carolyn MR. LUETKEHANS: He can't object to my witness. MR. BLAZER: I just did. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: I just object to everybody's witness. Carolyn, can you clear up the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>project built, but it's because of that there was some alternative use built. There's probably cases out there. I just don't know them off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Do you have expertise in compatibility of different kinds of development?</li> <li>A. As real estate and land use policy analysts, we certainly have a great deal of experience looking at issues of compatibility and how one use might either help or hurt the development of alternative uses.</li> <li>Q. So it would be possible to get a report that would analyze the impact on some of the up-and-coming businesses that are being talked about</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	testimony. I was already precluded from asking about the Renewable Portfolio Standard, about the production of tax credit. This is exactly the type of area that I was precluded from questioning him on. MR. LUETKEHANS: This is my CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, you're correct. Okay, Carolyn MR. LUETKEHANS: He can't object to my witness. MR. BLAZER: I just did. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: I just object to everybody's witness. Carolyn, can you clear up the question?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>project built, but it's because of that there was some alternative use built. There's probably cases out there. I just don't know them off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Do you have expertise in compatibility of different kinds of development?</li> <li>A. As real estate and land use policy analysts, we certainly have a great deal of experience looking at issues of compatibility and how one use might either help or hurt the development of alternative uses.</li> <li>Q. So it would be possible to get a report that would analyze the impact on some of the up-and-coming businesses that are being talked about in the area of a wind farm?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	testimony. I was already precluded from asking about the Renewable Portfolio Standard, about the production of tax credit. This is exactly the type of area that I was precluded from questioning him on. MR. LUETKEHANS: This is my CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, you're correct. Okay, Carolyn MR. LUETKEHANS: He can't object to my witness. MR. BLAZER: I just did. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: I just object to everybody's witness. Carolyn, can you clear up the question? MS. GERWIN: Yes, I'm going to clear up
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>project built, but it's because of that there was some alternative use built. There's probably cases out there. I just don't know them off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Do you have expertise in compatibility of different kinds of development?</li> <li>A. As real estate and land use policy analysts, we certainly have a great deal of experience looking at issues of compatibility and how one use might either help or hurt the development of alternative uses.</li> <li>Q. So it would be possible to get a report that would analyze the impact on some of the up-and-coming businesses that are being talked about in the area of a wind farm?</li> <li>A. In terms of how the wind farm would affect</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	testimony. I was already precluded from asking about the Renewable Portfolio Standard, about the production of tax credit. This is exactly the type of area that I was precluded from questioning him on. MR. LUETKEHANS: This is my CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, you're correct. Okay, Carolyn MR. LUETKEHANS: He can't object to my witness. MR. BLAZER: I just did. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: I just object to everybody's witness. Carolyn, can you clear up the question? MS. GERWIN: Yes, I'm going to clear up the question. I'll put it in context of the term
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>project built, but it's because of that there was some alternative use built. There's probably cases out there. I just don't know them off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Do you have expertise in compatibility of different kinds of development?</li> <li>A. As real estate and land use policy analysts, we certainly have a great deal of experience looking at issues of compatibility and how one use might either help or hurt the development of alternative uses.</li> <li>Q. So it would be possible to get a report that would analyze the impact on some of the up-and-coming businesses that are being talked about in the area of a wind farm?</li> <li>A. In terms of how the wind farm would affect those businesses? We haven't done that, but</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	testimony. I was already precluded from asking about the Renewable Portfolio Standard, about the production of tax credit. This is exactly the type of area that I was precluded from questioning him on. MR. LUETKEHANS: This is my CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, you're correct. Okay, Carolyn MR. LUETKEHANS: He can't object to my witness. MR. BLAZER: I just did. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: I just object to everybody's witness. Carolyn, can you clear up the question? MS. GERWIN: Yes, I'm going to clear up the question. I'll put it in context of the term that was used, the multiplier effect, this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>project built, but it's because of that there was some alternative use built. There's probably cases out there. I just don't know them off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Do you have expertise in compatibility of different kinds of development?</li> <li>A. As real estate and land use policy analysts, we certainly have a great deal of experience looking at issues of compatibility and how one use might either help or hurt the development of alternative uses.</li> <li>Q. So it would be possible to get a report that would analyze the impact on some of the up-and-coming businesses that are being talked about in the area of a wind farm?</li> <li>A. In terms of how the wind farm would affect those businesses? We haven't done that, but certainly you could talk to the existing businesses</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	testimony. I was already precluded from asking about the Renewable Portfolio Standard, about the production of tax credit. This is exactly the type of area that I was precluded from questioning him on. MR. LUETKEHANS: This is my CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, you're correct. Okay, Carolyn MR. LUETKEHANS: He can't object to my witness. MR. BLAZER: I just did. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: I just object to everybody's witness. Carolyn, can you clear up the question? MS. GERWIN: Yes, I'm going to clear up the question. I'll put it in context of the term that was used, the multiplier effect, this multiplier.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>project built, but it's because of that there was some alternative use built. There's probably cases out there. I just don't know them off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Do you have expertise in compatibility of different kinds of development?</li> <li>A. As real estate and land use policy analysts, we certainly have a great deal of experience looking at issues of compatibility and how one use might either help or hurt the development of alternative uses.</li> <li>Q. So it would be possible to get a report that would analyze the impact on some of the up-and-coming businesses that are being talked about in the area of a wind farm?</li> <li>A. In terms of how the wind farm would affect those businesses? We haven't done that, but certainly you could talk to the existing businesses and ask how they would be affected by the project. We haven't done that.</li> <li>Q. You mentioned opportunity costs, and in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>testimony. I was already precluded from asking about the Renewable Portfolio Standard, about the production of tax credit. This is exactly the type of area that I was precluded from questioning him on.</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: This is my CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, you're correct. Okay, Carolyn MR. LUETKEHANS: He can't object to my witness.</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: I just did.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN CORNALE: I just object to everybody's witness. Carolyn, can you clear up the question?</li> <li>MS. GERWIN: Yes, I'm going to clear up the question. I'll put it in context of the term that was used, the multiplier effect, this multiplier.</li> <li>BY MS. GERWIN:</li> <li>Q. Does the multiplier effect work both ways? If you take money out of an economy, does it have a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>project built, but it's because of that there was some alternative use built. There's probably cases out there. I just don't know them off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Do you have expertise in compatibility of different kinds of development?</li> <li>A. As real estate and land use policy analysts, we certainly have a great deal of experience looking at issues of compatibility and how one use might either help or hurt the development of alternative uses.</li> <li>Q. So it would be possible to get a report that would analyze the impact on some of the up-and-coming businesses that are being talked about in the area of a wind farm?</li> <li>A. In terms of how the wind farm would affect those businesses? We haven't done that, but certainly you could talk to the existing businesses and ask how they would be affected by the project. We haven't done that.</li> <li>Q. You mentioned opportunity costs, and in that regard have you do they take into account</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>testimony. I was already precluded from asking about the Renewable Portfolio Standard, about the production of tax credit. This is exactly the type of area that I was precluded from questioning him on.</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: This is my CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, you're correct. Okay, Carolyn MR. LUETKEHANS: He can't object to my witness.</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: I just did.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN CORNALE: I just object to everybody's witness. Carolyn, can you clear up the question?</li> <li>MS. GERWIN: Yes, I'm going to clear up the question. I'll put it in context of the term that was used, the multiplier effect, this multiplier.</li> <li>BY MS. GERWIN:</li> <li>Q. Does the multiplier effect work both ways? If you take money out of an economy, does it have a multiplying negative effect same as injecting it</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>project built, but it's because of that there was some alternative use built. There's probably cases out there. I just don't know them off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Do you have expertise in compatibility of different kinds of development?</li> <li>A. As real estate and land use policy analysts, we certainly have a great deal of experience looking at issues of compatibility and how one use might either help or hurt the development of alternative uses.</li> <li>Q. So it would be possible to get a report that would analyze the impact on some of the up-and-coming businesses that are being talked about in the area of a wind farm?</li> <li>A. In terms of how the wind farm would affect those businesses? We haven't done that, but certainly you could talk to the existing businesses and ask how they would be affected by the project. We haven't done that.</li> <li>Q. You mentioned opportunity costs, and in that regard have you do they take into account the grants that are given to these projects? For</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>testimony. I was already precluded from asking about the Renewable Portfolio Standard, about the production of tax credit. This is exactly the type of area that I was precluded from questioning him on.</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: This is my CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, you're correct. Okay, Carolyn MR. LUETKEHANS: He can't object to my witness.</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: I just did.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN CORNALE: I just object to everybody's witness. Carolyn, can you clear up the question?</li> <li>MS. GERWIN: Yes, I'm going to clear up the question. I'll put it in context of the term that was used, the multiplier effect, this multiplier.</li> <li>BY MS. GERWIN:</li> <li>Q. Does the multiplier effect work both ways? If you take money out of an economy, does it have a multiplying negative effect same as injecting it into an economy?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>project built, but it's because of that there was some alternative use built. There's probably cases out there. I just don't know them off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Do you have expertise in compatibility of different kinds of development?</li> <li>A. As real estate and land use policy analysts, we certainly have a great deal of experience looking at issues of compatibility and how one use might either help or hurt the development of alternative uses.</li> <li>Q. So it would be possible to get a report that would analyze the impact on some of the up-and-coming businesses that are being talked about in the area of a wind farm?</li> <li>A. In terms of how the wind farm would affect those businesses? We haven't done that, but certainly you could talk to the existing businesses and ask how they would be affected by the project. We haven't done that.</li> <li>Q. You mentioned opportunity costs, and in that regard have you do they take into account</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>testimony. I was already precluded from asking about the Renewable Portfolio Standard, about the production of tax credit. This is exactly the type of area that I was precluded from questioning him on.</li> <li>MR. LUETKEHANS: This is my CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Blazer, you're correct. Okay, Carolyn MR. LUETKEHANS: He can't object to my witness.</li> <li>MR. BLAZER: I just did.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN CORNALE: I just object to everybody's witness. Carolyn, can you clear up the question?</li> <li>MS. GERWIN: Yes, I'm going to clear up the question. I'll put it in context of the term that was used, the multiplier effect, this multiplier.</li> <li>BY MS. GERWIN:</li> <li>Q. Does the multiplier effect work both ways? If you take money out of an economy, does it have a multiplying negative effect same as injecting it</li> </ul>

	Page 1668		Page 1670
1	funding a program, there will be reductions in the	1	income would go up?
2	volume of economic activity, and obviously if the	2	A. I don't off the top of my head.
3	federal government makes a policy decision that to	3	Q. Okay. I think it was like 445,000. And
4	fund one program or one type of project, it's	4	the Prairie Central school budget is 23 million a
5	implicitly making a decision not to fund an	5	year.
6	alternative project or policy, and there will be	6	MR. SLAGEL: That's all I have.
7	winners and losers associated with how the	7	A. Thank you.
8	government decides to allocate its resources.	8	CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Anybody else from the
9	MS. GERWIN: Okay, thank you very much.	9	audience with questions? All right. Mr. Gruen,
10	Sorry to keep you.	10	thank you.
11	CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Any other questions	11	All right. Mr. Luetkehans, it's 9:30.
12	from the audience at this time? You've got a	12	<b>MR. LUETKEHANS:</b> Yeah, we've spoke to Mr.
13	question? All right, while he's working on that,	13	Heffley and he has graciously agreed to come back.
14	county staff have any questions of this witness?	14	I guess I'm a little more upset about this than he
15	Chuck, you don't have any questions of this writess?	15	is, but he's agreed to come back. The only other
16	MR. SLAGEL: Hello? John Slagel.	16	thing that I think we would all like to maybe
	QUESTIONS BY		resolve at some point in time if we have five
17	MR. SLAGEL:	17	minutes is try to understand the schedule going
18		18	•
19	Q. Do you know, do colleges teach the JEDI model?	19	forward. Mr. Rand is coming Thursday, I have
20		20	provided his report to Mr. Blazer this evening, and
21	A. I'm sorry, I can't opine on what colleges	21	that's who we will bring in and only him on
22	do teach or don't teach on the JEDI model. I'm	22	Thursday.
23	assuming that, given Dr. Loomis's work, he probably	23	<b>CHAIRMAN CORNALE:</b> He will be the only
24	teaches it, but I don't know.	24	one?
	Page 1669		Page 1671
	Page 1669		Page 1671
1	Q. Okay. Do you know, in the report from	1	MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes, especially since
1 2	Q. Okay. Do you know, in the report from Loomis, did he assume that all the wind turbine new	1 2	MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes, especially since CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay.
	Q. Okay. Do you know, in the report from		MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes, especially since
2	Q. Okay. Do you know, in the report from Loomis, did he assume that all the wind turbine new jobs and employees that were created are going to live in Livingston County or was there a multiplier	2	MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes, especially since CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay.
2 3	Q. Okay. Do you know, in the report from Loomis, did he assume that all the wind turbine new jobs and employees that were created are going to	2 3	MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes, especially since CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. MR. LUETKEHANS: this was supposed to
2 3 4	Q. Okay. Do you know, in the report from Loomis, did he assume that all the wind turbine new jobs and employees that were created are going to live in Livingston County or was there a multiplier	2 3 4	MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes, especially since CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. MR. LUETKEHANS: this was supposed to be the short one and we took all night.
2 3 4 5	Q. Okay. Do you know, in the report from Loomis, did he assume that all the wind turbine new jobs and employees that were created are going to live in Livingston County or was there a multiplier for how many were out of county and in county?	2 3 4 5	MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes, especially since CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. MR. LUETKEHANS: this was supposed to be the short one and we took all night. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. He'll be talking
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know, in the report from Loomis, did he assume that all the wind turbine new jobs and employees that were created are going to live in Livingston County or was there a multiplier for how many were out of county and in county?</li> <li>A. I don't know what was assumed about how</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes, especially since CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. MR. LUETKEHANS: this was supposed to be the short one and we took all night. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. He'll be talking about
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know, in the report from Loomis, did he assume that all the wind turbine new jobs and employees that were created are going to live in Livingston County or was there a multiplier for how many were out of county and in county?</li> <li>A. I don't know what was assumed about how many workers reside in the county, so I just don't</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes, especially since CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. MR. LUETKEHANS: this was supposed to be the short one and we took all night. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. He'll be talking about MR. LUETKEHANS: He excuse me, sorry,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. Okay. Do you know, in the report from Loomis, did he assume that all the wind turbine new jobs and employees that were created are going to live in Livingston County or was there a multiplier for how many were out of county and in county? A. I don't know what was assumed about how many workers reside in the county, so I just don't know.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes, especially since CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. MR. LUETKEHANS: this was supposed to be the short one and we took all night. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. He'll be talking about MR. LUETKEHANS: He excuse me, sorry, takes a second to go back on. He will be talking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know, in the report from Loomis, did he assume that all the wind turbine new jobs and employees that were created are going to live in Livingston County or was there a multiplier for how many were out of county and in county?</li> <li>A. I don't know what was assumed about how many workers reside in the county, so I just don't know.</li> <li>Q. Okay, so but like in his report, did he</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes, especially since CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. MR. LUETKEHANS: this was supposed to be the short one and we took all night. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. He'll be talking about MR. LUETKEHANS: He excuse me, sorry, takes a second to go back on. He will be talking about noise.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know, in the report from Loomis, did he assume that all the wind turbine new jobs and employees that were created are going to live in Livingston County or was there a multiplier for how many were out of county and in county?</li> <li>A. I don't know what was assumed about how many workers reside in the county, so I just don't know.</li> <li>Q. Okay, so but like in his report, did he say all of them were going to be from the county?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes, especially since CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. MR. LUETKEHANS: this was supposed to be the short one and we took all night. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. He'll be talking about MR. LUETKEHANS: He excuse me, sorry, takes a second to go back on. He will be talking about noise. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Noise, okay. All
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know, in the report from Loomis, did he assume that all the wind turbine new jobs and employees that were created are going to live in Livingston County or was there a multiplier for how many were out of county and in county?</li> <li>A. I don't know what was assumed about how many workers reside in the county, so I just don't know.</li> <li>Q. Okay, so but like in his report, did he say all of them were going to be from the county? CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Slagel, that would be a Loomis question.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes, especially since CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. MR. LUETKEHANS: this was supposed to be the short one and we took all night. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. He'll be talking about MR. LUETKEHANS: He excuse me, sorry, takes a second to go back on. He will be talking about noise. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Noise, okay. All right, so we will expect on Thursday evening that Mr. Rand will be available 6:30 in Fairbury. Is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know, in the report from Loomis, did he assume that all the wind turbine new jobs and employees that were created are going to live in Livingston County or was there a multiplier for how many were out of county and in county?</li> <li>A. I don't know what was assumed about how many workers reside in the county, so I just don't know.</li> <li>Q. Okay, so but like in his report, did he say all of them were going to be from the county? CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Slagel, that would</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes, especially since CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. MR. LUETKEHANS: this was supposed to be the short one and we took all night. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. He'll be talking about MR. LUETKEHANS: He excuse me, sorry, takes a second to go back on. He will be talking about noise. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Noise, okay. All right, so we will expect on Thursday evening that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know, in the report from Loomis, did he assume that all the wind turbine new jobs and employees that were created are going to live in Livingston County or was there a multiplier for how many were out of county and in county?</li> <li>A. I don't know what was assumed about how many workers reside in the county, so I just don't know.</li> <li>Q. Okay, so but like in his report, did he say all of them were going to be from the county? CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Slagel, that would be a Loomis question. MR. SLAGEL: Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes, especially since CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. MR. LUETKEHANS: this was supposed to be the short one and we took all night. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. He'll be talking about MR. LUETKEHANS: He excuse me, sorry, takes a second to go back on. He will be talking about noise. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Noise, okay. All right, so we will expect on Thursday evening that Mr. Rand will be available 6:30 in Fairbury. Is that correct, Chuck, in Fairbury?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know, in the report from Loomis, did he assume that all the wind turbine new jobs and employees that were created are going to live in Livingston County or was there a multiplier for how many were out of county and in county?</li> <li>A. I don't know what was assumed about how many workers reside in the county, so I just don't know.</li> <li>Q. Okay, so but like in his report, did he say all of them were going to be from the county? CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Slagel, that would be a Loomis question. MR. SLAGEL: Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Yeah, so not really in this context.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes, especially since CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. MR. LUETKEHANS: this was supposed to be the short one and we took all night. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. He'll be talking about MR. LUETKEHANS: He excuse me, sorry, takes a second to go back on. He will be talking about noise. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Noise, okay. All right, so we will expect on Thursday evening that Mr. Rand will be available 6:30 in Fairbury. Is that correct, Chuck, in Fairbury? MR. SCHOPP: Yes, that's right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know, in the report from Loomis, did he assume that all the wind turbine new jobs and employees that were created are going to live in Livingston County or was there a multiplier for how many were out of county and in county?</li> <li>A. I don't know what was assumed about how many workers reside in the county, so I just don't know.</li> <li>Q. Okay, so but like in his report, did he say all of them were going to be from the county? CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Slagel, that would be a Loomis question. MR. SLAGEL: Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Yeah, so not really in this context. MR. SLAGEL: Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes, especially since CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. MR. LUETKEHANS: this was supposed to be the short one and we took all night. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. He'll be talking about MR. LUETKEHANS: He excuse me, sorry, takes a second to go back on. He will be talking about noise. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Noise, okay. All right, so we will expect on Thursday evening that Mr. Rand will be available 6:30 in Fairbury. Is that correct, Chuck, in Fairbury? MR. SCHOPP: Yes, that's right. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, so we're for sure there. We need to look further out with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know, in the report from Loomis, did he assume that all the wind turbine new jobs and employees that were created are going to live in Livingston County or was there a multiplier for how many were out of county and in county?</li> <li>A. I don't know what was assumed about how many workers reside in the county, so I just don't know.</li> <li>Q. Okay, so but like in his report, did he say all of them were going to be from the county? CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Slagel, that would be a Loomis question. MR. SLAGEL: Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Yeah, so not really in this context. MR. SLAGEL: Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes, especially since CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. MR. LUETKEHANS: this was supposed to be the short one and we took all night. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. He'll be talking about MR. LUETKEHANS: He excuse me, sorry, takes a second to go back on. He will be talking about noise. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Noise, okay. All right, so we will expect on Thursday evening that Mr. Rand will be available 6:30 in Fairbury. Is that correct, Chuck, in Fairbury? MR. SCHOPP: Yes, that's right. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, so we're for sure there. We need to look further out with the schedule. We can do that here. If you give me
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know, in the report from Loomis, did he assume that all the wind turbine new jobs and employees that were created are going to live in Livingston County or was there a multiplier for how many were out of county and in county?</li> <li>A. I don't know what was assumed about how many workers reside in the county, so I just don't know.</li> <li>Q. Okay, so but like in his report, did he say all of them were going to be from the county? CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Slagel, that would be a Loomis question. MR. SLAGEL: Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Yeah, so not really in this context. MR. SLAGEL: Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right. BY MR. SLAGEL:</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes, especially since CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. MR. LUETKEHANS: this was supposed to be the short one and we took all night. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. He'll be talking about MR. LUETKEHANS: He excuse me, sorry, takes a second to go back on. He will be talking about noise. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Noise, okay. All right, so we will expect on Thursday evening that Mr. Rand will be available 6:30 in Fairbury. Is that correct, Chuck, in Fairbury? MR. SCHOPP: Yes, that's right. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, so we're for sure there. We need to look further out with the schedule. We can do that here. If you give me about three or four minutes, we'll look at that and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know, in the report from Loomis, did he assume that all the wind turbine new jobs and employees that were created are going to live in Livingston County or was there a multiplier for how many were out of county and in county?</li> <li>A. I don't know what was assumed about how many workers reside in the county, so I just don't know.</li> <li>Q. Okay, so but like in his report, did he say all of them were going to be from the county? CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Slagel, that would be a Loomis question. MR. SLAGEL: Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Yeah, so not really in this context. MR. SLAGEL: Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right.</li> <li>BY MR. SLAGEL: Q. The school was brought up. You looked at</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes, especially since CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. MR. LUETKEHANS: this was supposed to be the short one and we took all night. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. He'll be talking about MR. LUETKEHANS: He excuse me, sorry, takes a second to go back on. He will be talking about noise. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Noise, okay. All right, so we will expect on Thursday evening that Mr. Rand will be available 6:30 in Fairbury. Is that correct, Chuck, in Fairbury? MR. SCHOPP: Yes, that's right. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, so we're for sure there. We need to look further out with the schedule. We can do that here. If you give me about three or four minutes, we'll look at that and let everybody know.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know, in the report from Loomis, did he assume that all the wind turbine new jobs and employees that were created are going to live in Livingston County or was there a multiplier for how many were out of county and in county?</li> <li>A. I don't know what was assumed about how many workers reside in the county, so I just don't know.</li> <li>Q. Okay, so but like in his report, did he say all of them were going to be from the county? CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Slagel, that would be a Loomis question. MR. SLAGEL: Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Yeah, so not really in this context. MR. SLAGEL: Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right.</li> <li>BY MR. SLAGEL: Q. The school was brought up. You looked at Loomis's figures a little bit for the Prairie</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes, especially since CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. MR. LUETKEHANS: this was supposed to be the short one and we took all night. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. He'll be talking about MR. LUETKEHANS: He excuse me, sorry, takes a second to go back on. He will be talking about noise. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Noise, okay. All right, so we will expect on Thursday evening that Mr. Rand will be available 6:30 in Fairbury. Is that correct, Chuck, in Fairbury? MR. SCHOPP: Yes, that's right. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, so we're for sure there. We need to look further out with the schedule. We can do that here. If you give me about three or four minutes, we'll look at that and let everybody know. (Brief pause.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know, in the report from Loomis, did he assume that all the wind turbine new jobs and employees that were created are going to live in Livingston County or was there a multiplier for how many were out of county and in county?</li> <li>A. I don't know what was assumed about how many workers reside in the county, so I just don't know.</li> <li>Q. Okay, so but like in his report, did he say all of them were going to be from the county? CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Slagel, that would be a Loomis question. MR. SLAGEL: Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Yeah, so not really in this context. MR. SLAGEL: Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right.</li> <li>BY MR. SLAGEL: Q. The school was brought up. You looked at Loomis's figures a little bit for the Prairie Central budget?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes, especially since CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. MR. LUETKEHANS: this was supposed to be the short one and we took all night. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. He'll be talking about MR. LUETKEHANS: He excuse me, sorry, takes a second to go back on. He will be talking about noise. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Noise, okay. All right, so we will expect on Thursday evening that Mr. Rand will be available 6:30 in Fairbury. Is that correct, Chuck, in Fairbury? MR. SCHOPP: Yes, that's right. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, so we're for sure there. We need to look further out with the schedule. We can do that here. If you give me about three or four minutes, we'll look at that and let everybody know. (Brief pause.) CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, we've got
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know, in the report from Loomis, did he assume that all the wind turbine new jobs and employees that were created are going to live in Livingston County or was there a multiplier for how many were out of county and in county?</li> <li>A. I don't know what was assumed about how many workers reside in the county, so I just don't know.</li> <li>Q. Okay, so but like in his report, did he say all of them were going to be from the county? CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Slagel, that would be a Loomis question. MR. SLAGEL: Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Yeah, so not really in this context. MR. SLAGEL: Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right.</li> <li>BY MR. SLAGEL: Q. The school was brought up. You looked at Loomis's figures a little bit for the Prairie Central budget? A. Modestly.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes, especially since CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. MR. LUETKEHANS: this was supposed to be the short one and we took all night. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. He'll be talking about MR. LUETKEHANS: He excuse me, sorry, takes a second to go back on. He will be talking about noise. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Noise, okay. All right, so we will expect on Thursday evening that Mr. Rand will be available 6:30 in Fairbury. Is that correct, Chuck, in Fairbury? MR. SCHOPP: Yes, that's right. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, so we're for sure there. We need to look further out with the schedule. We can do that here. If you give me about three or four minutes, we'll look at that and let everybody know. (Brief pause.) CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, we've got some decisions. So Thursday we're good, 6:30 Walton
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know, in the report from Loomis, did he assume that all the wind turbine new jobs and employees that were created are going to live in Livingston County or was there a multiplier for how many were out of county and in county?</li> <li>A. I don't know what was assumed about how many workers reside in the county, so I just don't know.</li> <li>Q. Okay, so but like in his report, did he say all of them were going to be from the county? CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Mr. Slagel, that would be a Loomis question. MR. SLAGEL: Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Yeah, so not really in this context. MR. SLAGEL: Okay. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right.</li> <li>BY MR. SLAGEL: Q. The school was brought up. You looked at Loomis's figures a little bit for the Prairie Central budget?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes, especially since CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. MR. LUETKEHANS: this was supposed to be the short one and we took all night. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. He'll be talking about MR. LUETKEHANS: He excuse me, sorry, takes a second to go back on. He will be talking about noise. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Noise, okay. All right, so we will expect on Thursday evening that Mr. Rand will be available 6:30 in Fairbury. Is that correct, Chuck, in Fairbury? MR. SCHOPP: Yes, that's right. CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, so we're for sure there. We need to look further out with the schedule. We can do that here. If you give me about three or four minutes, we'll look at that and let everybody know. (Brief pause.) CHAIRMAN CORNALE: All right, we've got

LIV	INGSTON COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS		January 26, 201
	Page 1672		Page 1674
1	We'll meet at the courthouse for this meeting. It's	1	keep these guys on task. Well, I try my best. I'll
2	a regular business meeting, will have nothing to do	2	have to keep everybody on task, okay?
3	with the application at hand, so there won't be	3	So with that, understand we're going to
4	anything lost.	4	meet on Thursday at 6:30 at the Walton Centre.
5	What will happen is there's some	5	February 5th this board will meet, not to act on
6	there's consideration for some amendment of property	6	anything, not to do anything with regards to wind,
7	value guarantees that when we originally discussed	7	nothing short of the property value guarantee; that
8	it we thought all the information would be available	8	it looks without the information we can't do
9	to us. At this point, it's not all in. So	9	anything more conclusive. And then February 9th,
0	realistically, we can't make an educated decision.	10	here, 6:30; February 10th, Walton Centre, 6:30.
	So I believe the board will look to push that	11	Okay. Thursday will be Rand for sure.
1	further back until all the information's available.		And, Mr. Luetkehans, you'll have a better feel of
2		12	•
.3	So having said that, we're going to go	13	witnesses for us for the next hearing, is that
.4	February 9th and February 10th. Okay, February 9th	14	correct, moving forward?
.5	will be here, Pontiac Township High School.	15	MR. LUETKEHANS: Yes.
.6	February 10th will be at the Walton Centre. Both of	16	CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Okay. All right. With
.7	them will be at 6:30, all right?	17	that, I need a motion or
.8	So I implore everyone here please drive	18	MR. VITZTHUM: I'll make
٤9	careful. It's very slippery out there. Take your	19	MR. BLAKEMAN: Carolyn.
20	time getting home.	20	CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Oh, hold the motion to
21	Oh, witnesses. One other thing. I have	21	recess. Carolyn, go.
22	the we had the belief that Thursday evening other	22	MS. GERWIN: What's the information you're
23	individuals may be able to get up and speak. It's	23	missing for the property value guarantee plan
24	probably not looking like that. Counsel has	24	decision? What are you waiting for?
	Page 1673		Page 1675
1	provided me with a statement, and I believe it's a	1	CHAIRMAN CORNALE: The information is
2	true interpretation of what I'd like to tell	2	everything that we may possibly get in testimony,
3	everyone as we look forward to witnesses being able	3	both their testimony, Mr. Luetkehans, additional
4	to testify. Just so I'll give you the	4	interested parties may have additional information
5	information. You can think on it.		to add to that. As far as not speaking for the
6	All right, I'm going to read this. As a	6	whole board but speaking, I guess, in my thought, we
0 7	result of the last three nights, four nights,	7	need to gather as much possible information as we
			can before we make a concrete decision on it. So a
8	several nights, there's a perception on the part of	8	
9	the ZBA that there has been a significant amount of	9	realistic possibility is that we'll be post this
0	irrelevant information submitted, the presentation	10	hearing. All right. With that, motion to recess.
.1	of which has consumed a great deal of time. The ZBA	11	<b>MR. VITZTHUM:</b> I make that motion.
.2	is asking all concerned to do a better job of asking	12	CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Vitzthum motions
.3	and answering questions related to relevant	13	Could I get a second?
.4	material. In other words, please be more succinct,	14	MS. HUISMAN: I'll second.
.5	succinct. I don't know about that word. Counsel,	15	CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Huisman seconds. Al
L6	thank you. Otherwise, the ZBA may be compelled to	16	in favor?
L7	put time limitations on the presentation and	17	ALL MEMBERS: Aye.
L8	cross-examination of witnesses. There comes a time	18	CHAIRMAN CORNALE: Opposed.
		1	

- 18 cross-examination of witnesses. There comes a time19 when you have made your point and the rest is just
- when you have made your point and the rest is just
  overkill.
  Okay. We haven't had to put time
  limitations on anything and I really don't want to,
  I -- I want everyone to have their opportunity to
- 24 speak, but if you get off task, you guys have seen I  $\$  24

(Adjourned at 9:32 p.m.)

```
Page 1676
     1 STATE OF ILLINOIS
                                                                                                            )
)SS
     2
                  COUNTY OF FORD
           I, June Haeme, a Notary Public in and for
the County of Ford, State of Illinois, do hereby
certify that the following Livingston County Zoning
Board of Appeals Case SU-7-14 hearing was taken at
the Pontiac Township High School, 1100 Indiana
Avenue, Pontiac, Illinois, on January 26, 2015.
That the said deposition was taken down in
stenograph notes and afterwards reduced to
typewriting under my instruction and that the
deposition is a true record of the testimony given.
I do further certify that I am a
disinterested person in this cause of action; that I
am not a relative, or otherwise interested in the
event of this action, and am not in the employ of
the attorneys for either party.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
hand and affixed my notarial seal this 9th day of
February, 2015.
     3
     4
     5
     6
     7
     8
    9
10
11
12
                  February, 2015.
13
14
15
                                                                                                          JUNE HAEME, CSR
NOTARY PUBLIC
16
17
18
                   "OFFICIAL SEAL"
                June Haeme
Notary Public, State of Illinois
My Commission Expires:
September 27, 2016
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

	accurate (4)	1559:11,18;1580:15;	1615:6;1629:11;	
\$	1569:22;1612:2;	1583:6;1585:19;	1634:8;1635:15	a
ψ	1655:10;1657:1	1587:8;1597:8;1602:3;	agreed (2)	
\$11,000 (2)	accurately (2)	1635:2;1652:14	1670:13,15	
	1566:21;1623:16	Adjourned (1)	agreeing (1)	a
1632:16;1636:16	acknowledge (1)	1675:19	1596:11	•••
<b>\$170 (1)</b>	1654:6	adjust (1)	agreement (16)	a
1666:3	act (1)	1625:18	1560:1;1583:15,21;	•
\$35,000 (2)	1674:5	adjusted (3)	1584:7,7,9;1585:11,20;	
1565:22;1627:1	acting (1)	1573:16;1574:14;	1586:9,11;1587:13,13,	
<b>\$6</b> (1)	1554:3	1623:7		
1594:1			16,19,20;1594:13	
\$95,000 (1)	action (1)	adjusting (1)	agreements (3)	a
1653:17	1554:24	1633:20	1601:16,18;1647:11	
	activities (5)	adjustments (1)	agricultural-based (1)	a
]	1556:12;1591:11;	1621:16	1631:8	
	1592:22;1594:12;	administration (1)	ahead (3)	
[Noise (1)	1620:19	1600:4	1554:2;1605:17;	
1627:22	activity (23)	advantage (1)	1662:12	a
102/122	1558:20;1562:4,11;	1662:1	air (4)	
Α	1566:10,24;1567:16;	advent (1)	1559:7;1597:6;	
1	1574:22;1594:17;	1591:16	1658:12;1659:13	
Aaron (3)	1597:19;1609:11;	advised (1)	air/noise (1)	
1555:8,11,14	1615:7,8;1616:21,22;	1588:2	1598:4	
able (5)	1617:22,24;1618:1,4,	affect (1)	Airport (1)	
	11;1627:18;1653:22;	1665:16	1556:7	
1592:9;1650:13;	1664:8;1668:2	affected (1)	airports (1)	
1660:19;1672:23;	actual (18)	1665:19	1581:18	
1673:3	1574:14;1591:8;	after-the-fact (2)	alleged (1)	
above (1)	1592:4;1613:12;	1630:8,21	1599:4	
1563:3	1620:4;1621:8;	afterwards (1)	allocate (1)	
absence (4)	1630:15,16;1631:13;	1591:8	1668:8	
1560:10;1566:23;	1636:1;1651:15;	Again (31)	allow (1)	
1641:18;1664:14				
Absolutely (3)	1652:18;1655:23,24,	1573:22;1579:12;	1562:17	
1598:13;1603:23;	24;1663:9,10,18	1590:17;1594:24;	allowed (2)	
1605:12	actually (27)	1595:23;1599:21;	1587:8;1617:7	
academic (1)	1563:18;1567:20;	1600:19;1601:21;	alluded (1)	
1615:16	1577:22;1580:9;	1602:2;1611:21;	1587:4	a
accept (3)	1584:23;1585:10;	1612:20;1613:14;	along (4)	
1614:21,24;1655:6	1588:22;1598:5,20;	1614:10,24;1618:17;	1554:7;1572:17;	
accepted (5)	1606:4;1612:22;	1623:11,15;1625:1;	1582:8,13	a
1558:9;1561:21;	1616:12;1617:8,12;	1628:2;1631:5;	alter (5)	
1570:19;1574:24;	1618:17,19,21;1620:3;	1635:15;1637:19;	1567:17;1571:13;	a
1606:10	1625:8;1631:11;	1646:6;1649:2;1651:9;	1589:23;1592:3,15	
access (2)	1632:22;1635:18,20;	1654:9;1655:11;	altered (2)	a
1563:3;1571:5	1659:2;1660:8;	1658:3;1662:2;1663:1;	1575:18;1588:12	
accident (1)	1662:19,21	1666:14	altering (1)	a
. ,	add (3)	agglomeration (1)	1637:6	
1554:4	1584:7;1659:17;	1618:11	alternative (7)	a
accidents (1)	1675:5	agglomerations (1)	1560:11;1592:21;	•••
1602:5	added (4)	1568:14	1604:9;1664:17;	a
according (7)	1557:13,14;1576:21;	aggregate (4)	1665:2,11;1668:6	a
1559:1;1563:5;		1632:14;1636:14,18;	alternatives (2)	
1564:1;1565:14;	1661:1			a
1573:20;1649:1;	adding (1)	1655:13	1604:17;1647:13	
1655:3	1574:23	aggregated (1)	although (1)	
A 1º 1 (1)	addition (6)	1626:3	1562:7	a
Accordingly (1)	1558:1;1560:12;	aggregates (1)	aluminum (1)	1
<b>Accordingly (1)</b> 1561:3			1.07.5	1
1561:3	1574:5;1581:10;	1626:5	1627:5	
1561:3 account (6)	1574:5;1581:10; 1594:4,24	ago (4)	always (2)	
1561:3 account (6) 1566:14,22;1572:20;	1574:5;1581:10; 1594:4,24 additional (6)	<b>ago (4)</b> 1599:8;1613:3;	<b>always (2)</b> 1636:11;1648:13	a
1561:3 account (6) 1566:14,22;1572:20; 1636:10;1649:14;	1574:5;1581:10; 1594:4,24	<b>ago (4)</b> 1599:8;1613:3; 1651:17;1654:4	always (2) 1636:11;1648:13 amendment (1)	a
1561:3 <b>account (6)</b> 1566:14,22;1572:20; 1636:10;1649:14; 1665:22	1574:5;1581:10; 1594:4,24 additional (6)	<b>ago (4)</b> 1599:8;1613:3;	<b>always (2)</b> 1636:11;1648:13	a aj
1561:3 <b>account (6)</b> 1566:14,22;1572:20; 1636:10;1649:14;	1574:5;1581:10; 1594:4,24 additional (6) 1558:6;1564:12;	<b>ago (4)</b> 1599:8;1613:3; 1651:17;1654:4	always (2) 1636:11;1648:13 amendment (1)	

#### January 26, 2015

1598:5;1658:11 amenity (3) 1559:6;1597:5; 1598:3 among (3) 1557:20;1634:3,8 amount (7) 1564:7;1572:10; 1599:9;1619:24; 1652:16:1669:24; 1673:9 amounts (3) 1561:5;1622:21,23 analyses (5) 1604:3;1606:19; 1613:20;1617:14; 1661:16 analysis (48) 1556:1,21;1557:8, 11;1559:17;1561:15; 1565:4,5;1566:1; 1567:1;1571:8; 1572:19;1575:1; 1578:20;1582:24; 1597:18;1598:22; 1600:7;1602:12; 1604:24;1606:23; 1610:17;1611:5; 1616:7,10,15;1621:7; 1626:1;1629:4,12; 1630:3;1632:9,11; 1633:20;1634:4; 1635:2,4,5,8,19,21; 1638:2;1639:4; 1644:15,16;1649:21; 1659:21;1664:12 analyst (3) 1561:2;1622:17; 1623:12 analysts (1) 1665:8 analytical (2) 1561:21;1606:10 analyze (1) 1665:13 analyzed (1) 1566:24 and/or (1) 1556:10 announcement (1) 1554:21 annual (4) 1563:15;1619:24; 1636:15;1658:23 answered (6) 1596:13,14,18; 1642:22;1646:13; 1657:21 anticipate (1) 1623:22 apparent (2) 1594:13;1604:6 apparently (4)

**Min-U-Script**®

Area Wide Reporting and Video Conferencing 1-800-747-6789

(1) \$11,000 - apparently

	1	1		January 20, 2015
1560:20;1567:19;	1632:9;1648:9,16,18;	AUDIENCE (6)	1573:9	1650:13;1657:18;
1652:3;1655:13	1649:1;1656:8,9,14;	1646:8;1660:3,5,17;	base (17)	1658:3;1666:6,23,24
Appeals (2)	1657:4	1668:12;1670:9	1564:6;1567:17;	big (2)
1554:10;1576:20	articles (6)	August (1)	1569:15;1571:13;	1615:4;1637:9
appeared (1)	1579:20,20;1580:7,	1648:21	1575:14,19;1576:6;	Bill (2)
1631:20	14;1604:22;1647:20	author (9)	1582:20;1588:13,17;	1594:6;1595:2
appears (1)	assertion (1)	1560:4;1563:1;	1589:14,24;1592:4,16;	billion (1)
1571:19	1604:14	1603:9;1606:6;1641:4;	1637:6,17;1662:5	1659:3
applicant (1)	assess (1)	1643:6;1645:6,9;	based (16)	<b>Bi-Regional</b> (1)
1645:24	1635:14	1652:10	1557:19;1571:8,18;	1580:11
application (1)	assessed (6)	authors (3)	1584:9,18;1604:14,14,	Bishop (1)
1672:3	1597:23;1598:2;	1566:1;1632:11;	16,19;1606:13;	1602:21
		1663:21		bit (3)
Applications (1)	1599:12;1603:19;		1613:14,19;1628:8,12,	
1617:19	1612:22;1614:2	auto (1)	13;1629:2	1554:4;1642:23;
applied (1)	assessing (3)	1556:14	basic (1)	1669:20
1634:20	1604:15,16,19	automate (1)	1561:12	black (1)
apply (1)	assessment (3)	1650:15	basis (7)	1661:7
1601:10	1596:24;1620:4;	available (7)	1557:7;1588:14;	blades (2)
appraisal (1)	1635:11	1565:5;1572:12;	1595:5;1596:11;	1565:8;1626:15
1598:16	assessments (2)	1607:16;1633:22;	1629:6;1638:2;1642:1	BLAKEMAN (3)
appraiser (3)	1598:17;1605:4	1671:12;1672:8,12	be-all (1)	1554:20;1555:6;
1598:14,18,21	assignments (1)	average (4)	1599:19	1674:19
approach (1)	1556:18	1636:14,17;1653:17;	bear (1)	Blazer (66)
1634:20	assistance (3)	1669:24	1558:24	1577:8,10,12;
appropriate (3)	1578:17,18,19	Avoid (1)	become (2)	1584:3,16,18;1585:1,8,
1561:11;1622:20;	associated (7)	1580:10	1650:5,16	15;1586:1,16,23;
1643:23	1557:13;1562:10;	avoided (1)	began (1)	1587:11,20,24;1588:7,
appropriateness (1)	1566:19;1572:2;	1659:8	1656:6	8;1595:10,14,21;
1561:15	1574:2;1649:19;	avoiding (1)	begin (2)	1596:15,17,19,21;
approving (1)	1668:7	1635:12	1624:7;1648:12	1601:12,20;1605:9,12,
1571:14	Associates (2)	aware (16)	beginning (1)	24;1606:2;1610:9;
approximately (3)	1555:18;1556:18	1583:19;1584:11,12;	1606:23	1617:13,13;1625:14;
1570:15;1632:15;	assume (9)	1586:11;1594:9,10;	behind (1)	1628:19;1639:10,11,
1636:15	1581:2;1606:14;	1611:10;1614:14;	1572:15	13,23;1640:4,7,12,19,
area (30)	1628:2;1633:6;	1616:6,9,13;1628:11,	beholden (1)	20,22;1642:15,19;
1557:21;1558:21,21,	1652:13,20;1665:24;	14;1630:1;1634:17;	1556:19	1643:21;1644:4,8,20;
23;1561:7;1597:19;	1666:2;1669:2	1661:1	belief (1)	1645:2;1646:16,22;
1601:18;1610:23,24;	assumed (5)	away (1)	1672:22	1654:19;1656:9;
1615:13,19,19,20;	1623:4;1652:10,17;	1566:9	bells (1)	1657:21;1658:2,7;
1617:14;1618:2;	1656:19;1669:6	Aye (1)	1593:13	1659:6;1660:1;1666:4,
1620:17,19;1632:1,23;	assumes (2)	1675:17	below (1)	23;1667:7,11;1670:20
1633:4;1635:19;	1574:9;1666:5	D	1563:3	Blazer's (1)
1636:3;1637:22;	assuming (5)	B	beneficial (1)	1666:10
1643:23;1662:2,3;	1569:1;1605:8;		1556:2	<b>Bloomington</b> (1)
1664:2,9;1665:15;	1649:4;1657:11;	back (17)	benefit (1)	1572:10
1667:4	1668:23	1561:11;1593:12;	1584:6	Board (11)
areas (8)	assumption (3)	1600:9;1605:14,18;	benefit/cost (1)	1554:10;1555:1;
1565:20;1615:11,18;			1635:5	1576:20;1585:21;
1,00,20,101,11,10,	1561:2;1573:22;	1608:4:1609:3:1611:9:	1055.5	13/0.20,1303.21,
	1561:2;1573:22; 1621:18	1608:4;1609:3;1611:9; 1615:21:1620:3.15:		
1616:24;1618:1,8,9;	1621:18	1615:21;1620:3,15;	benefits (15)	1586:5;1594:5,18;
1616:24;1618:1,8,9; 1638:24	1621:18 assumptions (7)	1615:21;1620:3,15; 1632:5;1635:19;	<b>benefits (15)</b> 1583:15;1588:4;	1586:5;1594:5,18; 1595:2;1672:11;
1616:24;1618:1,8,9; 1638:24 <b>area's (1)</b>	1621:18 assumptions (7) 1561:5,10,11,12;	1615:21;1620:3,15; 1632:5;1635:19; 1670:13,15;1671:8;	<b>benefits (15)</b> 1583:15;1588:4; 1596:24;1607:6;	1586:5;1594:5,18; 1595:2;1672:11; 1674:5;1675:6
1616:24;1618:1,8,9; 1638:24 <b>area's (1)</b> 1664:9	1621:18 assumptions (7) 1561:5,10,11,12; 1571:2;1573:17;	1615:21;1620:3,15; 1632:5;1635:19; 1670:13,15;1671:8; 1672:12	<b>benefits (15)</b> 1583:15;1588:4; 1596:24;1607:6; 1634:6;1635:9;1643:9;	1586:5;1594:5,18; 1595:2;1672:11; 1674:5;1675:6 <b>boards (1)</b>
1616:24;1618:1,8,9; 1638:24 area's (1) 1664:9 argumentative (3)	1621:18 assumptions (7) 1561:5,10,11,12; 1571:2;1573:17; 1574:13	1615:21;1620:3,15; 1632:5;1635:19; 1670:13,15;1671:8; 1672:12 backward (1)	<b>benefits (15)</b> 1583:15;1588:4; 1596:24;1607:6; 1634:6;1635:9;1643:9; 1656:22;1657:8,10,11;	1586:5;1594:5,18; 1595:2;1672:11; 1674:5;1675:6 <b>boards (1)</b> 1577:6
1616:24;1618:1,8,9; 1638:24 area's (1) 1664:9 argumentative (3) 1601:7;1624:10;	1621:18 <b>assumptions (7)</b> 1561:5,10,11,12; 1571:2;1573:17; 1574:13 <b>assured (1)</b>	1615:21;1620:3,15; 1632:5;1635:19; 1670:13,15;1671:8; 1672:12 <b>backward (1)</b> 1633:8	benefits (15) 1583:15;1588:4; 1596:24;1607:6; 1634:6;1635:9;1643:9; 1656:22;1657:8,10,11; 1658:20;1659:15,19,21	1586:5;1594:5,18; 1595:2;1672:11; 1674:5;1675:6 <b>boards (1)</b> 1577:6 <b>bodies (1)</b>
1616:24;1618:1,8,9; 1638:24 area's (1) 1664:9 argumentative (3) 1601:7;1624:10; 1645:18	1621:18 <b>assumptions (7)</b> 1561:5,10,11,12; 1571:2;1573:17; 1574:13 <b>assured (1)</b> 1647:12	1615:21;1620:3,15; 1632:5;1635:19; 1670:13,15;1671:8; 1672:12 backward (1) 1633:8 backward-looking (1)	benefits (15) 1583:15;1588:4; 1596:24;1607:6; 1634:6;1635:9;1643:9; 1656:22;1657:8,10,11; 1658:20;1659:15,19,21 Berkeley (2)	1586:5;1594:5,18; 1595:2;1672:11; 1674:5;1675:6 <b>boards (1)</b> 1577:6 <b>bodies (1)</b> 1577:5
1616:24;1618:1,8,9; 1638:24 area's (1) 1664:9 argumentative (3) 1601:7;1624:10; 1645:18 arise (1)	1621:18 <b>assumptions (7)</b> 1561:5,10,11,12; 1571:2;1573:17; 1574:13 <b>assured (1)</b> 1647:12 <b>attainable (1)</b>	1615:21;1620:3,15; 1632:5;1635:19; 1670:13,15;1671:8; 1672:12 backward (1) 1633:8 backward-looking (1) 1654:7	benefits (15) 1583:15;1588:4; 1596:24;1607:6; 1634:6;1635:9;1643:9; 1656:22;1657:8,10,11; 1658:20;1659:15,19,21 Berkeley (2) 1638:17;1661:19	1586:5;1594:5,18; 1595:2;1672:11; 1674:5;1675:6 <b>boards (1)</b> 1577:6 <b>bodies (1)</b> 1577:5 <b>body (1)</b>
1616:24,1618:1,8,9; 1638:24 area's (1) 1664:9 argumentative (3) 1601:7;1624:10; 1645:18 arise (1) 1603:5	1621:18 <b>assumptions (7)</b> 1561:5,10,11,12; 1571:2;1573:17; 1574:13 <b>assured (1)</b> 1647:12 <b>attainable (1)</b> 1647:14	1615:21;1620:3,15; 1632:5;1635:19; 1670:13,15;1671:8; 1672:12 backward (1) 1633:8 backward-looking (1) 1654:7 backwards (1)	benefits (15) 1583:15;1588:4; 1596:24;1607:6; 1634:6;1635:9;1643:9; 1656:22;1657:8,10,11; 1658:20;1659:15,19,21 Berkeley (2) 1638:17;1661:19 best (1)	1586:5;1594:5,18; 1595:2;1672:11; 1674:5;1675:6 <b>boards (1)</b> 1577:6 <b>bodies (1)</b> 1577:5 <b>body (1)</b> 1671:24
1616:24;1618:1,8,9; 1638:24 area's (1) 1664:9 argumentative (3) 1601:7;1624:10; 1645:18 arise (1) 1603:5 around (1)	1621:18 <b>assumptions (7)</b> 1561:5,10,11,12; 1571:2;1573:17; 1574:13 <b>assured (1)</b> 1647:12 <b>attainable (1)</b> 1647:14 <b>attempt (1)</b>	1615:21;1620:3,15; 1632:5;1635:19; 1670:13,15;1671:8; 1672:12 backward (1) 1633:8 backward-looking (1) 1654:7 backwards (1) 1635:24	benefits (15) 1583:15;1588:4; 1596:24;1607:6; 1634:6;1635:9;1643:9; 1656:22;1657:8,10,11; 1658:20;1659:15,19,21 Berkeley (2) 1638:17;1661:19 best (1) 1674:1	1586:5;1594:5,18; 1595:2;1672:11; 1674:5;1675:6 <b>boards (1)</b> 1577:6 <b>bodies (1)</b> 1577:5 <b>body (1)</b> 1671:24 <b>both (10)</b>
1616:24,1618:1,8,9; 1638:24 area's (1) 1664:9 argumentative (3) 1601:7;1624:10; 1645:18 arise (1) 1603:5	1621:18 <b>assumptions (7)</b> 1561:5,10,11,12; 1571:2;1573:17; 1574:13 <b>assured (1)</b> 1647:12 <b>attainable (1)</b> 1647:14	1615:21;1620:3,15; 1632:5;1635:19; 1670:13,15;1671:8; 1672:12 backward (1) 1633:8 backward-looking (1) 1654:7 backwards (1)	benefits (15) 1583:15;1588:4; 1596:24;1607:6; 1634:6;1635:9;1643:9; 1656:22;1657:8,10,11; 1658:20;1659:15,19,21 Berkeley (2) 1638:17;1661:19 best (1)	1586:5;1594:5,18; 1595:2;1672:11; 1674:5;1675:6 <b>boards (1)</b> 1577:6 <b>bodies (1)</b> 1577:5 <b>body (1)</b> 1671:24
1616:24;1618:1,8,9; 1638:24 area's (1) 1664:9 argumentative (3) 1601:7;1624:10; 1645:18 arise (1) 1603:5 around (1)	1621:18 <b>assumptions (7)</b> 1561:5,10,11,12; 1571:2;1573:17; 1574:13 <b>assured (1)</b> 1647:12 <b>attainable (1)</b> 1647:14 <b>attempt (1)</b>	1615:21;1620:3,15; 1632:5;1635:19; 1670:13,15;1671:8; 1672:12 backward (1) 1633:8 backward-looking (1) 1654:7 backwards (1) 1635:24	benefits (15) 1583:15;1588:4; 1596:24;1607:6; 1634:6;1635:9;1643:9; 1656:22;1657:8,10,11; 1658:20;1659:15,19,21 Berkeley (2) 1638:17;1661:19 best (1) 1674:1	1586:5;1594:5,18; 1595:2;1672:11; 1674:5;1675:6 <b>boards (1)</b> 1577:6 <b>bodies (1)</b> 1577:5 <b>body (1)</b> 1671:24 <b>both (10)</b>
1616:24;1618:1,8,9; 1638:24 area's (1) 1664:9 argumentative (3) 1601:7;1624:10; 1645:18 arise (1) 1603:5 around (1) 1590:12 article (19)	1621:18 <b>assumptions (7)</b> 1561:5,10,11,12; 1571:2;1573:17; 1574:13 <b>assured (1)</b> 1647:12 <b>attainable (1)</b> 1647:14 <b>attempt (1)</b> 1567:19	1615:21;1620:3,15; 1632:5;1635:19; 1670:13,15;1671:8; 1672:12 backward (1) 1633:8 backward-looking (1) 1654:7 backwards (1) 1635:24 bad (1) 1640:17	benefits (15) 1583:15;1588:4; 1596:24;1607:6; 1634:6;1635:9;1643:9; 1656:22;1657:8,10,11; 1658:20;1659:15,19,21 Berkeley (2) 1638:17;1661:19 best (1) 1674:1 better (8) 1633:18;1638:6,22;	1586:5;1594:5,18; 1595:2;1672:11; 1674:5;1675:6 <b>boards (1)</b> 1577:6 <b>bodies (1)</b> 1577:5 <b>body (1)</b> 1671:24 <b>both (10)</b> 1567:6;1571:24; 1573:4;1589:7;1590:7;
1616:24;1618:1,8,9; 1638:24 area's (1) 1664:9 argumentative (3) 1601:7;1624:10; 1645:18 arise (1) 1603:5 around (1) 1590:12 article (19) 1580:7,9;1593:9,19;	1621:18 <b>assumptions (7)</b> 1561:5,10,11,12; 1571:2;1573:17; 1574:13 <b>assured (1)</b> 1647:12 <b>attainable (1)</b> 1647:14 <b>attempt (1)</b> 1567:19 <b>attended (1)</b> 1576:20	1615:21;1620:3,15; 1632:5;1635:19; 1670:13,15;1671:8; 1672:12 backward (1) 1633:8 backward-looking (1) 1654:7 backwards (1) 1635:24 bad (1) 1640:17 banker (3)	benefits (15) 1583:15;1588:4; 1596:24;1607:6; 1634:6;1635:9;1643:9; 1656:22;1657:8,10,11; 1658:20;1659:15,19,21 Berkeley (2) 1638:17;1661:19 best (1) 1674:1 better (8) 1633:18;1638:6,22; 1639:4,7;1656:2;	1586:5;1594:5,18; 1595:2;1672:11; 1674:5;1675:6 <b>boards (1)</b> 1577:6 <b>bodies (1)</b> 1577:5 <b>body (1)</b> 1671:24 <b>both (10)</b> 1567:6;1571:24; 1573:4;1589:7;1590:7; 1601:10;1649:22;
1616:24;1618:1,8,9; 1638:24 area's (1) 1664:9 argumentative (3) 1601:7;1624:10; 1645:18 arise (1) 1603:5 around (1) 1590:12 article (19)	1621:18 <b>assumptions (7)</b> 1561:5,10,11,12; 1571:2;1573:17; 1574:13 <b>assured (1)</b> 1647:12 <b>attainable (1)</b> 1647:14 <b>attempt (1)</b> 1567:19 <b>attended (1)</b>	1615:21;1620:3,15; 1632:5;1635:19; 1670:13,15;1671:8; 1672:12 backward (1) 1633:8 backward-looking (1) 1654:7 backwards (1) 1635:24 bad (1) 1640:17	benefits (15) 1583:15;1588:4; 1596:24;1607:6; 1634:6;1635:9;1643:9; 1656:22;1657:8,10,11; 1658:20;1659:15,19,21 Berkeley (2) 1638:17;1661:19 best (1) 1674:1 better (8) 1633:18;1638:6,22;	1586:5;1594:5,18; 1595:2;1672:11; 1674:5;1675:6 <b>boards (1)</b> 1577:6 <b>bodies (1)</b> 1577:5 <b>body (1)</b> 1671:24 <b>both (10)</b> 1567:6;1571:24; 1573:4;1589:7;1590:7;

### January 26, 2015

January 26, 2015

				Sundary 20, 2015
bottles (1)	1560:2;1641:22;	1590:20;1598:17;	1646:9,19;1654:19;	1572:17,23
1659:1	1648:10,13	1616:15;1617:22;	1658:2;1660:2,4,11;	clusters (2)
bottom (4)	buying (1)	1619:23;1626:24;	1662:11;1666:11;	1568:15,19
1563:16;1603:7;	1653:18	1647:4;1663:11	1667:7,12;1668:11;	coefficients (1)
1616:19;1620:16		cases (3)	1669:11,14,17;1670:8,	1633:21
box (1)	С	1615:6;1616:20;	23;1671:2,5,10,15,21;	Colleagues (2)
1661:7		1665:2	1674:16,20;1675:1,12,	1578:10,17
brands (2)	cabling (2)	cash (3)	15,18	collect (1)
1629:4,12	1563:4;1626:15	1594:14,19,22	change (8)	1563:4
break (1)	calculated (1)	Cat (1)	1557:23;1566:18;	collectively (1)
1605:11	1562:19	1650:22	1593:4;1637:16,18;	1603:12
Breathes (1)	calibrated (1)	categories (1)	1649:18;1662:5,10	college (1)
1593:21	1631:10	1622:20	changed (2)	1632:7
bridges (1)	California (4)	Caterpillar (1)	1574:14;1645:10	colleges (3)
1581:18	1565:13;1616:3;	1650:5	changes (15)	1556:15;1668:19,21
brief (2)	1656:6;1664:4	caused (2)	1557:18;1559:6,11;	column (2)
		1575:18;1588:13		1633:16;1636:9
1554:21;1671:20	call (7)		1561:4;1597:5,8,13,24;	
briefly (1)	1554:3,3,13;1555:6,	Cayuga (14)	1598:2;1599:7,8;	combination (1)
1584:5	8;1654:17;1664:13	1567:3,9;1589:4,11;	1600:1;1621:18,20;	1562:13
bring (3)	called (1)	1590:3,6,10,11;1592:1,	1658:11	combined (1)
1564:18;1653:3;	1602:15	20;1593:17;1594:2;	changing (2)	1619:16
1670:21	came (7)	1602:23;1663:14	1566:17;1649:17	comfort (1)
broadly (1)	1565:20;1567:5,7;	ceased (1)	chase (1)	1638:3
1581:24	1589:7;1590:12,13,15	1651:12	1616:17	comical (1)
brought (3)	can (37)	cell (1)	checked (1)	1601:6
1618:7;1640:13;	1559:9;1565:16;	1556:7	1603:4	coming (6)
1669:19	1572:11;1576:4;	Center (5)	Chicago (1)	1560:19;1563:23;
Brown (1)	1580:13;1586:4;	1579:22,24;1618:1,	1574:16	1585:16;1639:1;
1632:18	1587:1;1604:13;	4,11	China (1)	1666:19;1670:19
budget (2)	1605:17;1608:1;	centers (4)	1565:12	Commencing (1)
1669:21;1670:4	1612:8;1615:9;	1615:9;1616:22;	Chuck (3)	1554:1
build (3)	1616:23;1621:17,19,	1617:22,24	1576:17;1668:15;	comment (2)
1568:12;1569:2;	19;1624:17;1627:8;	Central (4)	1671:13	1585:22;1617:17
1645:12	1629:1;1632:2;1634:7;	1656:23;1657:14;	citation (1)	commented (1)
building (1)	1635:15;1636:12;	1669:21;1670:4	1632:1	1585:24
1620:18	1640:8,18,20;1645:22;	Centre (4)	cited (4)	comments (5)
built (17)	1646:3,10;1649:10;	1671:23;1672:16;	1580:19;1588:22;	1579:7,10;1597:3;
1567:20,23;1575:17;	1660:13,17;1666:15;	1674:4,10	1589:21,22	1656:15,18
1588:11,22;1589:1,5;	1667:13;1671:17;	certain (3)	cites (2)	commissioned (1)
1590:11,16;1625:20,	1673:5;1675:8	1560:8;1613:10,12	1568:1;1632:18	1560:21
23;1643:8,11;1648:5;			· · · · ·	
1651:12;1665:1,2	capacity $(4)$	certainly (10) 1577:16;1587:21;	city (1) 1618:3	<b>commissions (1)</b> 1638:20
	1632:17;1636:16;			
<b>built-in</b> (1)	1658:17;1663:7	1602:11;1603:20;	claim (1)	commitments (1)
1615:20	capital (2)	1604:8;1606:19;	1570:7	1563:23
bunch (1)	1563:6;1581:20	1619:2;1653:14;	claimed (1)	communities (2)
1650:14	capture (1)	1665:8,18	1562:8	1614:23;1664:24
burden (1)	1572:11	cetera (1)	classified (1)	community (6)
1558:24	captured (1)	1658:13	1612:6	1581:20,21;1582:4;
Bureau (1)	1574:18	chain (8)	clear (7)	1614:19;1618:10;
1631:14	Carbon (1)	1562:13,15;1568:22;	1554:21;1574:1;	1655:17
burst (1)	1659:8	1569:8;1570:5;1574:6;	1624:9;1662:21;	community's (4)
1664:7	careful (1)	1579:21;1611:15	1666:14;1667:13,15	1581:13,14;1582:16,
business (4)	1672:19	chairman (59)	clearly (1)	20
1557:24;1569:7;	carefully (1)	1554:3;1576:16,24;	1647:14	companies (2)
1653:21;1672:2	1629:20	1577:3;1585:18;	clients (2)	1627:10;1630:17
Businesses (10)	Carolyn (7)	1586:13,18;1587:3;	1555:23;1556:2	company (9)
1557:21,23;1558:1;	1660:9;1662:12,16;	1588:1;1594:6;1595:2,	close (2)	1616:6,12,20;
1572:18;1593:21;	1667:8,13;1674:19,21	17,20;1596:17;1601:9;	1614:23;1667:24	1618:12,15;1619:5,16,
1594:2,18;1665:14,17,	cars (2)	1605:9,13,17,23;	closer (1)	23;1647:22
18	1659:9,10	1617:13,15;1639:11,	1555:20	company's (1)
buy (1)	Case (13)	14;1640:4,9,16;	closing (1)	1643:18
1557:21	1554:11;1558:21;	1642:21;1643:2;	1556:7	comparatively (1)
buyer (4)	1559:3;1561:7;1565:7;	1644:2;1645:21,23;	clothes (2)	1620:22
	1007.0,1001.7,1000.7,	1077.2,1075.21,25,		1020.22

### January 26, 2015

compare (4)	conclusive (1)	24;1602:6,7;1609:11;	24;1577:3,10;1585:16,	1567:13,21;1568:3,10,
1577:16;1593:12;	1674:9	1615:8;1616:21;	18;1586:2,13,18;	13;1569:9;1570:2,15,
1663:16;1664:8	concrete (4)	1623:9;1627:10,17;	1587:1,3;1588:1;	16;1572:4,8,13,21;
compared (4)	1564:16;1626:15,19;	1641:2;1643:12;	1595:10,17,20;	1574:1,18;1575:19;
1612:14;1623:6;	1675:8	1647:11;1648:12;	1596:17;1601:9;	1576:7,11;1583:17,21;
1637:8;1663:18	condition (4)	1649:16;1652:8;	1605:9,13,17,23;	1586:4,10;1588:14,22;
comparing (2)	1599:5;1648:14;	1663:22	1617:13,15;1639:11,	1589:2,14,19,24;
1608:24;1610:4	1657:14,16	construe (1)	14,23;1640:4,8,9,16;	1590:11,23;1592:19;
comparison (3)	conditions (5)	1581:24	1642:15,21;1643:2;	1593:19,23;1594:1,5,
1568:6;1663:3,16	1574:15;1575:24;	consultants (1)	1644:2;1645:21,23;	17;1595:2;1600:22;
compatibility (2)	1598:23;1641:1;	1624:18	1646:9,16,19;1654:19;	1601:15;1602:16,19,
1665:5,9	1648:20	consulting (1)	1658:2;1660:2,4,11;	21,24;1603:10;1614:6,
compelled (1)	conduct (3)	1555:17	1662:11;1666:11;	16,20;1615:3,11;
1673:16	1554:22;1567:19;	consumed (1)	1667:7,12;1668:11;	1617:1,23;1618:13,16,
competing (1)	1632:11	1673:11	1669:11,14,17;1670:8,	18;1619:5,12,18,19;
1647:13	conducted (4)	consumption (3)	23;1671:2,5,10,15,21;	1620:17;1621:6,13,23;
completed (2)	1556:10;1565:6;	1562:2;1609:9;	1674:16,20;1675:1,12,	1622:9,14,15;1625:19,
1565:11;1570:1	1568:1;1598:22	1658:24	15,18	24;1626:2,6,8,18;
completely (1)	conducting (1)	contain (1)	corporate (1)	1627:6,11;1628:1;
1617:10	1561:14	1568:14	1556:12	1630:7,13;1631:2;
completes (1)	conducts (1)	contained (1)	Correcting (1)	1632:18,24;1636:20;
1576:15	1555:23	1575:24	1565:23	1637:4;1647:10;
completion (1)	confidence (1)	contains (2)	correctly (2)	1650:2;1652:11,14;
1565:6	1563:22	1568:3,8	1609:1;1631:23	1653:3,17,19;1655:21;
comply (1)	confirms (1)	context (11)	correlated (1)	1661:24;1662:10,24;
1606:21	1564:16	1575:12;1595:23;	1636:1	1668:14;1669:4,5,5,7,
component (1)	consequences (1)	1596:7;1612:2;1617:4,	correlation (1)	10
1562:23	1576:15	11;1630:22;1656:3;	1666:13	county-level (4)
components (5)	consider (5)	1658:20;1667:16;	cost (6)	1632:12,14;1635:1;
1565:12;1568:5,22;	1596:24;1603:10;	1669:15	1559:16;1560:17;	1636:18
1607:23;1626:12	1618:3;1653:3;	continuation (1)	1571:6;1618:19;	County's (5)
comport (1)	1659:11	1554:9	1619:11;1646:15	1568:17;1569:15;
1607:2				
	consideration (2)	continue (2)	costs (12)	1575:11,13;1584:8
composition (3)	1634:1;1672:6	1606:1;1646:10	1567:24;1569:5;	county-wide (1)
1569:14;1623:22;	considered (12)	continuing (1)	1573:21;1574:3;	1630:9
1637:16	1559:17;1573:4;	1591:19	1600:5;1603:2;	couple (2)
comprehensive (2)	1574:17;1599:20;	contract (3)	1618:15;1635:9;	1629:15;1662:17
1568:17;1635:5	1600:6;1612:9,10,11,	1573:11;1646:5;	1659:22;1664:13;	course (1)
comprehensively (2)	12;1618:1;1650:17,19	1648:12	1665:21;1666:12	1602:7
1558:13;1583:2	consist (1)	contractor (8)	Council (1)	court (3)
conceivable (1)	1573:21	1565:9,10,18,21;	1593:23	1624:21,23;1653:9
1661:5	consistent (4)	1573:4,5,7;1627:8	Counsel (6)	courthouse (1)
concentrations (1)	1609:18;1610:1;	contractors (4)	1584:3;1587:24;	1672:1
1572:8	1632:17;1637:2	1564:18;1627:15,21,	1588:1;1660:6;	cover (5)
concept (1)	constitute (1)	24	1672:24;1673:15	1569:20;1576:10;
1664:19	1554:24	contributed (1)	count (1)	1598:8;1600:21;
concerned (1)	constitutes (1)	1556:5	1599:2	1602:11
1673:12	1603:14	control (2)	Counties (12)	covering (2)
concerning (1)	construct (1)	1664:2,19	1567:7,21;1568:7;	1615:19;1631:24
1635:3	1649:3	controversial (1)	1571:21;1589:7;	covers (3)
conclude (3)	constructed (1)	1606:24	1590:7;1630:14;	1597:18;1610:23;
1604:5,5;1661:24	1647:9	convention (6)	1631:2;1632:10;	1632:22
concluded (3)	construction (56)	1558:9;1561:21;	1634:19;1636:22;	created (17)
1636:8;1642:5,10	1556:8;1560:24;	1574:24;1606:10,19;	1637:9	1561:20;1565:17;
concluding (3)	1561:19;1562:4,10;	1609:18	country (1)	1567:10;1570:2,9;
1642:1,4;1661:20	1563:13,15,18;1564:6,	conventional (1)	1634:21	1572:6;1594:3,4,8;
conclusion (12)	9,19,21;1565:7,17,19;	1612:15	County (118)	1595:1,4;1612:18;
1568:24;1575:16;	1566:16;1567:4,8,12,	Cook (2)	1554:9,10;1556:9;	1613:9,12;1643:13;
1579:8;1636:24;	16,18;1568:16,20;	1568:6;1653:17	1557:5;1558:22,23;	1655:1;1669:3
1637:2,2;1641:11,13,	1569:1,13,18,24;	copy (3)	1559:2;1560:19;	creates (2)
15;1642:9,13;1643:4	1570:6;1576:2;1591:5,	1577:20,20;1607:24	1561:8,20;1562:22;	1658:22;1661:13
conclusions (2)	6,11,12;1592:4,11,12;	Cornale (67)	1563:1,24;1564:3,6,10,	creating (1)
1597:4;1634:13	1593:6;1594:4,12,17,	1554:13;1576:16,21,	20;1565:2,21;1566:10;	1557:22
1377.4,1034.13	1373.0,1374.4,12,17,	1554.15,1570.10,21,	20,1303.2,21,1300.10;	1331.22

creation (4) 1557:9;1558:5; 1566:21,23 credit (1) 1667:3 credits (1) 1560:8 creditworthy (2) 1560:2;1641:22 crews (1) 1564:21 critical (1) 1616:14 cross (1) 1639:17 cross-examination (1) 1673:18 cross-examine (3) 1639:24;1640:1,6 crushed (1) 1626:18 cut (2) 1616:17;1646:8

#### D

Dakota (1) 1565:8 damage (1) 1602:7 danger (1) 1560:9 data (18) 1567:24:1571:2.6. 10:1579:17.19: 1589:14;1608:21; 1622:13;1624:2; 1625:18;1626:2; 1628:3:1633:1.19; 1655:13.24:1660:19 database (2) 1579:23:1647:21 data's (1) 1622:15 date (1) 1586:19 dated (1) 1656:4 day (1) 1586:7 deal (4) 1615:10;1616:24; 1665:8;1673:11 debt (1) 1574:22 December (3) 1591:18;1625:15; 1631:6 decide (2) 1572:17:1658:5 decides (1) 1668:8 decision (5)

1668:3.5;1672:10; 1674:24:1675:8 decisions (5) 1556:4;1576:13; 1635:7;1636:13; 1671:22 decline (2) 1574:20;1582:14 declined (6) 1567:13:1585:22; 1590:24;1591:7,12,13 decrease (1) 1591:9 Deer (2) 1584:10:1586:10 Deerfield (1) 1555:22 default (8) 1573:13,17,22; 1574:8,13;1623:8,10, 23 defaults (1) 1623:6 defined (3) 1609:23;1611:16; 1653:10 definition (2) 1588:2;1664:16 definitions (3) 1611:19,23;1612:2 demand (6) 1559:15.22:1566:18: 1600:3;1646:24; 1649:18 demands (3) 1600:10;1601:24; 1602:3 **Department** (3) 1564:1;1578:24; 1608:17 departments (2) 1618:13:1619:5 depend (3) 1639:2;1652:16,17 depended (2) 1615:10;1616:24 dependent (1) 1556:19 depends (1) 1650:10 deposition (1) 1624:22 derived (2) 1561:3;1608:22 describe (4) 1571:16;1613:13; 1621:3;1659:21 described (8) 1562:14;1567:11; 1589:8:1613:4; 1621:10:1622:18: 1623:14:1625:7 describes (1)

1580:8 describing (1) 1661:6 description (1) 1619:3 design (2) 1568:15.20 desired (1) 1635:6 despite (1) 1570:6 detail (1) 1583:23 details (4) 1585:23;1586:3; 1625:8;1664:22 deteriorates (3) 1582:5,6,11 deterioration (1) 1582:15 determine (2) 1586:21;1630:3 determined (1) 1613:7 detrimental (2) 1598:23;1599:5 develop (3) 1558:15:1559:23; 1647:2 developed (4) 1568:14:1610:17; 1628:24:1631:17 developer (14) 1559:24;1560:20; 1564:20:1565:15; 1567:24;1568:11; 1574:15;1594:2; 1623:13:1624:2.12.14: 1625:2.4 developers (2) 1624:15;1627:16 development (40) 1556:3,3;1557:3,3; 1558:13,14;1559:12, 15,20;1562:23;1565:2, 11;1568:18;1583:2,3; 1593:23;1597:9; 1600:2;1603:12; 1608:15,19;1611:11; 1628:22;1632:10,12; 1634:1,2,5,6,18; 1635:10,12;1636:14; 1641:16:1651:20; 1653:16;1654:2; 1664:10;1665:6,11 developments (7) 1556:13,14,15; 1560:4,11;1564:15; 1648:15 Diana (1) 1554:16 difference (1) 1666:21

different (21) 1575:22;1576:4; 1600:21:1609:23; 1610:18;1622:21,22, 23;1626:4,5;1628:16; 1636:6;1637:20,21; 1638:24,24;1655:16; 1662:2,3,3;1665:6 dig (1) 1618:22 dioxide (1) 1659:8 direct (27) 1557:8,11;1558:10; 1560:24;1561:6,17,22; 1562:3,9,18;1565:24; 1566:3;1570:20,24; 1571:22;1576:5; 1606:11;1609:10,16; 1611:10,19;1612:6,10, 10,12;1642:16; 1663:16 directed (1) 1660:22 directly (4) 1570:3,9;1572:6,24 director (2) 1593:22;1617:18 dirt (1) 1564:17 disagree (11) 1592:17.23:1596:10: 1612:1,17:1615:22; 1616:4:1617:2: 1636:24;1649:9,11 disagreeing (2) 1596:4,11 disappear (1) 1650:7 disappears (1) 1650:10 disclose (2) 1557:1;1628:5 disclosed (2) 1561:13;1566:8 discount (1) 1662:9 discuss (1) 1584:6 discussed (3) 1581:11;1587:5; 1672:7 discusses (1) 1593:24 discussing (1) 1585:2 discussion (4) 1564:13;1571:15; 1588:5;1607:21 displaced (2) 1566:11:1592:5 displacement (2) 1566:15;1649:15

#### January 26, 2015

disputing (1) 1595:5 distance (1) 1555:3 **District** (3) 1656:23;1657:15,17 districts (1) 1657:9 divided (1) 1570:24 document (3) 1593:9:1658:15,19 dollar (1) 1586:15 dollars (6) 1584:8;1586:15; 1623:9;1644:18; 1661:11,13 done (30) 1564:17;1566:4; 1602:7,12;1604:2,23; 1605:5.8:1606:17.18: 1607:13,21;1610:19; 1621:18:1627:13.13: 1630:2;1631:16; 1637:12;1638:4,13,14; 1642:17;1656:21; 1658:19;1661:4; 1662:18,18;1665:17,20 **Donnelley** (2) 1650:4,21 doubt (5) 1622:2;1644:15; 1655:4.7:1657:5 down (5) 1578:21;1598:6; 1626:4;1629:20; 1647:14 download (1) 1625:21 Dr (32) 1556:24:1557:7; 1560:7,13;1577:18; 1579:8;1581:1,6; 1583:5,14;1584:22; 1605:4;1607:10; 1611:19;1621:5,23; 1625:6,10,17;1630:4; 1631:5;1632:5; 1635:22;1645:13; 1647:17:1649:24; 1652:12:1655:20: 1656:12,24;1658:5; 1668:23 dramatically (1) 1641:24 draw(1) 1568:23 drawn (2) 1559:2;1572:24 drive (3) 1622:16;1639:21; 1672:18

	r
drivers (1)	1597:4,17,1
1634:5	24;1600:20
drives (2)	1603:13;16
1622:19;1640:17	1605:3;160
dropped (1)	22;1607:6;1
1641:24	18,21;1613:
due (1)	1615:7;161
1618:9	1617:18;16
duly (1)	1622:7;162
1555:11	1629:3;163
DuPage (2)	1634:2,5,6,1
1556:7;1568:6	1637:6,14,1
duration (3)	1652:8;1654
1569:1,13;1653:23	5;1657:8,11
during (8)	1661:16;16
1561:18;1574:6;	1663:3;166
1576:19;1590:9,11,23;	1668:2
1592:2,18	economics (5)
Dutch (1)	1555:16;16
1580:11	1632:8,9;16
Dwight (1)	economies (2)
1614:9	1569:4;157
	economist (3)
E	1598:15,21
	economists (3
earlier (6)	1638:18,23
1568:9;1594:14,20;	economy (19)
1607:15;1655:12;	1569:23;15
1658:8	1572:21;15
early (1)	1575:7;158
1639:22	1596:3;161
earnings (3)	1618:6,7;16
1570:14;1575:11;	1625:19;16
1570:14;1575:11; 1637:3	1625:19;16 1667:21,23
1637:3	
1637:3 easier (3)	1667:21,23
1637:3 easier (3) 1608:5;1612:13;	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10
1637:3 easier (3) 1608:5;1612:13; 1618:21	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3)
1637:3 easier (3) 1608:5;1612:13; 1618:21 easiest (1)	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3) 1581:19,20
1637:3 easier (3) 1608:5;1612:13; 1618:21 easiest (1) 1639:18	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3) 1581:19,20 educational (
1637:3 easier (3) 1608:5;1612:13; 1618:21 easiest (1) 1639:18 econometric (5)	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3) 1581:19,20 educational ( 1581:21
1637:3 easier (3) 1608:5;1612:13; 1618:21 easiest (1) 1639:18 econometric (5) 1630:9;1632:11;	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3) 1581:19,20 educational ( 1581:21 effect (7)
1637:3 easier (3) 1608:5;1612:13; 1618:21 easiest (1) 1639:18 econometric (5) 1630:9;1632:11; 1634:20;1635:19;	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3) 1581:19,20 educational ( 1581:21 effect (7) 1571:1;157
1637:3 easier (3) 1608:5;1612:13; 1618:21 easiest (1) 1639:18 econometric (5) 1630:9;1632:11; 1634:20;1635:19; 1639:3	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3) 1581:19,20 educational ( 1581:21 effect (7) 1571:1;157 1629:23;16
1637:3 easier (3) 1608:5;1612:13; 1618:21 easiest (1) 1639:18 econometric (5) 1630:9;1632:11; 1634:20;1635:19; 1639:3 econometrics (1)	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3) 1581:19,20 educational ( 1581:21 effect (7) 1571:1;157 1629:23;16 1667:17,20
1637:3 easier (3) 1608:5;1612:13; 1618:21 easiest (1) 1639:18 econometric (5) 1630:9;1632:11; 1634:20;1635:19; 1639:3 econometrics (1) 1637:20	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3) 1581:19,20 educational ( 1581:21 effect (7) 1571:1;157 1629:23;16 1667:17,20 effects (30)
1637:3 easier (3) 1608:5;1612:13; 1618:21 easiest (1) 1639:18 econometric (5) 1630:9;1632:11; 1634:20;1635:19; 1639:3 econometrics (1)	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3) 1581:19,20 educational ( 1581:21 effect (7) 1571:1;157 1629:23;16 1667:17,20
1637:3 easier (3) 1608:5;1612:13; 1618:21 easiest (1) 1639:18 econometric (5) 1630:9;1632:11; 1634:20;1635:19; 1639:3 econometrics (1) 1637:20 economic (118)	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3) 1581:19,20 educational ( 1581:21 effect (7) 1571:1;157 1629:23;16 1667:17,20 effects (30) 1557:18;15
1637:3 easier (3) 1608:5;1612:13; 1618:21 easiest (1) 1639:18 econometric (5) 1630:9;1632:11; 1634:20;1635:19; 1639:3 econometrics (1) 1637:20 economic (118) 1555:24,24;1556:3,	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3) 1581:19,20 educational ( 1581:21 effect (7) 1571:1;157 1629:23;16 1667:17,20 effects (30) 1557:18;15 1561:23;15
1637:3 easier (3) 1608:5;1612:13; 1618:21 easiest (1) 1639:18 econometric (5) 1630:9;1632:11; 1634:20;1635:19; 1639:3 econometrics (1) 1637:20 economic (118) 1555:24,24;1556:3, 5,22;1557:2,4,10,12,	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3) 1581:19,20 educational ( 1581:21 effect (7) 1571:1;157 1629:23;16 1667:17,20 effects (30) 1557:18;15 1561:23;15 1566:14;15
1637:3 easier (3) 1608:5;1612:13; 1618:21 easiest (1) 1639:18 econometric (5) 1630:9;1632:11; 1634:20;1635:19; 1639:3 econometrics (1) 1637:20 economic (118) 1555:24,24;1556:3, 5,22;1557:2,4,10,12, 14,15,20;1558:12,16,	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3) 1581:19,20 educational ( 1581:21 effect (7) 1571:1;157 1629:23;16 1667:17,20 effects (30) 1557:18;15 1561:23;15 1566:14;15 1570:11,20
1637:3 easier (3) 1608:5;1612:13; 1618:21 easiest (1) 1639:18 econometric (5) 1630:9;1632:11; 1634:20;1635:19; 1639:3 econometrics (1) 1637:20 economic (118) 1555:24,24;1556:3, 5,22;1557:2,4,10,12, 14,15,20;1558:12,16, 19,20;1559:5,10,13;	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3) 1581:19,20 educational ( 1581:21 effect (7) 1571:1;157 1629:23;16 1667:17,20 effects (30) 1557:18;15 1561:23;15 1566:14;15 1570:11,20 1571:22;15
1637:3 easier (3) 1608:5;1612:13; 1618:21 easiest (1) 1639:18 econometric (5) 1630:9;1632:11; 1634:20;1635:19; 1639:3 econometrics (1) 1637:20 economic (118) 1555:24,24;1556:3, 5,22;1557:2,4,10,12, 14,15,20;1558:12,16, 19,20;1559:5,10,13; 1560:13;1561:22;	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3) 1581:19,20 educational ( 1581:21 effect (7) 1571:1;157 1629:23;16 1667:17,20 effects (30) 1557:18;15 1561:23;15 1566:14;15 1570:11,20 1571:22;15 1597:18,20
1637:3 easier (3) 1608:5;1612:13; 1618:21 easiest (1) 1639:18 econometric (5) 1630:9;1632:11; 1634:20;1635:19; 1639:3 econometrics (1) 1637:20 economic (118) 1555:24,24;1556:3, 5,22;1557:2,4,10,12, 14,15,20;1558:12,16, 19,20;1559:5,10,13; 1560:13;1561:22; 1562:11,18,24;	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3) 1581:19,20 educational ( 1581:21 effect (7) 1571:1;157 1629:23;16 1667:17,20 effects (30) 1557:18;15 1561:23;15 1566:14;15 1570:11,20 1577:122;15 1597:18,20 1606:12;16
1637:3 easier (3) 1608:5;1612:13; 1618:21 easiest (1) 1639:18 econometric (5) 1630:9;1632:11; 1634:20;1635:19; 1639:3 econometrics (1) 1637:20 economic (118) 1555:24,24;1556:3, 5,22;1557:2,4,10,12, 14,15,20;1558:12,16, 19,20;1559:5,10,13; 1560:13;1561:22; 1562:11,18,24; 1563:21;1565:4,5;	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3) 1581:19,20 educational ( 1581:21 effect (7) 1571:1;157 1629:23;16 1667:17,20 effects (30) 1557:18;15 1566:14;15 1566:14;15 1570:11,20 1577:122;15 1597:18,20 1606:12;16 1611:7;161
1637:3 easier (3) 1608:5;1612:13; 1618:21 easiest (1) 1639:18 econometric (5) 1630:9;1632:11; 1634:20;1635:19; 1639:3 econometrics (1) 1637:20 economic (118) 1555:24,24;1556:3, 5,22;1557:2,4,10,12, 14,15,20;1558:12,16, 19,20;1559:5,10,13; 1560:13;1561:22; 1562:11,18,24; 1563:21;1565:4,5; 1566:20;1568:17;	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3) 1581:19,20 educational ( 1581:21 effect (7) 1571:1;157 1629:23;16 1667:17,20 effects (30) 1557:18;15 1566:14;15 1570:11,20 1577:122;15 1597:18,20 1606:12;16 1611:7;161 1622:17;16
1637:3 easier (3) 1608:5;1612:13; 1618:21 easiest (1) 1639:18 econometric (5) 1630:9;1632:11; 1634:20;1635:19; 1639:3 econometrics (1) 1637:20 economic (118) 1555:24,24;1556:3, 5,22;1557:2,4,10,12, 14,15,20;1558:12,16, 19,20;1559:5,10,13; 1560:13;1561:22; 1562:11,18,24; 1563:21;1565:4,5; 1566:20;1568:17; 1569:15;1570:18;	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3) 1581:19,20 educational ( 1581:21 effect (7) 1571:1;157 1629:23;16 1667:17,20 effects (30) 1557:18;15 1566:14;15 1570:11,20 1577:122;15 1597:18,20 1606:12;16 1611:7;161 1622:17;16
1637:3 easier (3) 1608:5;1612:13; 1618:21 easiest (1) 1639:18 econometric (5) 1630:9;1632:11; 1634:20;1635:19; 1639:3 econometrics (1) 1637:20 economic (118) 1555:24,24;1556:3, 5,22;1557:2,4,10,12, 14,15,20;1558:12,16, 19,20;1559:5,10,13; 1560:13;1561:22; 1562:11,18,24; 1563:21;1565:4,5; 1566:20;1568:17; 1569:15;1570:18; 1571:7,13;1574:22;	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3) 1581:19,20 educational ( 1581:21 effect (7) 1571:1;157 1629:23;16 1667:17,20 effects (30) 1557:18;15 1566:14;15 1570:11,20 1577:22;15 1597:18,20 1606:12;16 1611:7;161 1622:17;16 1649:14;16 1656:16;16
1637:3 easier (3) 1608:5;1612:13; 1618:21 easiest (1) 1639:18 econometric (5) 1630:9;1632:11; 1634:20;1635:19; 1639:3 econometrics (1) 1637:20 economic (118) 1555:24,24;1556:3, 5,22;1557:2,4,10,12, 14,15,20;1558:12,16, 19,20;1559:5,10,13; 1560:13;1561:22; 1562:11,18,24; 1563:21;1565:4,5; 1566:20;1568:17; 1569:15;1570:18;	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3) 1581:19,20 educational ( 1581:21 effect (7) 1571:1;157 1629:23;16 1667:17,20 effects (30) 1557:18;15 1566:14;15 1570:11,20 1577:22;15 1597:18,20 1606:12;16 1611:7;161 1622:17;16 1649:14;16 1656:16;16 efficient (1)
1637:3 easier (3) 1608:5;1612:13; 1618:21 easiest (1) 1639:18 econometric (5) 1630:9;1632:11; 1634:20;1635:19; 1639:3 econometrics (1) 1637:20 economic (118) 1555:24,24;1556:3, 5,22;1557:2,4,10,12, 14,15,20;1558:12,16, 19,20;1559:5,10,13; 1560:13;1561:22; 1562:11,18,24; 1563:21;1565:4,5; 1566:20;1568:17; 1569:15;1570:18; 1571:7,13;1574:22;	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3) 1581:19,20 educational ( 1581:21 effect (7) 1571:1;157 1629:23;16 1667:17,20 effects (30) 1557:18;15 1566:14;15 1570:11,20 1577:22;15 1597:18,20 1606:12;16 1611:7;161 1622:17;16 1649:14;16 1656:16;16 efficient (1) 1650:16
$\begin{array}{c} 1637:3\\ \textbf{easier (3)}\\ 1608:5;1612:13;\\ 1618:21\\ \textbf{easiest (1)}\\ 1639:18\\ \textbf{econometric (5)}\\ 1630:9;1632:11;\\ 1634:20;1635:19;\\ 1639:3\\ \textbf{econometrics (1)}\\ 1637:20\\ \textbf{economic (118)}\\ 1555:24,24;1556:3,\\ 5,22;1557:2,4,10,12,\\ 14,15,20;1558:12,16,\\ 19,20;1559:5,10,13;\\ 1560:13;1561:22;\\ 1562:11,18,24;\\ 1563:21;1565:4,5;\\ 1566:20;1568:17;\\ 1569:15;1570:18;\\ 1571:7,13;1574:22;\\ 1575:3,6,18,19,23;\\ 1576:3,8,14;1583:1,6,\\ \end{array}$	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3) 1581:19,20 educational ( 1581:21 effect (7) 1571:1;157 1629:23;16 1667:17,20 effects (30) 1557:18;15 1566:14;15 1570:11,20 1577:22;15 1597:18,20 1606:12;16 1611:7;161 1622:17;16 1649:14;16 1656:16;16 efficient (1) 1650:16
1637:3easier (3) $1608:5;1612:13;$ $1618:21$ easiest (1) $1639:18$ econometric (5) $1630:9;1632:11;$ $1634:20;1635:19;$ $1639:3$ econometrics (1) $1637:20$ economic (118) $1555:24,24;1556:3,$ $5,22;1557:2,4,10,12,$ $14,15,20;1558:12,16,$ $19,20;1559:5,10,13;$ $1560:13;1561:22;$ $1562:11,18,24;$ $1563:21;1565:4,5;$ $1566:20;1568:17;$ $1569:15;1570:18;$ $1571:7,13;1574:22;$ $1576:3,8,14;1583:1,6,$ $11,15;1584:6;1585:20;$	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3) 1581:19,20 educational ( 1581:21 effect (7) 1571:1;157 1629:23;16 1667:17,20 effects (30) 1557:18;15 1566:14;15 1570:11,20 1577:22;15 1597:18,20 1606:12;16 1611:7;161 1622:17;16 1649:14;16 1656:16;16 efficient (1) 1650:16 Efforts (1)
1637:3 easier (3) 1608:5;1612:13; 1618:21 easiest (1) 1639:18 econometric (5) 1630:9;1632:11; 1634:20;1635:19; 1639:3 econometrics (1) 1637:20 economic (118) 1555:24,24;1556:3, 5,22;1557:2,4,10,12, 14,15,20;1558:12,16, 19,20;1559:5,10,13; 1560:13;1561:22; 1562:11,18,24; 1563:21;1565:4,5; 1566:20;1568:17; 1569:15;1570:18; 1571:7,13;1574:22; 1575:3,6,18,19,23; 1576:3,8,14;1583:1,6, 11,15;1584:6;1585:20; 1586:20;1587:4;	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3) 1581:19,20 educational ( 1581:21 effect (7) 1571:1;157 1629:23;16 1667:17,20 effects (30) 1557:18;15 1566:14;15 1570:11,20 1577:122;15 1597:18,20 1606:12;16 1611:7;161 1622:17;16 1649:14;16 1656:16;16 efficient (1) 1650:16 Efforts (1) 1633:17
1637:3 easier (3) 1608:5;1612:13; 1618:21 easiest (1) 1639:18 econometric (5) 1630:9;1632:11; 1634:20;1635:19; 1639:3 econometrics (1) 1637:20 economic (118) 1555:24,24;1556:3, 5,22;1557:2,4,10,12, 14,15,20;1558:12,16, 19,20;1559:5,10,13; 1560:13;1561:22; 1562:11,18,24; 1563:21;1565:4,5; 1566:20;1568:17; 1569:15;1570:18; 1571:7,13;1574:22; 1576:3,8,14;1583:1,6, 11,15;1584:6;1585:20; 1586:20;1587:4; 1588:4,12,13,16;	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3) 1581:19,20 educational ( 1581:21 effect (7) 1571:1;157 1629:23;16 1667:17,20 effects (30) 1557:18;15 1561:23;15 1566:14;15 1570:11,20 1577:122;15 1597:18,20 1606:12;16 1611:7;161 1622:17;16 1649:14;16 1656:16;16 efficient (1) 1650:16 Efforts (1) 1633:17 eg (1)
$\begin{array}{c} 1637:3\\ \textbf{easier (3)}\\ 1608:5;1612:13;\\ 1618:21\\ \textbf{easiest (1)}\\ 1639:18\\ \textbf{econometric (5)}\\ 1630:9;1632:11;\\ 1634:20;1635:19;\\ 1639:3\\ \textbf{econometrics (1)}\\ 1637:20\\ \textbf{economic (118)}\\ 1555:24,24;1556:3,\\ 5,22;1557:2,4,10,12,\\ 14,15,20;1558:12,16,\\ 19,20;1559:5,10,13;\\ 1560:13;1561:22;\\ 1562:11,18,24;\\ 1563:21;1565:4,5;\\ 1566:20;1568:17;\\ 1569:15;1570:18;\\ 1571:7,13;1574:22;\\ 1575:3,6,18,19,23;\\ 1576:3,8,14;1583:1,6,\\ 11,15;1584:6;1585:20;\\ 1586:20;1587:4;\\ \end{array}$	1667:21,23 educated (1) 1672:10 education (3) 1581:19,20 educational ( 1581:21 effect (7) 1571:1;157 1629:23;16 1667:17,20 effects (30) 1557:18;15 1566:14;15 1570:11,20 1577:122;15 1597:18,20 1606:12;16 1611:7;161 1622:17;16 1649:14;16 1656:16;16 efficient (1) 1650:16 Efforts (1) 1633:17

1597:4,17,18;1599:18,	1605:14
24;1600:20;1601:22;	either (6)
1603:13;1604:1,11;	1571:2;1584:14;
1605:3;1606:5,11,18,	1593:1;1601:14,19;
22;1607:6;1608:14,16,	1665:10
18,21;1613:20;1614:2;	elected (1)
1615:7;1616:7,9,21;	1594:18
1617:18;1620:19,20;	electrical (1)
1622:7;1628:21,22;	1563:4
1629:3;1632:12;	electrician (3)
1634:2,5,6,18;1635:11;	1650:4,6,22
1637:6,14,17;1643:10;	electricity (4)
1652:8;1654:2;1656:1,	1566:17;1641:6;
5;1657:8,11;1659:20;	1649:17;1651:7
1661:16;1662:5,10;	elements (2)
1663:3;1664:18;	1581:12,14
1668:2	else (5)
conomics (5)	1578:9;1579:3,15;
1555:16;1631:19;	1592:7;1670:8
1632:8,9;1658:10	elsewhere (1)
conomies (2)	1662:20
1569:4;1572:21	emergency (1)
conomist (3)	1602:15
1598:15,21;1659:14	emissions (2)
conomists (3)	1658:23;1659:8
1638:18,23;1664:12	emphasizes (1)
conomy (19)	1556:1
1569:23;1570:16;	empirical (2)
1572:21;1574:10,12;	1635:11;1638:2
1575:7;1584:8;1593:5;	empirically (1)
1596:3;1615:21;	1634:18
1618:6,7;1623:5,23;	employed (1)
1625:19;1661:7,21;	1596:2
1667:21,23	employees (4)
lucated (1)	1570:23;1649:20,22;
1672:10	1669:3
lucation (3)	employers (1)
1581:19,20;1582:3	1650:13
lucational (1)	employment (22)
1581:21	1557:13;1562:6;
fect (7)	1563:21;1564:2;
1571:1;1572:4;	1567:17,23;1571:10;
1629:23;1661:14;	1575:13,23;1576:6;
1667:17,20,22	1579:17;1588:16;
fects (30)	1589:18;1591:9,13;
1557:18;1558:2,20;	1603:8;1604:4;
1561:23;1562:1,1,4;	1631:14;1632:15;
1566:14;1569:12;	1635:1;1636:18,21
1570:11,20,21;	end (7)
1571:22;1591:19;	1560:6;1563:5,19;
1597:18,20;1604:10;	1565:17;1572:19;
1606:12;1609:8,8,10;	1573:4;1661:19
1611:7;1615:14,17;	end-all (1)
1622:17;1635:3;	1599:19
1649:14;1653:21;	ended (1)
1656:16;1661:11	
ficient (1)	1591:18
1650:16	1591:18
1650:16	1591:18 endogen (1) 1636:10
1650:16 fforts (1)	1591:18 endogen (1) 1636:10 endogeneity (1)
1650:16 <b>fforts (1)</b> 1633:17	1591:18 endogen (1) 1636:10 endogeneity (1) 1636:13
1650:16 fforts (1) 1633:17 g (1)	1591:18 endogen (1) 1636:10 endogeneity (1) 1636:13 Energy (73)
1650:16 <b>fforts (1)</b> 1633:17 <b>g (1)</b> 1600:3	1591:18 endogen (1) 1636:10 endogeneity (1) 1636:13 Energy (73) 1554:11,12;1556:23;
1650:16 fforts (1) 1633:17 g (1)	1591:18 endogen (1) 1636:10 endogeneity (1) 1636:13 Energy (73)

19:1560:4.6.11; 1564:15.19:1565:2.11: 1566:16:1567:20; 1568:2,12;1570:1,14; 1575:17,21;1579:22, 24;1583:1;1588:12,15, 23;1597:9;1600:2; 1603:2:1604:9; 1608:18,19;1610:20; 1613:21:1622:7; 1625:22;1627:13; 1628:24:1630:10; 1631:19,19;1633:24; 1635:5,9;1637:14; 1638:5,13,15,16,20,20; 1641:16,18,19; 1644:22;1645:7,11; 1646:2;1647:2,3,8; 1648:8;1649:16; 1650:9;1651:20; 1654:2;1664:7,14,16, 24 Energy's (1) 1608:17 enforcement (1) 1600:16 engineer (1) 1564:14 engineering (3) 1568:15,19;1653:16 enough (1) 1624:15 enter (3) 1583:16,21;1586:8 entered (1) 1586:9 entire (5) 1578:3;1579:8,13; 1614:1;1639:17 entitled (3) 1556:22;1593:20; 1607:5 environmental (7) 1576:14;1658:20,21; 1659:14,15,19,21 equipment (8) 1562:12;1563:8,12; 1564:22;1568:16,20; 1573:22;1602:6 equity (4) 1574:8,9,17;1643:18 equivalent (7) 1561:19;1563:16; 1602:4;1654:24; 1659:1,9;1662:8 era (1) 1631:24 erection (1) 1627:18 especially (3) 1561:10;1571:24; 1671:1 essential (2)

January 26, 2015

1557:1:1566:7 essentially (1) 1623:4 established (7) 1556:20;1599:7; 1609:19;1610:2,6,8; 1612:16 estate (6) 1556:2;1582:17; 1598:15,20;1599:9; 1665:7 estimate (5) 1560:24;1561:2; 1573:13;1619:18; 1624:3 estimated (2) 1566:2;1573:18 estimates (16) 1560:17,17;1561:18; 1566:13;1567:2; 1569:24:1570:18; 1571:20;1572:16; 1574:2;1575:5; 1619:16,17;1621:19; 1649:13;1652:8 estimating (3) 1594:6;1595:2; 1618:19 et (1) 1658:13 evaluate (2) 1612:13:1661:16 evaluated (1) 1556:11 even (11) 1565:3;1569:1,22; 1575:4;1591:10; 1615:10;1616:24; 1638:6,9;1650:21; 1662:4 evening (6) 1554:5;1605:20; 1640:11;1670:20; 1671:11;1672:22 event (1) 1610:14 events (1) 1641:23 everybody (3) 1671:19,23;1674:2 everybody's (1) 1667:13 everyone (3) 1672:18;1673:3,23 evidence (5) 1569:9;1587:12; 1593:17;1594:9; 1666:5 Ex (5) 1632:9,11:1633:6; 1634:20;1637:11 exactly (2) 1629:22;1667:3

1572:17,23 exaggerated (2) 1615:14:1663:23 experience (13) **Exaggerating** (1) 1564:15;1604:2,13, 1580:10 15.16.19:1606:14: examined (1) 1613:15,19:1636:2; 1619:24 1641:5,8;1665:9 example (20) experienced (2) 1564:13:1624:13 1556:17:1559:14; experiments (1) 1569:16;1572:5,24; 1573:13:1582:15; 1664:20 1583:14;1600:2; expert (4) 1610:21,22;1615:3,4; 1595:15;1617:7; 1626:20,23;1630:17; 1658:6;1659:15 1633:23:1653:15; expertise (1) 1664:15;1665:24 1665:5 examples (7) expired (1) 1556:9;1563:11; 1560:9 1588:23;1589:1; explain (5) 1559:4;1560:15; 1600:19;1603:20; 1604:9 1572:15;1609:21; excavating (1) 1617:21 explained (1) 1627:24 excellent (1) 1641:16 1643:3 explaining (1) except (2) 1613:1 1587:11;1644:20 explains (1) exclusive (1) 1617:8 exploit (1) 1660:24 excuse (5) 1569:4 1607:3;1625:14; extent (3) 1574:1;1604:21; 1633:13:1647:3; 1671:7 1664:15 Exhibit (13) extrapolating (1) 1555:10:1577:24: 1642:22 1579:6;1587:22; 1593:8,15;1607:5,18; 1633:10:1651:20; 1654:1:1658:16: facilities (1) 1661:18 1581:21 existing (4) facility (3) 1603:9:1634:22: 1594:12;1647:3; 1647:13;1665:18 1650:12 exists (3) fact (15) 1559:22;1584:15; 1566:5;1584:5; 1646:24 1586:20;1588:2; expand (3) 1607:22;1613:7; 1569:17;1595:18; 1628:11;1630:3,5; 1610:15 1633:7;1636:1; expect (3) 1637:11;1644:20; 1593:5;1620:21; 1645:3;1652:22 1671:11 factors (16) expected (3) 1572:11;1576:4; 1592:13 expedite (1) 1640:9 factory (2) expenditures (14) 1556:8;1667:24 1561:1;1562:2; facts (1) 1563:7,10;1570:23; 1666:5 1572:1;1573:14,20,24; fails (1) 1571:16 1600:1;1609:9;1623:7; 1652:11,13 failure (1) expensive (2) 1603:10

F

Fairbury (3) 1614:12:1671:12.13 Fairfield (2) 1594:6:1595:2 fairly (1) 1614:23 faith (1) 1587:9 familiar (4) 1583:23;1648:16,16; 1664:22 far (9) 1565:16;1603:12,24; 1604:7;1610:20; 1630:6:1656:22; 1657:2;1675:5 farm (25) 1567:4,6,9;1568:15, 20;1569:10;1590:6; 1592:20;1593:18,21; 1599:5:1602:16; 1604:24:1607:7: 1608:17;1614:3; 1624:11,13;1625:2,4; 1627:16;1651:11; 1661:10;1665:15,16 farms (6) 1563:18;1604:15,17, 20,23;1637:14 fashion (1) 1607:19 favor (1) 1675:16 feasibility (10) 1558:18;1641:4,15; 1643:5,6,22;1644:1.9: 1647:5,15 feasible (13) 1558:15;1559:23; 1560:12:1569:2; 1641:1,12,20;1642:2,6, 11;1645:12;1647:1,12 features (1) 1660:24 February (8) 1671:24;1672:14,14, 14,16;1674:5,9,10 federal (5) 1560:8,10;1666:3, 19;1668:3 feel (5) 1559:7,11;1597:6,8, 1638:5,22;1639:4,6; 20;1598:3,5;1599:12, 1674:12 15,20,22;1650:11,14; few (8) 1586:24;1605:8; 1658:11;1659:11,12 1610:18;1613:3; 1625:9;1632:3; 1651:17:1654:3 fewer (3) 1610:21;1649:22,23 figures (5) 1567:14,22;1591:8; 1636:19:1669:20

filling (1) 1564:16 finance (1) 1569:2 finances (1) 1573:3 financial (6) 1555:24:1641:14; 1643:5;1647:5; 1657:14,16 financially (9) 1559:23:1560:12; 1640:24;1641:12,19; 1642:2,6,11;1647:1 financing (2) 1573:10;1641:9 find (9) 1588:24;1590:1; 1601:6;1613:7;1621:1; 1632:14;1636:14; 1646:3;1648:4 finding (2) 1607:9;1648:10 findings (3) 1571:3;1579:7; 1597:3 fine (2) 1608:6;1657:22 finish (1) 1617:15 fire (1) 1600:4 firm (8) 1555:17,18,23; 1556:10:1613:20; 1614:1,2;1628:4 firms (3) 1568:9,16;1569:3 first (14) 1557:6:1569:2; 1586:7:1609:4.5: 1610:5;1622:8; 1624:24;1625:1; 1634:17;1636:9; 1639:3;1659:4;1666:4 fiscal (10) 1555:24;1559:13; 1599:24;1600:10; 1603:11,17;1607:6; 1619:19;1657:10,11 five (2) 1623:9;1670:17 flight (1) 1639:22 focused (1) 1655:13 folks (1) 1638:14 follow (2) 1558:8:1651:5 followed (3) 1575:1:1614:9; 1656:19

#### January 26, 2015

following (2) 1567:8:1591:16 follow-up (1) 1630:2 Footnote (5) 1580:9,19;1647:21; 1651:22.24 force (1) 1591:21 forecast (5) 1570:4,10;1618:15; 1619:11:1663:17 forecasts (1) 1570:13 forget (1) 1608:6 form (2) 1610:5;1645:20 format (1) 1611:2 Forrest (1) 1614:15 forth (1) 1581:18 forward (6) 1555:2;1587:4; 1615:21;1670:19; 1673:3;1674:14 found (4) 1565:3:1580:17.18; 1620:7 founded (1) 1555:18 four (2)1671:18:1673:7 fourth (1) 1598:6 frame (1) 1630:7 Francisco (1) 1555:22 frankly (4) 1639:21;1652:5; 1661:4;1663:19 front (1) 1614:10 fuel (5) 1566:17;1626:22,23; 1627:2;1649:18 full (4) 1578:12:1633:16; 1636:9:1654:18 full-time (9) 1561:19,24;1563:16; 1594:7;1595:3;1609:7; 1654:24;1663:5,17 fully (2) 1586:11:1618:8 function (3) 1592:24;1661:11; 1663:6 fund (2) 1668:4.5

				January 26, 201
fundamentally (1)	1588:14;1594:14,21;	1620:7	1559:7;1597:6;	Hold (4)
1615:12	1603:7;1604:5;	Group's (1)	1598:4;1599:12;	1587:3;1645:23;
funding (1)	1607:12;1611:20;	1608:22	1658:12;1659:12	1647:14;1674:20
1668:1	1623:22,23;1625:7;	growing (1)	hear (2)	Holding (1)
further (6)	1633:23;1641:21;	1592:5	1582:10;1588:6	1554:23
1560:7;1573:8;	1658:15;1665:23;	growth (1)	heard (4)	home (4)
1587:5;1588:4;	1668:23	1635:1	1596:15;1610:6,8;	1596:1,16;1640:17;
1671:16;1672:12	glad (3)	Gruen (28)	1660:21	1672:20
future (1)	1576:22;1601:6;	1555:9,11,12,14,15,	hearing (3)	homes (1)
1664:9	1610:10	17,17,21;1556:18,18;	1554:9;1674:13;	1631:8
	glance (1)	1576:16;1577:1,4,7,9,	1675:10	honorable (1)
G	1657:3	13;1585:5;1586:20;	hearings (1)	1622:1
• (4)	gleaned (1)	1588:9;1593:7;1601:6;	1554:22	hope (1)
gain (1)	1606:15	1616:1,18;1618:22;	Heffley (1)	1556:17
1650:24	goes (2)	1646:23;1656:4;	1670:13	hospitals (1)
gallons (1) 1659:1	1582:7,13 good (7)	1658:8;1670:9 G-R-U-E-N (1)	Hello (1) 1668:16	1556:15 host (1)
gas (3)	1582:7,8,12;1587:9;	1555:9	help (3)	1650:10
1641:24;1651:1,5	1614:8;1661:8;	guarantee (2)	1604:13;1642:24;	hosts (1)
gather (1)	1671:22	1674:7,23	1665:10	1634:22
1675:7	goods (5)	guarantees (1)	helped (1)	hotel (1)
gauge (2)	1557:15;1572:7,12,	1672:7	1578:21	1556:14
1631:2,8	18;1633:22	guess (5)	helpful (2)	hour (2)
gave (2)	gospel (1)	1654:17;1659:4;	1630:22;1633:2	1639:19,21
1596:23;1607:15	1610:13	1666:18;1670:14;	helping (1)	hours (1)
GE (2)	Government (8)	1675:6	1556:1	1640:14
1562:21,21	1577:5,5;1600:1;	guys (5)	helps (2)	household (2)
general (2)	1641:17;1656:10;	1577:1;1605:15;	1590:21;1603:1	1558:4;1570:11
1627:10,21	1666:19;1668:3,8	1645:21;1673:24;	Henry (1)	households (2)
generally (4)	governs (1)	1674:1	1602:21	1562:3;1609:10
1558:9;1561:21;	1600:23		Hewings (1)	Howard (1)
1				1554 10
1606:10;1648:11	graciously (1)	H	1617:18	1554:18
generate (5)	1670:13		Hidden (3)	huh (2)
<b>generate (5)</b> 1557:4;1562:24;	1670:13 Graff (1)	half (2)	<b>Hidden (3)</b> 1616:7;1618:12;	<b>huh (2)</b> 1610:13;1652:2
<b>generate (5)</b> 1557:4;1562:24; 1600:14;1620:1;	1670:13 Graff (1) 1593:20	<b>half (2)</b> 1566:3;1639:19	<b>Hidden (3)</b> 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4	huh (2) 1610:13;1652:2 Huisman (5)
<b>generate (5)</b> 1557:4;1562:24; 1600:14;1620:1; 1661:2	1670:13 Graff (1) 1593:20 Grand (1)	half (2) 1566:3;1639:19 half-hour (2)	Hidden (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 high (5)	huh (2) 1610:13;1652:2 Huisman (5) 1554:19;1576:21;
generate (5) 1557:4;1562:24; 1600:14;1620:1; 1661:2 generated (6)	1670:13 Graff (1) 1593:20 Grand (1) 1602:18	half (2) 1566:3;1639:19 half-hour (2) 1639:16,17	Hidden (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 high (5) 1563:20;1571:11;	huh (2) 1610:13;1652:2 Huisman (5) 1554:19;1576:21; 1577:2;1675:14,15
generate (5) 1557:4;1562:24; 1600:14;1620:1; 1661:2 generated (6) 1570:21,22;1599:10;	1670:13 Graff (1) 1593:20 Grand (1) 1602:18 grant (1)	half (2) 1566:3;1639:19 half-hour (2) 1639:16,17 hand (2)	Hidden (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 high (5) 1563:20;1571:11; 1591:19;1653:20;	huh (2) 1610:13;1652:2 Huisman (5) 1554:19;1576:21; 1577:2;1675:14,15 hundred (2)
generate (5) 1557:4;1562:24; 1600:14;1620:1; 1661:2 generated (6) 1570:21,22;1599:10; 1600:17;1624:13;	1670:13 Graff (1) 1593:20 Grand (1) 1602:18 grant (1) 1593:24	half (2) 1566:3;1639:19 half-hour (2) 1639:16,17 hand (2) 1555:10;1672:3	Hidden (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 high (5) 1563:20;1571:11; 1591:19;1653:20; 1672:15	huh (2) 1610:13;1652:2 Huisman (5) 1554:19;1576:21; 1577:2;1675:14,15 hundred (2) 1574:10;1627:13
generate (5) 1557:4;1562:24; 1600:14;1620:1; 1661:2 generated (6) 1570:21,22;1599:10; 1600:17;1624:13; 1662:24	1670:13 Graff (1) 1593:20 Grand (1) 1602:18 grant (1)	half (2) 1566:3;1639:19 half-hour (2) 1639:16,17 hand (2) 1555:10;1672:3 handed (4)	Hidden (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 high (5) 1563:20;1571:11; 1591:19;1653:20;	huh (2) 1610:13;1652:2 Huisman (5) 1554:19;1576:21; 1577:2;1675:14,15 hundred (2)
generate (5) 1557:4;1562:24; 1600:14;1620:1; 1661:2 generated (6) 1570:21,22;1599:10; 1600:17;1624:13;	1670:13 Graff (1) 1593:20 Grand (1) 1602:18 grant (1) 1593:24 grants (5)	half (2) 1566:3;1639:19 half-hour (2) 1639:16,17 hand (2) 1555:10;1672:3	Hidden (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 high (5) 1563:20;1571:11; 1591:19;1653:20; 1672:15 higher (5)	huh (2) 1610:13;1652:2 Huisman (5) 1554:19;1576:21; 1577:2;1675:14,15 hundred (2) 1574:10;1627:13 hundreds (1)
generate (5) 1557:4;1562:24; 1600:14;1620:1; 1661:2 generated (6) 1570:21,22;1599:10; 1600:17;1624:13; 1662:24 generates (1) 1661:20 Generating (1)	1670:13 Graff (1) 1593:20 Grand (1) 1602:18 grant (1) 1593:24 grants (5) 1665:23;1666:3,12, 15,18 gravel (3)	half (2) 1566:3;1639:19 half-hour (2) 1639:16,17 hand (2) 1555:10;1672:3 handed (4) 1593:7;1607:4; 1651:19;1654:3 happen (2)	Hidden (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 high (5) 1563:20;1571:11; 1591:19;1653:20; 1672:15 higher (5) 1623:8,10,21; 1624:3;1664:18 highly (1)	huh (2) 1610:13;1652:2 Huisman (5) 1554:19;1576:21; 1577:2;1675:14,15 hundred (2) 1574:10;1627:13 hundreds (1) 1644:18 hurt (1) 1665:10
generate (5) 1557:4;1562:24; 1600:14;1620:1; 1661:2 generated (6) 1570:21,22;1599:10; 1600:17;1624:13; 1662:24 generates (1) 1661:20 Generating (1) 1658:22	1670:13 Graff (1) 1593:20 Grand (1) 1602:18 grant (1) 1593:24 grants (5) 1665:23;1666:3,12, 15,18 gravel (3) 1564:17;1626:15,17	half (2) 1566:3;1639:19 half-hour (2) 1639:16,17 hand (2) 1555:10;1672:3 handed (4) 1593:7;1607:4; 1651:19;1654:3 happen (2) 1664:13;1672:5	Hidden (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 high (5) 1563:20;1571:11; 1591:19;1653:20; 1672:15 higher (5) 1623:8,10,21; 1624:3;1664:18 highly (1) 1564:13	huh (2) 1610:13;1652:2 Huisman (5) 1554:19;1576:21; 1577:2;1675:14,15 hundred (2) 1574:10;1627:13 hundreds (1) 1644:18 hurt (1) 1665:10 hypothesis (1)
generate (5) 1557:4;1562:24; 1600:14;1620:1; 1661:2 generated (6) 1570:21,22;1599:10; 1600:17;1624:13; 1662:24 generates (1) 1661:20 Generating (1) 1658:22 geographic (9)	1670:13 Graff (1) 1593:20 Grand (1) 1602:18 grant (1) 1593:24 grants (5) 1665:23;1666:3,12, 15,18 gravel (3) 1564:17;1626:15,17 graveled (1)	half (2) 1566:3;1639:19 half-hour (2) 1639:16,17 hand (2) 1555:10;1672:3 handed (4) 1593:7;1607:4; 1651:19;1654:3 happen (2) 1664:13;1672:5 happened (1)	Hidden (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 high (5) 1563:20;1571:11; 1591:19;1653:20; 1672:15 higher (5) 1623:8,10,21; 1624:3;1664:18 highly (1) 1564:13 highway (1)	huh (2) 1610:13;1652:2 Huisman (5) 1554:19;1576:21; 1577:2;1675:14,15 hundred (2) 1574:10;1627:13 hundreds (1) 1644:18 hurt (1) 1665:10 hypothesis (1) 1634:24
generate (5) 1557:4;1562:24; 1600:14;1620:1; 1661:2 generated (6) 1570:21,22;1599:10; 1600:17;1624:13; 1662:24 generates (1) 1661:20 Generating (1) 1658:22 geographic (9) 1557:21;1561:7;	1670:13 Graff (1) 1593:20 Grand (1) 1602:18 grant (1) 1593:24 grants (5) 1665:23;1666:3,12, 15,18 gravel (3) 1564:17;1626:15,17 graveled (1) 1563:2	half (2) 1566:3;1639:19 half-hour (2) 1639:16,17 hand (2) 1555:10;1672:3 handed (4) 1593:7;1607:4; 1651:19;1654:3 happen (2) 1664:13;1672:5 happened (1) 1664:23	Hidden (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 high (5) 1563:20;1571:11; 1591:19;1653:20; 1672:15 higher (5) 1623:8,10,21; 1624:3;1664:18 highly (1) 1564:13 highway (1) 1556:9	huh (2) 1610:13;1652:2 Huisman (5) 1554:19;1576:21; 1577:2;1675:14,15 hundred (2) 1574:10;1627:13 hundreds (1) 1644:18 hurt (1) 1665:10 hypothesis (1) 1634:24 hypothetical (1)
generate (5) 1557:4;1562:24; 1600:14;1620:1; 1661:2 generated (6) 1570:21,22;1599:10; 1600:17;1624:13; 1662:24 generates (1) 1661:20 Generating (1) 1658:22 geographic (9) 1557:21;1561:7; 1597:19;1610:23;	1670:13 Graff (1) 1593:20 Grand (1) 1602:18 grant (1) 1593:24 grants (5) 1665:23;1666:3,12, 15,18 gravel (3) 1564:17;1626:15,17 graveled (1) 1563:2 great (7)	half (2) 1566:3;1639:19 half-hour (2) 1639:16,17 hand (2) 1555:10;1672:3 handed (4) 1593:7;1607:4; 1651:19;1654:3 happen (2) 1664:13;1672:5 happened (1) 1664:23 happens (1)	Hidden (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 high (5) 1563:20;1571:11; 1591:19;1653:20; 1672:15 higher (5) 1623:8,10,21; 1624:3;1664:18 highly (1) 1564:13 highway (1) 1556:9 Hill (1)	huh (2) 1610:13;1652:2 Huisman (5) 1554:19;1576:21; 1577:2;1675:14,15 hundred (2) 1574:10;1627:13 hundreds (1) 1644:18 hurt (1) 1665:10 hypothesis (1) 1634:24
generate (5) 1557:4;1562:24; 1600:14;1620:1; 1661:2 generated (6) 1570:21,22;1599:10; 1600:17;1624:13; 1662:24 generates (1) 1661:20 Generating (1) 1658:22 geographic (9) 1557:21;1561:7; 1597:19;1610:23; 1632:23;1633:4;	1670:13 Graff (1) 1593:20 Grand (1) 1602:18 grant (1) 1593:24 grants (5) 1665:23;1666:3,12, 15,18 gravel (3) 1564:17;1626:15,17 graveled (1) 1563:2 great (7) 1584:24;1591:17;	half (2) 1566:3;1639:19 half-hour (2) 1639:16,17 hand (2) 1555:10;1672:3 handed (4) 1593:7;1607:4; 1651:19;1654:3 happen (2) 1664:13;1672:5 happened (1) 1664:23 happens (1) 1629:5	Hidden (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 high (5) 1563:20;1571:11; 1591:19;1653:20; 1672:15 higher (5) 1623:8,10,21; 1624:3;1664:18 highly (1) 1564:13 highway (1) 1556:9 Hill (1) 1602:21	huh (2) 1610:13;1652:2 Huisman (5) 1554:19;1576:21; 1577:2;1675:14,15 hundred (2) 1574:10;1627:13 hundreds (1) 1644:18 hurt (1) 1665:10 hypothesis (1) 1634:24 hypothetical (1) 1567:22
generate (5) 1557:4;1562:24; 1600:14;1620:1; 1661:2 generated (6) 1570:21,22;1599:10; 1600:17;1624:13; 1662:24 generates (1) 1661:20 Generating (1) 1658:22 geographic (9) 1557:21;1561:7; 1597:19;1610:23; 1632:23;1633:4; 1637:21;1638:24;	1670:13 Graff (1) 1593:20 Grand (1) 1602:18 grant (1) 1593:24 grants (5) 1665:23;1666:3,12, 15,18 gravel (3) 1564:17;1626:15,17 graveled (1) 1563:2 great (7) 1584:24;1591:17; 1592:2;1634:23;	half (2) 1566:3;1639:19 half-hour (2) 1639:16,17 hand (2) 1555:10;1672:3 handed (4) 1593:7;1607:4; 1651:19:1654:3 happen (2) 1664:13;1672:5 happened (1) 1664:23 happens (1) 1629:5 hard (2)	Hidden (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 high (5) 1563:20;1571:11; 1591:19;1653:20; 1672:15 higher (5) 1623:8,10,21; 1624:3;1664:18 highly (1) 1564:13 highway (1) 1556:9 Hill (1) 1602:21 Hills (3)	huh (2) 1610:13;1652:2 Huisman (5) 1554:19;1576:21; 1577:2;1675:14,15 hundred (2) 1574:10;1627:13 hundreds (1) 1644:18 hurt (1) 1665:10 hypothesis (1) 1634:24 hypothetical (1)
generate (5) 1557:4;1562:24; 1600:14;1620:1; 1661:2 generated (6) 1570:21,22;1599:10; 1600:17;1624:13; 1662:24 generates (1) 1661:20 Generating (1) 1658:22 geographic (9) 1557:21;1561:7; 1597:19;1610:23; 1632:23;1633:4; 1637:21;1638:24; 1662:3	1670:13 Graff (1) 1593:20 Grand (1) 1602:18 grant (1) 1593:24 grants (5) 1665:23;1666:3,12, 15,18 gravel (3) 1564:17;1626:15,17 graveled (1) 1563:2 great (7) 1584:24;1591:17; 1592:2;1634:23; 1636:3;1665:8;	half (2) 1566:3;1639:19 half-hour (2) 1639:16,17 hand (2) 1555:10;1672:3 handed (4) 1593:7;1607:4; 1651:19;1654:3 happen (2) 1664:13;1672:5 happened (1) 1664:23 happens (1) 1629:5 hard (2) 1581:17;1664:20	Hidden (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 high (5) 1563:20;1571:11; 1591:19;1653:20; 1672:15 higher (5) 1623:8,10,21; 1624:3;1664:18 highly (1) 1564:13 highway (1) 1556:9 Hill (1) 1602:21 Hills (3) 1616:7;1618:12;	huh (2) 1610:13;1652:2 Huisman (5) 1554:19;1576:21; 1577:2;1675:14,15 hundred (2) 1574:10;1627:13 hundreds (1) 1644:18 hurt (1) 1665:10 hypothesis (1) 1634:24 hypothetical (1) 1567:22 I
generate (5) 1557:4;1562:24; 1600:14;1620:1; 1661:2 generated (6) 1570:21,22;1599:10; 1600:17;1624:13; 1662:24 generates (1) 1661:20 Generating (1) 1658:22 geographic (9) 1557:21;1561:7; 1597:19;1610:23; 1632:23;1633:4; 1637:21;1638:24; 1662:3 GERWIN (7)	1670:13 Graff (1) 1593:20 Grand (1) 1602:18 grant (1) 1593:24 grants (5) 1665:23;1666:3,12, 15,18 gravel (3) 1564:17;1626:15,17 graveled (1) 1563:2 great (7) 1584:24;1591:17; 1592:2;1634:23; 1636:3;1665:8; 1673:11	half (2) 1566:3;1639:19 half-hour (2) 1639:16,17 hand (2) 1555:10;1672:3 handed (4) 1593:7;1607:4; 1651:19;1654:3 happen (2) 1664:13;1672:5 happened (1) 1664:23 happens (1) 1629:5 hard (2) 1581:17;1664:20 Harvard (1)	Hidden (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 high (5) 1563:20;1571:11; 1591:19;1653:20; 1672:15 higher (5) 1623:8,10,21; 1624:3;1664:18 highly (1) 1564:13 highway (1) 1556:9 Hill (1) 1602:21 Hills (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4	huh (2) 1610:13;1652:2 Huisman (5) 1554:19;1576:21; 1577:2;1675:14,15 hundred (2) 1574:10;1627:13 hundreds (1) 1644:18 hurt (1) 1665:10 hypothesis (1) 1634:24 hypothetical (1) 1567:22 I Iberdrola (7)
generate (5) 1557:4;1562:24; 1600:14;1620:1; 1661:2 generated (6) 1570:21,22;1599:10; 1600:17;1624:13; 1662:24 generates (1) 1661:20 Generating (1) 1658:22 geographic (9) 1557:21;1561:7; 1597:19;1610:23; 1632:23;1633:4; 1637:21;1638:24; 1662:3 GERWIN (7) 1662:14,16;1666:17;	1670:13 Graff (1) 1593:20 Grand (1) 1602:18 grant (1) 1593:24 grants (5) 1665:23;1666:3,12, 15,18 gravel (3) 1564:17;1626:15,17 graveled (1) 1563:2 great (7) 1584:24;1591:17; 1592:2;1634:23; 1636:3;1665:8; 1673:11 greater (5)	half (2) 1566:3;1639:19 half-hour (2) 1639:16,17 hand (2) 1555:10;1672:3 handed (4) 1593:7;1607:4; 1651:19;1654:3 happen (2) 1664:13;1672:5 happened (1) 1664:23 happens (1) 1629:5 hard (2) 1581:17;1664:20 Harvard (1) 1556:8	Hidden (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 high (5) 1563:20;1571:11; 1591:19;1653:20; 1672:15 higher (5) 1623:8,10,21; 1624:3;1664:18 highly (1) 1564:13 highway (1) 1556:9 Hill (1) 1602:21 Hills (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 hire (2)	huh (2) 1610:13;1652:2 Huisman (5) 1554:19;1576:21; 1577:2;1675:14,15 hundred (2) 1574:10;1627:13 hundreds (1) 1644:18 hurt (1) 1665:10 hypothesis (1) 1634:24 hypothetical (1) 1567:22 I Iberdrola (7) 1584:9;1587:18,18;
generate (5) 1557:4;1562:24; 1600:14;1620:1; 1661:2 generated (6) 1570:21,22;1599:10; 1600:17;1624:13; 1662:24 generates (1) 1661:20 Generating (1) 1658:22 geographic (9) 1557:21;1561:7; 1597:19;1610:23; 1632:23;1633:4; 1637:21;1638:24; 1662:3 GERWIN (7) 1662:14,16;1666:17; 1667:15,19;1668:9;	1670:13 Graff (1) 1593:20 Grand (1) 1602:18 grant (1) 1593:24 grants (5) 1665:23;1666:3,12, 15,18 gravel (3) 1564:17;1626:15,17 graveled (1) 1563:2 great (7) 1584:24;1591:17; 1592:2;1634:23; 1636:3;165:8; 1673:11 greater (5) 1569:4;1572:8;	half (2) 1566:3;1639:19 half-hour (2) 1639:16,17 hand (2) 1555:10;1672:3 handed (4) 1593:7;1607:4; 1651:19;1654:3 happen (2) 1664:13;1672:5 happened (1) 1664:23 happens (1) 1629:5 hard (2) 1581:17;1664:20 Harvard (1) 1556:8 haves (1)	Hidden (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 high (5) 1563:20;1571:11; 1591:19;1653:20; 1672:15 higher (5) 1623:8,10,21; 1624:3;1664:18 highly (1) 1564:13 highway (1) 1556:9 Hill (1) 1602:21 Hills (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 hire (2) 1564:23;1573:9	huh (2) 1610:13;1652:2 Huisman (5) 1554:19;1576:21; 1577:2;1675:14,15 hundred (2) 1574:10;1627:13 hundreds (1) 1644:18 hurt (1) 1665:10 hypothesis (1) 1634:24 hypothetical (1) 1567:22 I Iberdrola (7) 1584:9;1587:18,18; 1647:24;1648:2;
generate (5) 1557:4;1562:24; 1600:14;1620:1; 1661:2 generated (6) 1570:21,22;1599:10; 1600:17;1624:13; 1662:24 generates (1) 1661:20 Generating (1) 1658:22 geographic (9) 1557:21;1561:7; 1597:19;1610:23; 1632:23;1633:4; 1637:21;1638:24; 1662:3 GERWIN (7) 1662:14,16;1666:17; 1667:15,19;1668:9; 1674:22	1670:13 Graff (1) 1593:20 Grand (1) 1602:18 grant (1) 1593:24 grants (5) 1665:23;1666:3,12, 15,18 gravel (3) 1564:17;1626:15,17 graveled (1) 1563:2 great (7) 1584:24;1591:17; 1592:2;1634:23; 1636:3;1665:8; 1673:11 greater (5)	half (2) 1566:3;1639:19 half-hour (2) 1639:16,17 hand (2) 1555:10;1672:3 handed (4) 1593:7;1607:4; 1651:19;1654:3 happen (2) 1664:13;1672:5 happened (1) 1664:23 happens (1) 1629:5 hard (2) 1581:17;1664:20 Harvard (1) 1556:8 haves (1) 1624:8	Hidden (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 high (5) 1563:20;1571:11; 1591:19;1653:20; 1672:15 higher (5) 1623:8,10,21; 1624:3;1664:18 highly (1) 1564:13 highway (1) 1556:9 Hill (1) 1602:21 Hills (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 hire (2)	huh (2) 1610:13;1652:2 Huisman (5) 1554:19;1576:21; 1577:2;1675:14,15 hundred (2) 1574:10;1627:13 hundreds (1) 1644:18 hurt (1) 1665:10 hypothesis (1) 1634:24 hypothetical (1) 1567:22 I Iberdrola (7) 1584:9;1587:18,18; 1647:24;1648:2; 1663:15;1666:2
generate (5) 1557:4;1562:24; 1600:14;1620:1; 1661:2 generated (6) 1570:21,22;1599:10; 1600:17;1624:13; 1662:24 generates (1) 1661:20 Generating (1) 1658:22 geographic (9) 1557:21;1561:7; 1597:19;1610:23; 1632:23;1633:4; 1637:21;1638:24; 1662:3 GERWIN (7) 1662:14,16;1666:17; 1667:15,19;1668:9;	1670:13 Graff (1) 1593:20 Grand (1) 1602:18 grant (1) 1593:24 grants (5) 1665:23;1666:3,12, 15,18 gravel (3) 1564:17;1626:15,17 graveled (1) 1563:2 great (7) 1584:24;1591:17; 1592:2;1634:23; 1636:3;1665:8; 1673:11 greater (5) 1569:4;1572:8; 1603:13;1604:1;	half (2) 1566:3;1639:19 half-hour (2) 1639:16,17 hand (2) 1555:10;1672:3 handed (4) 1593:7;1607:4; 1651:19;1654:3 happen (2) 1664:13;1672:5 happened (1) 1664:23 happens (1) 1629:5 hard (2) 1581:17;1664:20 Harvard (1) 1556:8 haves (1)	Hidden (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 high (5) 1563:20;1571:11; 1591:19;1653:20; 1672:15 higher (5) 1623:8,10,21; 1624:3;1664:18 highly (1) 1564:13 highway (1) 1556:9 Hill (1) 1602:21 Hills (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 hire (2) 1564:23;1573:9 hired (2)	huh (2) 1610:13;1652:2 Huisman (5) 1554:19;1576:21; 1577:2;1675:14,15 hundred (2) 1574:10;1627:13 hundreds (1) 1644:18 hurt (1) 1665:10 hypothesis (1) 1634:24 hypothetical (1) 1567:22 I Iberdrola (7) 1584:9;1587:18,18; 1647:24;1648:2;
generate (5) 1557:4;1562:24; 1600:14;1620:1; 1661:2 generated (6) 1570:21,22;1599:10; 1600:17;1624:13; 1662:24 generates (1) 1661:20 Generating (1) 1658:22 geographic (9) 1557:21;1561:7; 1597:19;1610:23; 1632:23;1633:4; 1637:21;1638:24; 1662:3 GERWIN (7) 1662:14,16;1666:17; 1667:15,19;1668:9; 1674:22 Gibs (1)	1670:13 Graff (1) 1593:20 Grand (1) 1602:18 grant (1) 1593:24 grants (5) 1665:23;1666:3,12, 15,18 gravel (3) 1564:17;1626:15,17 graveled (1) 1563:2 great (7) 1584:24;1591:17; 1592:2;1634:23; 1636:3;165:8; 1673:11 greater (5) 1569:4;1572:8; 1603:13;1604:1; 1664:18	half (2) 1566:3;1639:19 half-hour (2) 1639:16,17 hand (2) 1555:10;1672:3 handed (4) 1593:7;1607:4; 1651:19;1654:3 happen (2) 1664:13;1672:5 happened (1) 1664:23 happens (1) 1629:5 hard (2) 1581:17;1664:20 Harvard (1) 1556:8 haves (1) 1624:8 head (5)	Hidden (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 high (5) 1563:20;1571:11; 1591:19;1653:20; 1672:15 higher (5) 1623:8,10,21; 1624:3;1664:18 highly (1) 1564:13 highway (1) 1556:9 Hill (1) 1602:21 Hills (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 hire (2) 1564:23;1573:9 hired (2) 1627:14,15	huh (2) 1610:13;1652:2 Huisman (5) 1554:19;1576:21; 1577:2;1675:14,15 hundred (2) 1574:10;1627:13 hundreds (1) 1644:18 hurt (1) 1665:10 hypothesis (1) 1634:24 hypothetical (1) 1567:22 I Iberdrola (7) 1584:9;1587:18,18; 1647:24;1648:2; 1663:15;1666:2 idea (5)
generate (5) 1557:4;1562:24; 1600:14;1620:1; 1661:2 generated (6) 1570:21,22;1599:10; 1600:17;1624:13; 1662:24 generates (1) 1661:20 Generating (1) 1658:22 geographic (9) 1557:21;1561:7; 1597:19;1610:23; 1632:23;1633:4; 1637:21;1638:24; 1662:3 GERWIN (7) 1662:14,16;1666:17; 1667:15,19;1668:9; 1674:22 Gibs (1) 1554:19 gist (1) 1660:12	1670:13 Graff (1) 1593:20 Grand (1) 1602:18 grant (1) 1593:24 grants (5) 1665:23;1666:3,12, 15,18 gravel (3) 1564:17;1626:15,17 graveled (1) 1563:2 great (7) 1584:24;1591:17; 1592:2;1634:23; 1636:3;1665:8; 1673:11 greater (5) 1569:4;1572:8; 1603:13;1604:1; 1664:18 Griffin's (1) 1646:18 gross (10)	half (2) 1566:3;1639:19 half-hour (2) 1639:16,17 hand (2) 1555:10;1672:3 handed (4) 1593:7;1607:4; 1651:19;1654:3 happen (2) 1664:13;1672:5 happened (1) 1664:23 happens (1) 1629:5 hard (2) 1581:17;1664:20 Harvard (1) 1556:8 haves (1) 1624:8 head (5) 1643:16;1649:7; 1664:22;1665:4; 1670:2	Hidden (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 high (5) 1563:20;1571:11; 1591:19;1653:20; 1672:15 higher (5) 1623:8,10,21; 1624:3;1664:18 highly (1) 1564:13 highway (1) 1556:9 Hill (1) 1602:21 Hills (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 hire (2) 1564:23;1573:9 hired (2) 1627:14,15 hiring (2) 1563:19;1573:10 historical (1)	huh (2) 1610:13;1652:2 Huisman (5) 1554:19;1576:21; 1577:2;1675:14,15 hundred (2) 1574:10;1627:13 hundreds (1) 1644:18 hurt (1) 1665:10 hypothesis (1) 1634:24 hypothetical (1) 1567:22 I Iberdrola (7) 1584:9;1587:18,18; 1647:24;1648:2; 1663:15;1666:2 idea (5) 1584:24;1601:13; 1607:15;1624:12; 1657:22
generate (5) 1557:4;1562:24; 1600:14;1620:1; 1661:2 generated (6) 1570:21,22;1599:10; 1600:17;1624:13; 1662:24 generates (1) 1661:20 Generating (1) 1658:22 geographic (9) 1557:21;1561:7; 1597:19;1610:23; 1632:23;1633:4; 1637:21;1638:24; 1662:3 GERWIN (7) 1662:14,16;1666:17; 1667:15,19;1668:9; 1674:22 Gibs (1) 1554:19 gist (1) 1660:12 given (26)	1670:13 Graff (1) 1593:20 Grand (1) 1602:18 grant (1) 1593:24 grants (5) 1665:23;1666:3,12, 15,18 gravel (3) 1564:17;1626:15,17 graveled (1) 1563:2 great (7) 1584:24;1591:17; 1592:2;1634:23; 1636:3;1665:8; 1673:11 greater (5) 1569:4;1572:8; 1603:13;1604:1; 1664:18 Griffin's (1) 1646:18 gross (10) 1566:12,13,20;	half (2) 1566:3;1639:19 half-hour (2) 1639:16,17 hand (2) 1555:10;1672:3 handed (4) 1593:7;1607:4; 1651:19;1654:3 happen (2) 1664:13;1672:5 happened (1) 1664:23 happens (1) 1629:5 hard (2) 1581:17;1664:20 Harvard (1) 1556:8 haves (1) 1624:8 head (5) 1643:16;1649:7; 1664:22;1665:4; 1670:2 headquartered (1)	Hidden (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 high (5) 1563:20;1571:11; 1591:19;1653:20; 1672:15 higher (5) 1623:8,10,21; 1624:3;1664:18 highly (1) 1564:13 highway (1) 1556:9 Hill (1) 1602:21 Hills (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 hire (2) 1564:23;1573:9 hired (2) 1563:19;1573:10 historical (1) 1589:17	huh (2) 1610:13;1652:2 Huisman (5) 1554:19;1576:21; 1577:2;1675:14,15 hundred (2) 1574:10;1627:13 hundreds (1) 1644:18 hurt (1) 1665:10 hypothesis (1) 1634:24 hypothetical (1) 1567:22 I Iberdrola (7) 1584:9;1587:18,18; 1647:24;1648:2; 1663:15;1666:2 idea (5) 1584:24;1601:13; 1607:15;1624:12; 1657:22 identified (1)
generate (5) 1557:4;1562:24; 1600:14;1620:1; 1661:2 generated (6) 1570:21,22;1599:10; 1600:17;1624:13; 1662:24 generates (1) 1661:20 Generating (1) 1658:22 geographic (9) 1557:21;1561:7; 1597:19;1610:23; 1632:23;1633:4; 1637:21;1638:24; 1662:3 GERWIN (7) 1662:14,16;1666:17; 1667:15,19;1668:9; 1674:22 Gibs (1) 1554:19 gist (1) 1660:12 given (26) 1558:20;1569:14;	1670:13 Graff (1) 1593:20 Grand (1) 1602:18 grant (1) 1593:24 grants (5) 1665:23;1666:3,12, 15,18 gravel (3) 1564:17;1626:15,17 graveled (1) 1563:2 great (7) 1584:24;1591:17; 1592:2;1634:23; 1636:3;1665:8; 1636:3;1665:8; 1636:3;1665:8; 1636:3;1604:1; 1664:18 Griffin's (1) 1646:18 gross (10) 1566:12,13,20; 1567:10,22;1571:11;	half (2) 1566:3;1639:19 half-hour (2) 1639:16,17 hand (2) 1555:10;1672:3 handed (4) 1593:7;1607:4; 1651:19;1654:3 happen (2) 1664:13;1672:5 happened (1) 1664:23 happens (1) 1629:5 hard (2) 1581:17;1664:20 Harvard (1) 1556:8 haves (1) 1624:8 head (5) 1643:16;1649:7; 1664:22;1665:4; 1670:2 headquartered (1) 1574:16	Hidden (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 high (5) 1563:20;1571:11; 1591:19;1653:20; 1672:15 higher (5) 1623:8,10,21; 1624:3;1664:18 highly (1) 1564:13 highway (1) 1556:9 Hill (1) 1602:21 Hills (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 hire (2) 1564:23;1573:9 hired (2) 1563:19;1573:10 historical (1) 1589:17 Historically (1)	huh (2) 1610:13;1652:2 Huisman (5) 1554:19;1576:21; 1577:2;1675:14,15 hundred (2) 1574:10;1627:13 hundreds (1) 1644:18 hurt (1) 1665:10 hypothesis (1) 1634:24 hypothetical (1) 1567:22 I Iberdrola (7) 1584:9;1587:18,18; 1647:24;1648:2; 1663:15;1666:2 idea (5) 1584:24;1601:13; 1607:15;1624:12; 1657:22 identified (1) 1560:1
generate (5) 1557:4;1562:24; 1600:14;1620:1; 1661:2 generated (6) 1570:21,22;1599:10; 1600:17;1624:13; 1662:24 generates (1) 1661:20 Generating (1) 1658:22 geographic (9) 1557:21;1561:7; 1597:19;1610:23; 1632:23;1633:4; 1637:21;1638:24; 1662:3 GERWIN (7) 1662:14,16;1666:17; 1667:15,19;1668:9; 1674:22 Gibs (1) 1554:19 gist (1) 1660:12 given (26) 1558:20;1569:14; 1571:5,20,24;1573:8;	1670:13 Graff (1) 1593:20 Grand (1) 1602:18 grant (1) 1593:24 grants (5) 1665:23;1666:3,12, 15,18 gravel (3) 1564:17;1626:15,17 graveled (1) 1563:2 great (7) 1584:24;1591:17; 1592:2;1634:23; 1636:3;1665:8; 1673:11 greater (5) 1569:4;1572:8; 1603:13;1604:1; 1664:18 Griffin's (1) 1646:18 gross (10) 1566:12,13,20; 1567:10,22;1571:11; 1575:8,10;1613:11;	half (2) 1566:3;1639:19 half-hour (2) 1639:16,17 hand (2) 1555:10;1672:3 handed (4) 1593:7;1607:4; 1651:19;1654:3 happen (2) 1664:13;1672:5 happened (1) 1664:23 happens (1) 1629:5 hard (2) 1581:17;1664:20 Harvard (1) 1556:8 haves (1) 1624:8 head (5) 1643:16;1649:7; 1664:22;1665:4; 1670:2 headquartered (1) 1574:16 headquarters (1)	Hidden (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 high (5) 1563:20;1571:11; 1591:19;1653:20; 1672:15 higher (5) 1623:8,10,21; 1624:3;1664:18 highly (1) 1564:13 highway (1) 1556:9 Hill (1) 1602:21 Hills (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 hire (2) 1564:23;1573:9 hired (2) 1563:19;1573:10 historical (1) 1589:17 Historically (1) 1651:4	huh (2) 1610:13;1652:2 Huisman (5) 1554:19;1576:21; 1577:2;1675:14,15 hundred (2) 1574:10;1627:13 hundreds (1) 1644:18 hurt (1) 1665:10 hypothesis (1) 1634:24 hypothetical (1) 1567:22 I Iberdrola (7) 1584:9;1587:18,18; 1647:24;1648:2; 1663:15;1666:2 idea (5) 1584:24;1601:13; 1607:15;1624:12; 1657:22 identified (1) 1560:1 identify (2)
generate (5) 1557:4;1562:24; 1600:14;1620:1; 1661:2 generated (6) 1570:21,22;1599:10; 1600:17;1624:13; 1662:24 generates (1) 1661:20 Generating (1) 1658:22 geographic (9) 1557:21;1561:7; 1597:19;1610:23; 1632:23;1633:4; 1637:21;1638:24; 1662:3 GERWIN (7) 1662:14,16;1666:17; 1667:15,19;1668:9; 1674:22 Gibs (1) 1554:19 gist (1) 1660:12 given (26) 1558:20;1569:14;	1670:13 Graff (1) 1593:20 Grand (1) 1602:18 grant (1) 1593:24 grants (5) 1665:23;1666:3,12, 15,18 gravel (3) 1564:17;1626:15,17 graveled (1) 1563:2 great (7) 1584:24;1591:17; 1592:2;1634:23; 1636:3;1665:8; 1636:3;1665:8; 1636:3;1665:8; 1636:3;1604:1; 1664:18 Griffin's (1) 1646:18 gross (10) 1566:12,13,20; 1567:10,22;1571:11;	half (2) 1566:3;1639:19 half-hour (2) 1639:16,17 hand (2) 1555:10;1672:3 handed (4) 1593:7;1607:4; 1651:19;1654:3 happen (2) 1664:13;1672:5 happened (1) 1664:23 happens (1) 1629:5 hard (2) 1581:17;1664:20 Harvard (1) 1556:8 haves (1) 1624:8 head (5) 1643:16;1649:7; 1664:22;1665:4; 1670:2 headquartered (1) 1574:16	Hidden (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 high (5) 1563:20;1571:11; 1591:19;1653:20; 1672:15 higher (5) 1623:8,10,21; 1624:3;1664:18 highly (1) 1564:13 highway (1) 1556:9 Hill (1) 1602:21 Hills (3) 1616:7;1618:12; 1619:4 hire (2) 1564:23;1573:9 hired (2) 1563:19;1573:10 historical (1) 1589:17 Historically (1)	huh (2) 1610:13;1652:2 Huisman (5) 1554:19;1576:21; 1577:2;1675:14,15 hundred (2) 1574:10;1627:13 hundreds (1) 1644:18 hurt (1) 1665:10 hypothesis (1) 1634:24 hypothetical (1) 1567:22 I Iberdrola (7) 1584:9;1587:18,18; 1647:24;1648:2; 1663:15;1666:2 idea (5) 1584:24;1601:13; 1607:15;1624:12; 1657:22 identified (1) 1560:1

1561:16 Illinois (13) 1558:22;1564:1; 1573:15;1579:21; 1593:20:1598:19; 1617:20;1631:16; 1651:11,21;1654:3; 1655:2;1658:17 **Illustration** (1) 1580:11 impact (62) 1555:24;1556:5,23; 1557:11;1559:18; 1560:16;1561:4,15; 1565:4,5,14;1566:1; 1567:2;1569:23; 1570:18;1571:7,9; 1572:15;1575:1; 1576:3;1582:4,16,20; 1583:1;1586:20; 1587:4;1592:2,10,13; 1597:18:1599:9: 1600:20;1601:22; 1604:3,23;1606:18,23; 1608:16,19;1610:17; 1611:4;1613:20; 1614:2,3,3;1615:15; 1616:7,10;1619:19; 1622:7;1628:21,22; 1629:3,12;1652:8; 1653:22;1659:12,20; 1661:16:1664:9.11: 1665:13 impacted (2) 1603:6;1656:11 impacts (121) 1556:6,11:1557:2,5, 9,12,17,22;1558:2,4,4, 8,10,12,14,17,19; 1559:5,13,14;1560:13; 1561:17,22;1562:10, 11,14,16,16,16,19,24; 1563:14,15;1565:24; 1566:6,12,12,17,20; 1567:10;1569:21; 1570:5,6,19,24; 1571:11,12,22,23; 1573:1,4;1574:2,6; 1575:2,4,6,8,10,14; 1576:5,9,10;1580:10; 1583:2,6,11,12; 1594:11:1597:4.16: 1598:9,23;1599:19,24, 24;1600:10,14;1601:3; 1602:12;1603:8,11,13, 18;1604:1,7,15,20,22; 1606:5,11,22;1608:15; 1609:1;1610:4; 1611:12,15;1617:17; 1630:10;1632:9,12; 1634:2,19;1635:12,14, 16:1637:3,14:1641:3; 1643:10;1649:17;

1652:23;1655:15,16; 1656:1.5.15:1658:10. 21;1663:3,12;1664:18 IMPLAN (26) 1606:20;1608:22,22; 1609:19,24;1610:16; 1621:6,13,24;1622:2,3, 9;1625:18,23;1626:2; 1628:9,12,13,15,16,17; 1629:3,3,5,5,12 implement (2) 1641:1;1647:12 implicitly (1) 1668:5 implore (1) 1672:18 importance (1) 1576:1 important (6) 1563:13;1569:20; 1576:14;1580:7; 1596:23:1604:10 improper (2) 1565:23;1644:13 improve (2) 1588:16;1637:17 improvement (1) 1596:1 improvements (2) 1563:2;1596:16 incentives (2) 1560:9.11 incident (1) 1600:16 include (7) 1558:3;1563:2; 1568:19;1574:2; 1610:24;1613:24,24 included (2) 1571:23:1605:6 includes (2) 1562:9:1574:5 including (6) 1556:6;1560:17; 1580:7;1604:17; 1613:21;1650:11 income (16) 1557:13,19;1558:6; 1562:6;1566:22,23; 1572:5,11,16;1575:10, 14:1632:15:1635:1; 1636:15.20:1670:1 incomes (1) 1573:10 increase (17) 1559:15;1567:17; 1570:14,17;1573:9; 1574:18,21;1575:19; 1588:13;1592:11; 1600:3:1632:14; 1636:15.18.20:1637:9: 1661:21 increased (2)

1558:4;1634:24 increases (2) 1569:19:1637:7 increasing (1) 1637:6 independent (4) 1556:21;1571:7; 1638:19:1645:15 indicated (7) 1568:9,11:1583:20; 1586:6,8;1605:24; 1612:19 indicates (6) 1561:24:1563:17; 1568:3,18;1573:12; 1609:6 indication (4) 1559:21;1573:6,8; 1646:24 indirect (28) 1557:8,11,17,22; 1558:2.2.10:1561:23: 1562:4,13,16,18; 1565:24:1569:12: 1570:21;1571:22; 1573:4;1575:3; 1606:12;1609:10,16; 1611:14,16,20;1612:6, 11,11,12 indirectly (1) 1570:9 individual (2) 1561:16:1646:14 individuals (1) 1672:23 induce (4) 1558:14;1559:12; 1583:3:1597:9 induced (11) 1557:9,11:1558:3; 1561:23:1562:1: 1566:4:1570:11; 1606:12;1609:7; 1611:20;1652:7 industrial (2) 1556:13;1620:20 industries (3) 1558:1;1568:4,8 industry (16) 1556:20;1557:24; 1568:10,19;1570:21, 22;1589:18;1605:8; 1608:24;1610:3; 1611:3;1613:15; 1645:8;1653:2;1655:1; 1664:10 inexperience (1) 1660:22 infer (1) 1646:11 inference (1) 1623:24 information (24)

1557:1:1560:7; 1565:3:1566:8: 1571:18:1586:19; 1596:22.22:1601:19: 1623:13,16,18; 1624:12;1625:4; 1655:9;1656:10; 1672:8;1673:5,10; 1674:8,22;1675:1,4,7 information's (1) 1672:12 infrastructure (14) 1556:17;1581:13,15, 17,19,24;1582:4,6,7,8, 11,12,14,16 initial (1) 1570:7 injecting (1) 1667:22 injuries (1) 1602:6 input (5) 1562:23;1586:21; 1587:7;1623:16; 1626:5 Input/output (11) 1560:23;1580:8,15; 1615:9:1616:23; 1631:13;1633:18; 1634:9;1635:17; 1636:1:1637:12 inputs (17) 1560:16:1561:12,16; 1572:1:1578:23: 1579:2;1618:7;1621:8; 1622:16,20;1623:1,10; 1624:6,18:1653:19; 1661:6.9 installations (3) 1632:13:1634:19.24 installed (5) 1636:17,22;1643:15; 1645:8;1658:16 instead (2) 1567:23;1635:10 instruct (1) 1595:11 insurance (1) 1573:21 intended (1) 1579:7 interchanges (1) 1556:9 interdependencies (1) 1557:20 Interested (2) 1660:5;1675:4 interpretation (1) 1673:2 interruption] (1) 1627:22 into (27) 1561:16;1566:14,22;

#### January 26, 2015

1567:21:1572:20; 1575:12:1583:16.21: 1586:8,10,21;1587:7; 1593:21:1596:7: 1617:8:1623:19; 1624:6;1626:5; 1627:23;1633:24; 1636:10:1644:22; 1649:14;1660:16; 1661:9;1665:22; 1667:23 Invenergy (4) 1583:16,20;1586:8; 1644:18 Invenergy's (1) 1643:14 investigate (1) 1635:8 investment (2) 1556:3;1661:6 investors (3) 1574:8.9.17 involve (1) 1563:18 involved (2) 1554:3;1571:6 irrelevant (2) 1588:3;1673:10 issue (5) 1612:5:1622:3; 1648:21:1649:23,24 issues (6) 1597:16:1602:3; 1612:7:1633:24: 1648:17:1665:9 items (1) 1612:11 Iverson (2)

#### J

1554:16.17

January (2) 1554:8;1656:7 jargon (1) 1557:15 **JEDI (63)** 1562:9;1563:5; 1565:16,24;1571:17; 1573:12,13,20,23; 1574:5,8,13;1575:1; 1578:23;1579:2; 1606:20;1607:1; 1608:19,23;1609:20; 1610:1,19;1611:2,3,16, 23;1612:3,14;1615:9, 14;1616:23;1622:6,8; 1623:6,8,10,23; 1625:20;1626:4,6; 1628:8.11.12.23: 1629:7,18;1630:4,14, 19;1631:1,8,9,12,17; 1632:17;1634:2,10;

			1	January 20, 2015
1635:17;1663:17,20,	1560:16;1561:11;	last (7)	1584:3,4;1594:23;	1573:6,7,8;1574:6,10,
21;1668:19,22	1575:11	1594:23;1604:12;	1625:16;1628:20;	12,15,19,21;1575:4,7;
			1625.10,1028.20, 1631:7	
Joan (2)	Kiefer (1)	1606:13;1632:6;		1594:2;1608:15;
1554:18;1576:21	1554:16	1646:17;1661:17;	lingering (1)	1615:21;1617:16;
job (16)	kind (3)	1673:7	1591:18	1621:19;1624:3;
1557:9;1566:13;	1554:7;1627:14;	lasting (1)	linkage (1)	1625:18;1626:17,24;
1567:10;1575:8;	1635:21	1568:23	1649:23	1628:6;1633:20,22;
1595:24;1614:3;	kinds (3)	late (2)	linkages (3)	1635:6,11,14,16;
1649:13;1650:6,6,9,10,	1572:22;1628:5;	1554:5,6	1615:20;1618:6;	1655:17
16,18,18,24;1673:12	1665:6	Lawrence (2)	1622:16	locally (7)
jobs (85)	knew (1)	1638:17;1661:18	list (1)	1563:10;1564:17;
1557:14,19;1558:6;	1640:14	lawyer (1)	1614:19	1565:22;1571:17;
1561:20,24;1563:16;	knowledge (1)	1633:6	listed (3)	1573:10;1626:20;
1564:9,11;1565:17;	1645:16	leading (3)	1599:15,22;1613:3	1661:13
1566:3,4,15,15,21,22;	known (1)	1629:4,12,14	listening (1)	located (6)
1567:12,15;1570:2,4,9,	1663:22	leak (2)	1596:20	1567:6;1572:9;
10;1572:5;1575:9;	knows (1)	1615:17;1623:4	lists (2)	1590:6;1615:8;
1576:5;1589:18;	1601:20	leakage (1)	1609:16,20	1616:22;1653:20
1590:10,22;1591:5,6,8,		1571:24	literature (6)	location (1)
12;1592:6,6,12;1593:1,	L	leaks (1)	1607:1;1610:16;	1636:13
2;1594:3,4;1595:1,8;		1574:9	1615:17;1629:16,19;	locations (1)
1596:2,2;1603:9;	Lab (2)	lease (1)	1632:8	1622:22
1604:4;1608:14,18;	1625:22;1661:19	1574:11	litter (1)	long (3)
1609:7,17;1611:10,14,	labeled (2)	least (1)	1600:18	1576:13;1608:4;
16,20;1612:6,18,20;	1611:11,14	1663:11	little (8)	1653:8
1613:1,9,10,11,12;	labor (12)	led (1)	1554:4,6;1555:19;	longer (1)
				1610:18
1628:22;1630:18,19;	1557:13;1559:1;	1556:4	1599:8;1642:23;	
1632:16;1634:1;	1560:18;1561:6;	Lee (2)	1653:7;1669:20;	long-term (2)
1636:19;1637:3;	1564:8,22,23;1591:21;	1565:2,21	1670:14	1648:11,13
1643:13;1649:14,15,	1611:11;1623:4;	left (3)	live (2)	look (15)
20,23;1653:2,23,24;	1631:15;1650:12	1633:16;1636:9;	1662:16;1669:4	1591:3;1592:11;
1655:1,3;1662:6,8;	Laboratory (5)	1650:18	living (1)	1601:18;1604:3;
1663:5,6,7,17,22;	1617:19;1629:1;	less (13)	1565:19	1612:8;1625:9;1628:3,
1669:3	1633:24;1638:16,17	1564:3;1582:7,8,12,	Livingston (63)	18;1648:11;1658:5;
John (2)	Laboratory's (1)	12;1591:21;1595:7;	1554:9,10;1557:5;	1663:1;1671:16,18;
1554:13;1668:16	1608:18	1596:1;1603:9;	1558:21,23;1560:19;	1672:11;1673:3
Journal (1)	lack (2)	1615:13,18,18;1637:18	1561:8,20;1562:22,24;	looked (11)
1580:12	1571:5;1641:22	level (3)	1563:24;1564:20;	1580:14;1589:14;
judge (1)	Lake (1)	1558:20;1625:24;	1567:7,13,20;1568:3,	1607:17;1625:5;
1595:11	1568:7	1632:18	10,13,17;1569:9;	1633:11;1652:1;
June (5)	land (10)	licensed (1)	1570:2,16;1572:8,12,	1655:12;1664:2,3,23;
1579:22;1591:18;	1555:16;1556:2,19;	1598:18	20;1574:18;1575:19;	1669:19
1651:21;1652:1;	1574:11;1576:13;	Life (2)	1584:8;1588:14,22;	looking (17)
1654:3	1606:16;1613:21;	1593:21;1602:4	1589:18;1590:7,10,23;	1593:13;1594:19;
Justices (1)	1624:16;1661:5;	light (1)	1592:19;1593:19,23;	1630:9,23;1631:12,13,
1653:9	1665:7	1641:23	1594:5;1595:1;	22;1633:8;1634:8,9;
justification (3)	Lantz (1)	likely (27)	1600:22;1614:6,15;	1635:16,24;1655:14,
1569:7;1571:13;	1634:3	1559:3;1560:14;	1615:3;1620:17;	18;1657:20;1665:9;
1575:21	L-A-N-T-Z (1)	1564:6,8;1569:13,21;	1621:6,13,23;1622:9,	1672:24
	1634:3	1572:4,7;1573:24;	13,15;1625:19;1626:2,	looking-back (1)
Κ	large (6)	1576:2;1603:12,24;	6,18;1627:6,24;1630:7,	1662:17
X	1562:23;1571:24;	1604:7;1612:20,22;	13;1631:2;1632:23;	looks (4)
Kono (2)		1613:1,6;1618:13,15;	1647:9;1653:3;1669:4	1594:21;1605:7;
Kane (2)	1621:20;1634:21,22;			
1556:9;1568:6	1662:9	1619:6,11,17;1620:10;	LLC (1)	1652:1;1674:8
Kankakee (1)	larger (5)	1626:19;1641:12;	1554:11	Loomis (67)
1572:11	1572:9,21;1618:8,9;	1642:5,10	loan (1)	1556:24;1557:7,7;
Keep (7)	1620:20	limitations (4)	1593:24	1558:7,11;1559:1,10,
1558:19;1582:9;	largest (1)	1580:8;1633:18;	loaned (1)	17,18;1560:3,7,13;
1585:11;1640:19;	1614:5	1673:17,22	1594:3	1561:18,23;1562:7,15,
1668:10;1674:1,2	Larry (1)	limited (3)	local (36)	17;1563:6,9,17;
kept (1)	1593:21	1560:4;1569:12;	1563:11;1564:5,23;	1565:1;1566:14;
1645:11	LaSalle (1)	1641:16	1569:23;1570:4,5;	1567:1,11,18;1568:1,9;
Key (3)	1602:19	line (6)	1571:20;1572:18;	1569:6,24;1570:8,13,
-	1	1		i

Min-U-Script®

19:1571:1.8,12,15,19: 1572:14:1573:1.2.16: 1574:3,12:1575:2,12, 20:1576:9.12:1579:13: 1581:1:1599:17; 1602:10;1605:4; 1609:6;1621:6,23; 1625:17:1630:4; 1641:13;1643:6; 1644:17:1652:12; 1656:12;1660:13; 1663:12:1669:2,12 Loomis's (24) 1577:18;1579:8: 1581:6;1583:5,14; 1588:3;1607:10; 1609:4,15,15;1611:19; 1625:6,10;1631:6; 1632:5;1635:22; 1645:13;1647:17; 1650:1;1655:20; 1656:24:1658:5: 1668:23;1669:20 losers (1) 1668:7 losing (1) 1663:19 lost (2)1587:17;1672:4 lot (4) 1596:15:1624:8; 1639:24:1640:2 lots (3) 1618:5,6;1638:10 love (1) 1584:17 low (5) 1620:22;1651:1,4,7, 9 lower (2) 1620:10;1623:24 Luetkehans (61) 1555:3,5,8,12,19; 1581:5;1584:14,17,21; 1585:6,10;1586:14; 1587:16,22;1590:14; 1595:13,15,18; 1596:13,20;1601:7,17; 1605:19,22;1607:4; 1610:5,11;1617:6; 1624:10:1625:15; 1639:8,15;1640:2,11, 13;1642:17;1643:19, 24;1644:7,11,12,24; 1645:4,18,20;1646:15; 1656:8;1657:18,24; 1659:4;1666:8;1667:6, 9;1670:11,12;1671:1,3, 7;1674:12,15;1675:3

1650:3,6,21 main (2)1628:4;1662:4 mainly (1) 1634:23 maintenance (3) 1594:7;1595:4; 1600:15 major (3) 1568:14:1618:11; 1627:15 makes (2) 1586:5;1668:3 making (3) 1597:17;1635:6; 1668:5 malls (1) 1556:14 man(1)1622:1 managed (1) 1601:4 manner (1) 1570:19 manufacture (1) 1562:21 manufacturing (1) 1556:11 many (17) 1556:5:1564:8,17; 1570:8;1595:8;1596:2; 1599:1.4:1602:14: 1605:4:1606:18: 1635:12:1645:24: 1653:2;1654:24; 1669:5,7 March (2) 1567:5;1590:15 marked (3) 1578:1:1593:8; 1651:19 market (11) 1555:16,23;1640:24; 1641:12,14;1642:2,6, 11;1643:5;1648:14,20 marketing (1) 1641:5 material (5) 1568:16;1573:17; 1577:23;1604:22; 1673:14 materialize (1) 1641:3 materials (6) 1560:18;1561:6; 1563:8,12;1568:21; 1623:3 matter (3) 1615:15;1625:11; 1641:19 may (27) 1554:6.21:1555:12;

1558:14;1559:12;

1563:18:1572:17; 1583:3.9:1594:13: 1595:24;1597:9; 1601:14:1603:4: 1605:24;1624:2,6,8; 1652:9;1660:23; 1661:1;1664:17,17; 1672:23;1673:16; 1675:2,4 Maybe (4) 1585:6;1604:13; 1664:2;1670:16 McHenry (1) 1568:7 McLean (1) 1602:16 mean (7) 1579:12;1581:2,4; 1638:15;1640:15; 1657:11;1664:4 means (5) 1565:20:1596:8: 1633:6;1637:6,16 meant (1) 1617:24 measure (8) 1559:5,13;1583:11; 1597:4,20;1599:24; 1608:15;1658:10 median (1) 1636:20 meet (4) 1671:24;1672:1: 1674:4.5 meeting (6) 1554:23;1576:20,22; 1585:13:1672:1.2 megawatt (8) 1567:3,6;1573:15; 1632:16;1636:16,19; 1663:7,8 megawatts (1) 1645:8 member (1) 1585:21 members (4) 1554:6;1576:20; 1591:22;1675:17 memorandum (1) 1575:24 Menards (4) 1595:8,22;1596:15; 1662:7 mention (2) 1583:15;1584:5 mentioned (11) 1582:3;1588:21; 1590:4;1594:20; 1600:12,12;1607:8; 1626:14;1661:5; 1662:7;1665:21 merely (6) 1592:5;1600:19;

1603:4;1637:1; 1659:17.20 method (1) 1634:21 methodology (2) 1628:21;1632:6 methods (1) 1635:13 metric (1) 1659:9 Michael (2) 1554:13:1576:21 Midwest (1) 1632:24 might (8) 1564:10;1592:22; 1600:16,17;1603:3; 1624:13;1660:15; 1665:10 miles (1) 1565:19 million (6) 1570:15,17;1586:15; 1594:1;1666:3;1670:4 millions (1) 1584:7 mind (1) 1558:19 mine (1) 1608:4 Minnesota (2) 1565:10:1608:22 Minonk (2) 1567:6:1590:6 minute (5) 1579:19;1586:12,17; 1591:2;1605:11 minutes (8) 1586:24;1625:10; 1632:3;1639:13,14,20; 1670:18;1671:18 misleading (14) 1557:1;1560:14; 1563:14;1565:16; 1566:5;1567:1; 1569:22;1571:19; 1573:2;1576:8;1606:6; 1612:14,21;1613:2 missed (1) 1617:10 missing (3) 1618:5;1620:19; 1674:23 mobile (1) 1564:20 model (78) 1558:7;1560:16; 1561:3;1562:9;1563:5; 1565:16,24;1570:3; 1571:17:1572:19; 1573:12,13,20,23; 1574:5,8,14:1575:1; 1578:23,23;1579:2;

#### January 26, 2015

1586:21:1587:7; 1607:2:1608:19.21.23: 1609:20;1610:1,19; 1611:3,4,17,24;1612:3; 1615:14,15,18; 1621:10;1622:8,22; 1623:6,8,10,19; 1625:20;1626:4,6; 1628:8,9,12,12,13,13, 16,16,17,23,23,23; 1629:3,7,18;1630:4,19; 1631:1.8.9.12.17; 1634:2,10;1635:17; 1636:1;1663:17,20; 1668:20,22 modeling (1) 1637:12 models (18) 1560:23;1561:4,16; 1580:8,15;1606:20; 1609:19,24;1610:17; 1612:14,15;1615:9; 1616:23;1622:6; 1633:18:1634:9: 1650:20;1661:5 model's (1) 1630:14 modest (1) 1637:7 Modestly (1) 1669:22 moments (3) 1613:3;1651:17; 1654:4 money (6) 1563:22;1594:3; 1662:19,23;1666:21; 1667:21 months (2) 1563:19:1568:23 more (45) 1563:6;1568:5; 1569:20;1572:7,17,22, 23;1573:9;1576:11,19; 1583:10;1586:21; 1591:1,6;1604:7,10; 1608:24;1609:19; 1610:3,17;1612:15; 1615:13,14,17,20; 1617:21;1618:9; 1628:3:1630:15; 1633:3,21;1638:1,6; 1639:5,10,14;1642:23; 1647:15;1650:16; 1653:5,7;1663:23; 1670:14;1673:14; 1674:9 most (4) 1560:11;1569:3; 1578:16:1624:17 motion (4) 1674:17,20;1675:10, 11

**Min-U-Script**®

machine (3)

Μ

motions (1) 1675:12 Motorola (1) 1556:7 Mountains (1) 1632:22 **move** (8) 1564:21;1585:16; 1601:9;1639:8,8; 1640:7;1644:3;1646:9 moved (1) 1593:2 moving (4) 1587:3;1640:19; 1650:9;1674:14 much (18) 1563:9;1571:16,22; 1577:17;1609:19; 1610:17,18;1612:13, 15;1617:20;1620:10; 1638:5:1646:14; 1647:15:1660:14: 1662:15;1668:9; 1675:7 multiplier (16) 1557:18;1562:18; 1566:12;1571:1; 1572:3;1575:5;1611:7; 1615:17;1622:17; 1649:24:1653:20; 1661:11:1667:17.18, 20:1669:4 multipliers (14) 1561:17:1562:5: 1571:21;1580:10; 1608:21;1612:8; 1620:22;1621:6,14,24; 1622:9;1625:21,23; 1626:7 multiplying (1) 1667:22 municipal (4) 1574:22;1602:9; 1603:5;1618:20 municipality (1) 1614:6 must (1) 1561:2 myriad (1) 1635:8 Ν name (2) 1555:14;1662:15 named (1) 1614:15 national (10) 1608:16,17;1625:22; 1628:24:1633:23: 1635:3,7;1638:16,17;

1651:1,5 nature (5) 1571:21:1572:20; 1578:18:1604:6: 1649:21 near (2) 1615:8;1616:22 nearby (2) 1567:21;1572:22 nearly (1) 1570:17 necessarily (1) 1592:23 necessary (1) 1571:5 need (16) 1585:19;1600:15,18; 1608:2;1616:18; 1635:8:1642:13.13; 1644:3;1646:9;1653:2, 7:1661:15:1671:16; 1674:17;1675:7 needed (1) 1564:8 needs (2) 1564:24;1642:23 negative (2) 1659:11;1667:22 negligible (3) 1576:6;1637:4,15 negotiations (2) 1586:4:1601:14 neither (5) 1561:13:1563:8: 1569:6;1598:10,12 net (14) 1566:11,14;1571:12; 1575:8:1580:10: 1619:18;1635:3,11; 1636:18;1649:14; 1650:8,18,19;1661:2 Nevada (1) 1615:4 nevertheless (1) 1590:24 new (15) 1564:12;1566:21; 1569:16;1593:21; 1594:3;1615:7; 1616:21;1650:8,11,18, 19,23,24;1653:2; 1669:2 newspaper (1) 1579:20 next (4) 1560:15;1617:7,12; 1674:13 Nielsen (1) 1554:19 night (2) 1601:4;1671:4 nights (3) 1673:7.7.8

noise (6) 1559:8:1597:7: 1658:12:1659:13; 1671:9.10 nonagricultural (1) 1620:18 none (9) 1558:16;1573:23; 1599:6;1601:19; 1617:24:1623:13; 1641:2,7,10 nonfarm (2) 1591:9,12 nonIMPLAN (1) 1571:17 nonnecessities (1) 1563:23 nonpayroll (1) 1574:2 Nor (12) 1559:13,17:1563:8, 10;1569:6,9;1586:4; 1588:4;1599:23; 1635:4:1646:1.4 North (1) 1565:8 note (3) 1568:6;1576:18; 1651:21 noted (2) 1558:11:1562:7 notorious (1) 1617:16 November (4) 1564:2;1584:1; 1628:19;1656:5 nowhere (2) 1646:3.20 NREL (1) 1661:19 number (22) 1557:19:1567:12; 1572:3;1587:23; 1591:5;1599:2; 1612:17;1613:12; 1626:7;1629:1; 1633:15;1634:22; 1638:7,11;1643:21; 1644:14;1652:18; 1655:5;1659:1,9; 1662:6,7 numbers (4) 1565:17;1621:9; 1631:14,15 nutshell (1) 1617:20 0 **O&M (2)** 1573:19;1574:3 Oak (1) 1602:15

Oaks (17) 1565:1.14.18: 1566:1,4;1569:11; 1571:9;1578:22; 1607:6;1608:16,20; 1630:21;1662:18; 1663:4,9,10,11 object (3) 1666:4;1667:9,12 **Objection** (14) 1601:7,17;1610:5; 1624:10:1643:19; 1644:3,7;1645:18,20; 1657:18:1658:1; 1666:9,9,23 objective (2) 1556:21;1571:7 obtain (1) 1570:24 obtained (1) 1562:21 obtaining (1) 1647:10 obviously (3) 1632:24;1633:1; 1668:2 occupations (1) 1564:5 occur (2) 1558:17:1563:10 occurred (6) 1566:23:1569:10: 1589:21:1592:22: 1593:1:1641:17 o'clock (1) 1605:14 off (8) 1643:16;1646:8; 1649:7;1659:10; 1664:22;1665:3; 1670:2;1673:24 office (3) 1556:12;1578:10; 1616:3 offices (2) 1555:21;1616:1 officially (1) 1591:17 officials (1) 1657:6 offset (1) 1574:20 off-take (1) 1647:10 Ohio (1) 1565:12 oil (1) 1641:24 older (1) 1652:2 omission (1) 1603:14 once (1)

#### January 26, 2015

1569:24 one (67) 1555:1;1557:24; 1563:13:1567:16: 1568:4;1570:21,22; 1577:22;1579:19; 1580:4,17,19;1585:12, 18;1586:9;1589:5,6, 10;1590:4;1591:1; 1593:2;1594:7;1595:3, 8,8,24,24;1596:1,1,1; 1608:1:1610:22; 1612:7;1616:11; 1624:24;1629:6; 1630:4,20,24;1635:23; 1637:22,22;1638:1,1,9; 1639:2,10;1650:18,18, 24;1652:2,4;1653:9; 1654:3,9,15;1655:21; 1658:17;1660:7; 1662:8;1664:11; 1665:10;1668:4,4; 1670:24;1671:4; 1672:21 one-half (3) 1575:9;1653:5,11 ones (8) 1580:18;1588:20; 1589:20;1603:18; 1604:11:1627:12; 1629:14:1663:20 one's (1) 1587:6 ongoing (15) 1557:4;1563:21; 1566:2;1569:18,21; 1570:10;1573:14,23; 1576:5,13;1593:4; 1601:14;1604:4; 1652:9;1663:10 online (5) 1567:5,7:1590:12, 13.15 only (21) 1562:9;1564:4,23; 1568:24;1575:8,10; 1578:6;1581:8; 1589:10;1610:23; 1611:2;1637:22; 1639:3;1644:16; 1645:8;1654:14,14; 1661:8;1670:15,21,23 on-site (3) 1562:10;1576:5; 1611:11 open (3) 1569:16;1571:21; 1594:3 opened (1) 1589:6 operate (5) 1558:16;1559:23; 1568:12;1647:2;

1661:19

Natural (2)

1651:12 operated (1) 1567:23 operating (5) 1561:1;1570:1; 1575:17;1588:11; 1641:2 operation (2) 1570:13;1647:11 operations (8) 1566:2;1570:3; 1574:7;1594:11,16,21; 1652:9;1656:6 operator (3) 1650:4,6,22 opine (1) 1668:21 opinion (3) 1604:19;1658:6; 1661:23 opportunity (7) 1563:21:1577:4: 1650:15;1664:13; 1665:21;1666:12; 1673:23 opposed (3) 1605:10;1664:21; 1675:18 optimistic (1) 1624:17 order (2) 1579:16:1625:24 Ordinance (2) 1600:23.23 organization (2) 1568:2;1653:18 original (1) 1616:16 originally (1) 1672:7 others (1) 1634:3 otherwise (6) 1573:9;1624:3; 1628:17;1642:2; 1650:15;1673:16 out (46) 1554:7;1555:10; 1574:9;1575:16; 1577:6;1580:14; 1587:5:1590:1; 1592:10:1594:14: 1596:5:1597:21; 1598:7;1599:17,18; 1600:20;1601:22; 1602:2,10,15;1603:4; 1610:7;1613:7; 1615:17;1617:4,11; 1623:4;1637:1;1638:9; 1639:3,22;1640:17,18; 1642:14,24;1645:24; 1648:4:1659:20;

1665:3;1667:21; 1669:5:1671:16: 1672:19 outer (1) 1627:23 outlets (1) 1572:9 output (7) 1557:10,14,19; 1562:6:1570:16; 1661:8,8 outputs (1) 1621:20 outside (5) 1564:10,19;1565:20; 1572:7;1618:7 over (7) 1554:4;1603:18; 1636:17,23;1639:12; 1650:9;1651:5 overall (2) 1591:12:1608:15 overcome (1) 1633:17 overestimating (1) 1617:16 overkill (1) 1673:20 overstate (1) 1613:11 overstated (16) 1560:14:1563:14: 1566:6:1569:14.21: 1573:2:1576:8:1606:6: 1612:21;1613:2,8; 1620:7;1652:9; 1660:13,15,20 overstates (2) 1557:2;1567:1 own (6) 1561:14:1568:17: 1616:12:1628:16; 1641:21;1642:7 Р page (70) 1560:3;1563:1,16; 1572:14;1573:2; 1580:9:1582:24; 1583:10;1584:3,4; 1585:4;1588:9,24; 1589:1,8,15,17,21,22, 22;1590:5,20;1591:4, 14;1597:3;1598:6; 1599:15,22,23;1603:7; 1605:3:1606:3.9: 1608:12;1609:4,16; 1616:18;1618:23; 1620:6.8.9.16.16: 1622:4;1625:16; 1628:20;1630:23; 1631:6:1632:5:

1633:15:1634:12; 1636:8:1639:10: 1640:23;1644:21,23; 1645:3:1646:23: 1647:21;1649:2,12; 1651:22;1652:6,22,24; 1654:1,4,18;1655:3; 1658:9 pages (3) 1611:18,21;1620:5 paid (3) 1638:15,19;1662:19 paper (3) 1632:8;1635:10; 1648:22 paragraph (14) 1557:6;1598:6; 1616:19;1622:5; 1630:24;1632:6; 1633:16;1634:12,14; 1636:9:1647:7; 1649:13:1652:6: 1654:18 part (6) 1575:3;1585:1; 1603:5;1654:15; 1662:22;1673:8 particular (4) 1582:13;1632:1; 1654:9:1657:9 particularly (1) 1591:19 parties (2) 1660:5:1675:4 parts (3) 1571:17;1573:22; 1579:10 Parzyck (4) 1584:2;1585:22; 1586:6;1646:17 Parzyck's (1) 1584:22 past (1) 1556:17 pause (1) 1671:20 pay (1) 1650:14 paying (1) 1574:22 payment (1) 1594:1 payroll (2) 1623:7;1652:10 peer-reviewed (6) 1610:22;1629:16; 1630:2;1631:11,18; 1651:15 peer-viewed (1) 1632:8 pending (1) 1658:1 Peoria (1)

1572:10 per (6) 1573:15:1632:16; 1636:16.19:1663:6.8 percent (19) 1563:6;1564:4: 1573:19;1574:10; 1575:9.11:1591:21; 1603:9;1636:21,21; 1637:5,18:1652:10,13; 1653:5,11;1660:15,16; 1661:21 percentage (4) 1560:18;1623:3; 1637:18:1652:20 percentages (1) 1561:5 percentage-wise (1) 1660:14 perception (1) 1673:8 perform (1) 1634:4 performed (1) 1616:6 period (11) 1563:20;1570:6; 1590:23:1592:18; 1613:23;1614:1; 1636:5.6.17.23; 1637:21 periods (1) 1638:24 permit (1) 1649:3 permitted (2) 1579:23;1648:24 person (1) 1578:6 personal (5) 1562:2;1609:8; 1632:15:1636:15,20 personally (2) 1579:15;1580:5 personnel (1) 1573:14 perspective (4) 1566:6;1567:21; 1637:11;1660:16 phase (1) 1561:19 Phil (5) 1581:5;1625:14,15; 1628:19;1631:6 phone (1) 1556:8 physical (1) 1664:21 picked (1) 1600:18 pieces (1) 1610:22 place (3)

#### January 26, 2015

1559:10:1569:3; 1592:22 places (1) 1623:1 Plains (4) 1632:22;1634:23; 1635:19;1636:3 plan(3)1629:1;1649:19; 1674:23 plane (1) 1639:22 plant (1) 1566:19 plants (2) 1556:16;1591:11 platform (1) 1629:6 Pleasant (12) 1554:11,11;1556:23; 1566:7;1577:23; 1578:1;1593:8,15; 1622:7;1651:20; 1657:4;1663:7 Please (7) 1585:18:1588:9; 1601:10;1611:21; 1642:15:1672:18; 1673:14 plenty (1) 1624:18 pm (4) 1554:1;1605:16,16; 1675:19 point (15) 1575:11,16;1583:10; 1585:24;1588:5; 1592:14:1597:17: 1607:12;1628:4; 1637:1:1644:13; 1662:4;1670:17; 1672:9;1673:19 pointed (2) 1599:17;1639:3 pointing (13) 1592:10;1596:5; 1597:21;1598:7; 1599:18;1600:20; 1601:22;1602:2,10; 1603:4;1642:14; 1659:18,20 police (1) 1602:4 policy (11) 1555:16;1556:4; 1560:6;1631:19; 1635:7;1645:8,9; 1648:8;1665:7;1668:3, 6 Pontiac (4) 1614:5;1618:3; 1662:16:1672:15 population (1)

1660:6;1664:4,5;

1614:6 pornography (1) 1653:10 Portfolio (3) 1644:6,10;1667:2 portion (3) 1583:24;1622:12; 1624:22 portray (2) 1558:13:1583:2 posed (1) 1666:16 position (4) 1594:8:1595:4; 1652:21;1662:10 positive (5) 1558:16;1566:12; 1569:23;1576:3; 1592:2 positively (1) 1588:16 possibility (1) 1675:9 possible (2) 1665:12;1675:7 possibly (1) 1675:2 Post (6) 1632:9,11;1633:6; 1634:20:1637:11; 1675:9 postulated (1) 1558:12 potential (6) 1557:2;1559:18; 1567:15;1597:16; 1635:9.13 potentially (4) 1566:17;1568:4; 1587:8;1649:17 power (21)1556:16;1559:22; 1560:1,2;1563:5; 1569:19;1632:10,13, 16;1634:19,22,24; 1636:14,16,22; 1641:23;1646:4; 1647:1,10;1650:11; 1658:22 power-related (1) 1634:5 practice (1) 1574:24 Prairie (4) 1656:23;1657:14; 1669:20;1670:4 precise (2) 1591:6;1615:19 precisely (1) 1663:23 preclude (1) 1664:17 precluded (2)

1667:1,4 preconstruction (1) 1663:8 predicted (13) 1560:13:1564:9; 1566:13:1567:10: 1571:11;1603:8,13; 1604:1:1606:5; 1630:11;1641:3; 1663:12:1669:24 prefer (1) 1655:23 preparation (1) 1629:9 prepare (2) 1571:7;1579:16 prepared (4) 1583:20;1584:6; 1586:8;1619:17 preparing (4) 1578:4:1604:21; 1607:19;1626:9 presence (1) 1576:22 present (9) 1554:23;1558:8; 1561:22;1575:2; 1601:23,23;1606:11; 1620:20;1635:10 presentation (6) 1558:10:1565:23; 1577:13:1590:9: 1673:10,17 presented (16) 1557:12;1562:5,6; 1566:13;1570:18; 1576:9:1586:19; 1606:22:1609:11: 1611:2,8;1649:13,21; 1652:8:1661:18; 1663:5 Presumably (1) 1567:8 pretty (1) 1651:1 previously (5) 1575:17;1588:11; 1589:2;1590:8; 1663:24 price (1) 1566:18 prices (8) 1641:24;1647:14; 1649:18;1650:12; 1651:2,5,8,9 primarily (3) 1559:2;1573:21; 1618:19 principal (1) 1555:15 prior (1) 1569:10 private (1)

1555:23 probably (5) 1604:10:1639:13; 1665:2:1668:23: 1672:24 problem (4) 1615:12;1636:11; 1637:19;1640:15 problems (1) 1630:20 procedures (1) 1656:19 proceed (3) 1555:4,13;1587:1 proceeding (4) 1580:21;1584:1; 1586:7;1600:24 proceedings (1) 1604:6 process (1) 1640:10 produce (4) 1568:4;1575:22; 1621:20;1623:11 produced (3) 1557:16,19;1561:17 produces (1) 1661:8 production (1) 1667:3 products (1) 1557:21 **Professional (2)** 1564:14:1608:23 Professor (5) 1609:4,14,15; 1617:17:1632:7 profound (1) 1653:22 program (3) 1593:24:1668:1.4 project (112) 1554:12;1556:23; 1558:15,23;1559:24; 1560:18,21;1561:9; 1562:23;1565:4,6,15, 18,20;1566:5,7,16; 1567:2,22,24;1568:12, 23;1569:1,13,18; 1570:1,14;1571:14; 1573:11,15:1574:15; 1575:22;1576:2,4; 1583:7,12:1584:10; 1586:10;1588:15; 1589:4;1593:6;1597:1; 1602:18,21,23; 1607:23;1608:17,20; 1609:1:1610:4; 1611:11;1615:8; 1616:8,10,22;1618:12, 15.16:1619:4.9.12.18. 19:1620:1:1622:8; 1626:13;1627:1,18;

1633:23:1640:24; 1641:11:1642:1.5.10: 1643:8,13,23;1644:1; 1646:1:1647:3.5.8: 1648:4,11,14,23; 1649:6.16:1650:9: 1653:13,15;1655:15, 19,21,24;1656:6,11,23; 1660:24;1661:10,15, 20:1663:4.5.15; 1664:15,16;1665:1,19; 1666:2;1668:4,6 projected (5) 1558:16;1566:6; 1575:6,14;1652:23 projects (37) 1563:7;1564:11,19; 1565:11;1567:20; 1569:10;1575:17; 1579:23;1588:12,18, 21,23;1589:1,9,13,19; 1590:2:1603:2:1604:9: 1606:14;1610:21; 1613:22;1624:16; 1627:13,14;1630:10, 16;1634:23;1641:6,9; 1643:15,18;1645:11; 1651:15:1655:23; 1660:23;1665:23 project's (2) 1565:7;1620:11 promise (1) 1608:4 promote (4) 1610:20;1638:4,13, 15 promoting (1) 1568:2 prone (1) 1615:14 proper (1) 1572:20 properly (1) 1656:21 property (23) 1559:19;1574:7,11, 19,20;1597:13,24,24; 1598:5,16,17,23; 1599:8;1602:8; 1603:11,17;1619:24; 1620:4,8,10;1672:6; 1674:7.23 proponent (2) 1561:9;1620:11 proponents (2) 1611:3;1624:16 proposed (30) 1557:3,3;1558:12, 14;1559:12,14,19,24; 1560:21:1566:16; 1567:2;1568:12; 1575:21:1576:3; 1583:1,3;1588:15;

#### January 26, 2015

1597:9:1600:2; 1603:11:1615:7: 1616:21:1618:14; 1619:8:1640:24: 1647:2,9:1649:16; 1663:4.9 prospective (4) 1612:24;1613:10; 1635:21;1648:15 provide (12) 1559:16;1560:7; 1563:11:1564:7; 1571:13;1593:3; 1600:5;1623:9;1625:4; 1630:22;1635:4; 1641:14 provided (12) 1557:7;1571:18; 1573:6;1607:7;1624:3; 1625:6;1627:8; 1652:18;1656:10,20; 1670:20:1673:1 provides (9) 1559:21:1565:2: 1567:1;1569:6; 1571:19;1575:20; 1578:24;1635:10; 1646:24 providing (2) 1618:14:1619:8 proximity (1) 1572:21 prudent (1) 1604:5 public (13) 1554:22,23;1555:22; 1556:4:1559:15; 1581:22,23;1600:3,4,5, 6.10.19 publication (2) 1631:11,18 purchase (4) 1560:1;1570:22; 1572:17;1633:20 purchased (3) 1571:24;1572:23; 1626:1 purchasing (2) 1562:11;1569:19 purpose (4) 1557:10:1562:8; 1570:7;1613:5 purposes (1) 1666:1 push (1) 1672:11 put (20) 1567:21;1575:12; 1584:9;1596:7; 1616:20;1617:4; 1619:1;1622:19,22; 1623:1,19;1624:4,5,17; 1642:3;1656:2;

1660:16:1667:16; 1673:17,21 putting (1) 1595:23 0 qualify-of-life (2) 1559:6;1659:12 quality (8) 1559:8,9;1563:20; 1597:7:1598:4: 1653:23;1658:13; 1659:13 quality-of-life (3) 1597:5;1598:3; 1658:11 quantified (1) 1603:21 quantity (1) 1559:9 quickly (2) 1588:24;1640:7 quite (2) 1605:8;1610:18 quorum (1) 1554:22 quote (17) 1560:5,6;1562:15, 16:1563:2.5.17.19; 1565:16.17:1570:5: 1572:16,19;1573:3,5; 1589:9:1617:22 quotes (2) 1594:5;1595:1 quoting (1) 1629:17

R

raises (1) 1650:12 ramifications (1) 1576:11 Rand (3) 1670:19;1671:12; 1674:11 range (1) 1556:17 rate (1) 1564:3 rather (2) 1618:22;1637:4 ratio (1) 1562:18 reached (1) 1643:4 read (23) 1577:17;1580:9; 1583:24;1589:10; 1593:14:1594:23; 1600:22;1606:4; 1608:10;1609:1;

1610:7:1617:7: 1618:17;1622:12; 1624:23;1629:8; 1644:22;1647:4; 1648:9;1652:4; 1654:12,20;1673:6 readily (2) 1572:12;1607:16 reading (12) 1591:23;1594:10,15; 1597:10;1600:7; 1601:5:1603:15; 1606:20;1609:12; 1620:23;1649:2; 1654:8 ready (1) 1555:3 real (6) 1556:2;1582:17; 1598:15,20;1599:9; 1665:7 realistic (1) 1675:9 realistically (1) 1672:10 really (5) 1630:9;1650:17; 1659:16:1669:14; 1673:22 reason (18) 1555:1:1563:13; 1615:1:1621:12.22: 1622:2,24;1623:15; 1648:8;1649:9,11; 1655:4,6;1656:21; 1657:4,12;1659:18; 1662:6 reasonable (2) 1575:5:1604:5 reasonably (4) 1615:10:1616:23: 1633:21;1661:24 reasoning (1) 1572:15 reasons (4) 1559:4;1560:15; 1613:1,3 Rebar (1) 1627:3 recall (6) 1590:18;1606:7; 1631:23;1652:5; 1654:8;1655:12 receive (1) 1572:16 received (1) 1649:3 recent (2) 1633:3;1641:23 recently (3) 1631:1.11:1653:15 Recess (3) 1605:16;1674:21;

1675:10 Recession (4) 1591:17;1592:2,18; 1593:18 recitation (1) 1577:14 recognize (2) 1618:24:1619:2 recognizing (1) 1576:1 recommendation (1) 1586:5 record (18) 1577:23;1586:2,7; 1587:12,14,17,18,19, 21;1593:15;1594:24; 1617:8;1644:23; 1645:1,5;1646:3,20; 1666:1 recreation (5) 1559:7:1597:6; 1598:4:1658:12: 1659:13 reduce (1) 1559:9 reduced (1) 1591:21 reductions (2) 1559:8;1668:1 refer (3) 1590:17:1607:20; 1617:24 reference (2) 1585:20:1651:24 references (2) 1580:1,5 referred (11) 1557:17;1558:3; 1578:22;1590:5; 1593:10;1607:13,14; 1628:23:1629:15: 1641:17;1648:17 referring (22) 1560:8;1577:21; 1588:20;1589:16,20; 1591:4;1594:13; 1597:14,17;1600:11; 1606:21;1620:6; 1631:5;1632:21; 1645:13;1647:6,20,23; 1648:19;1652:24; 1656:14:1663:20 refers (6) 1560:4;1565:1; 1607:21,22;1621:8; 1648:9 reflect (4) 1566:21;1574:14; 1625:18;1633:21 reflected (2) 1579:18;1656:24 reflecting (1) 1656:5

regard (2) 1644:17:1665:22 regarding (6) 1587:12;1601:15; 1643:22;1647:4; 1654:21;1657:6 regards (1) 1674:6 region (3) 1603:3;1634:21; 1637:7 Regional (2) 1580:12;1617:18 regions (1) 1620:21 regular (1) 1672:2 relate (2) 1556:11;1557:18 related (3) 1562:12;1594:19; 1673:13 relative (4) 1575:7;1576:6; 1596:3;1637:3 relatively (4) 1568:13;1603:8; 1620:17:1653:20 relevance (1) 1643:19 relevant (9) 1558:21:1568:8: 1630:12,15,20; 1642:12:1651:16: 1662:4;1673:13 reliable (1) 1586:21 relied (5) 1556:24;1576:12; 1607:18:1610:9,11 relies (1) 1567:23 relocate (1) 1568:22 relocation (1) 1569:8 relying (2) 1608:9;1623:13 remain (2) 1652:11,13 remainder (1) 1573:19 remaining (1) 1563:24 remains (1) 1574:11 remember (10) 1620:24;1629:19,21; 1631:21,22,24; 1651:16:1656:13; 1658:8;1669:23 **REMI (3)** 1610:16:1629:5.13

remove (1)

1645:10 Renewable (10) 1579:22,24;1608:18; 1625:22;1628:24; 1633:23;1638:16; 1644:5,10;1667:2 renewed (1) 1560:10 replace (1) 1650:16 replacement (2) 1573:21;1600:15 replaces (3) 1650:21,22,23 replicated (1) 1638:10 report (172) 1556:22;1557:6; 1558:11;1559:1,10,18, 21;1560:3,6,22; 1561:13,23;1562:7,8, 15,17;1563:1,8,17; 1565:1,14;1566:4,8,14; 1567:11,12;1568:18; 1569:6;1570:8;1571:2, 9,9,12,15,18;1572:14; 1573:1,3,16;1574:3,12; 1575:2,12,20,24; 1576:9,10,12;1577:14, 17,18;1578:3,7,12,14, 16,22,24;1579:5,8,10, 13,16,18,22;1580:2; 1582:22.23:1583:6.14: 1585:5,11;1588:23,24; 1589:23;1591:4,14; 1593:10;1597:7.11; 1598:7:1599:18: 1600:12;1602:2,10; 1603:14:1605:6; 1606:3;1607:8,10,13, 17,19,21;1608:9; 1609:4,5,6,15;1610:7, 9,12;1611:19;1612:24; 1613:4,5;1618:23; 1620:4,15;1621:10; 1622:4,18;1623:14; 1625:7;1626:10; 1627:1;1628:5; 1629:17;1630:17,21, 24;1632:5;1635:22; 1640:3.23:1641:4.13. 15,22;1642:3,8; 1643:7;1644:21; 1645:6;1646:24; 1647:6,17;1649:12,14; 1650:1;1651:22,23; 1652:7,19,24;1654:7; 1655:9,12,12,14,18,20; 1656:2,4,8,16,24; 1658:5,6,9;1659:16; 1660:12,13;1663:13, 14,21;1665:12;1666:6,

24;1669:1,9;1670:20 reported (11) 1562:12,17;1563:15; 1564:8:1565:10.21: 1630:16:1651:16; 1655:23;1663:4,5 reporter (2) 1624:21,23 reporting (2) 1630:18:1656:9 reports (4) 1578:21;1600:17,20; 1601:22 represent (3) 1569:22:1573:18; 1575:10 represented (2) 1620:11;1660:6 represents (1) 1620:17 reputation (1) 1556:20 Requested (1) 1624:22 require (1) 1666:20 reread (1) 1624:21 research (7) 1555:16,17:1556:1, 21;1578:19;1653:16, 18 researchers (1) 1631:16 researching (1) 1607:9 reserve (1) 1577:4 reserves (1) 1574:23 reside (1) 1669:7 resident (2) 1564:4;1650:3 residential (1) 1556:13 residents (1) 1570:15 residing (1) 1564:10 resolve (1) 1670:17 resources (2) 1566:9;1668:8 respect (2) 1571:20;1618:10 respectively (1) 1636:22 re-spent (1) 1661:12 response (1) 1646:17 responsibility (1)

1578:12 responsible (2) 1618:14:1619:6 rest (1) 1673:19 restate (1) 1645:22 result (10) 1558:5;1561:24; 1570:4,10:1583:7; 1586:22;1592:4; 1609:7:1653:21; 1673:7 results (12) 1561:3;1575:22; 1621:20;1622:19,21; 1623:21;1624:4; 1630:11;1632:17; 1637:12;1639:1; 1661:2 resume (2) 1604:12;1605:6 retail (5) 1556:12:1572:6.9. 10.12 retailing (1) 1569:15 retrospective (1) 1654:7 returns (1) 1569:5 reveal (3) 1561:11:1571:1; 1574:3 revealed (1) 1621:11 revenue (10) 1567:24;1570:5; 1574:6,7,8,9,11,11; 1619:17:1620:5 revenues (3) 1574:16,19:1600:1 review (21) 1554:10;1571:8; 1573:12;1575:23; 1578:3,22;1579:2,12, 15;1580:20,23; 1584:22;1585:2,3; 1598:8;1604:22; 1616:11,14,16;1617:7; 1626:9 reviewed (10) 1571:10:1578:20; 1579:17,20,23;1580:4; 1581:9;1584:24; 1616:9;1625:10 reviewing (3) 1607:9,10;1642:8 reviews (2) 1556:6;1578:20 Rich (1) 1554:16 Ridge (27)

1554:11,12;1556:23; 1566:7;1567:3,9; 1577:23;1578:1; 1589:4.11:1590:3.10. 11;1592:1,20;1593:8, 15,18;1594:2;1602:18. 23;1622:7;1651:20; 1656:6;1657:4;1663:7, 14 right (113) 1576:24;1577:3,8, 21;1579:14;1580:16; 1581:8;1582:19,22; 1583:17,19;1584:19; 1587:14;1588:7; 1589:5;1590:1,16; 1594:22;1595:16; 1597:13;1598:1; 1599:23;1600:9; 1601:2;1605:10,13,23, 24;1608:3,3;1609:3, 17:1611:15.18:1612:1. 4,5;1613:16,17; 1614:11,13,14,18; 1615:4,5;1617:10; 1618:16;1619:7,10,12, 13,15,19;1620:1,13; 1621:5;1622:14,20; 1623:1,19;1624:6; 1625:13:1626:12; 1628:9:1630:14.23; 1631:5:1632:20: 1633:9.10.11:1634:15. 16;1636:2,4;1639:23; 1640:1,4,5,16,16; 1644:5;1645:21; 1647:16,18;1648:1; 1649:5,12;1651:1,2,8; 1652:4,6;1658:2; 1660:7:1661:22; 1662:15,23;1664:6; 1666:11;1668:13,15; 1669:17;1670:9,11; 1671:11,14,15,21; 1672:17;1673:6; 1674:16;1675:10 ring (1) 1593:13 ripple (4) 1569:12;1571:1; 1572:4;1661:14 ripples (1) 1557:24 risky (1) 1647:15 road (3) 1564:17;1601:15; 1659:10 roads (3) 1563:2:1581:18; 1626:15 roadway (2) 1600:15:1601:3

robust (1) 1663:12 Rocky (1) 1632:22 role (2) 1622:17;1658:4 roll (2) 1554:3,13 rose (1) 1591:20 rounds (1) 1572:2 rules (1) 1656:19 run (4) 1576:13;1584:10; 1586:10;1622:6 running (2) 1554:5,6 rural (4) 1571:21:1572:3; 1615:13.19 rush (1) 1644:11 S safety (8) 1559:7;1581:22,23; 1597:6;1598:4;1602:4; 1658:12:1659:13 salability (2) 1646:2.4 salaries (2) 1570:23;1572:1 salary (1) 1653:17 sales (1) 1570:22 same (10) 1601:18:1603:18; 1630:16.18:1632:23: 1635:21;1644:7; 1647:7;1664:19; 1667:22 sample (1) 1636:17 San (1) 1555:22 satisfied (1) 1641:2 saved (3) 1659:2;1662:20; 1663:1 savings (2) 1569:5;1658:24 saying (18) 1583:5,8,8;1592:1,3; 1611:1;1620:24; 1623:17;1627:17; 1629:20;1637:10,13; 1638:3;1642:7;1643:8; 1650:2.8:1651:16

January 26, 2015

scale (1) 1569:4 scenario (1) 1624:17 schedule (2) 1670:18:1671:17 school (12) 1577:5,6:1656:16, 23;1657:6,9,14,17; 1669:19,24;1670:4; 1672:15 Schools (3) 1582:3;1656:15,20 SCHOPP (5) 1554:2,16,18; 1576:18;1671:14 science (5) 1556:14;1580:12; 1639:2;1664:20,21 scope (5) 1657:19;1658:3; 1666:6,24,24 seats (1) 1605:18 second (14) 1590:4;1609:6; 1616:19;1622:5; 1625:2;1630:24; 1633:16;1634:12,14; 1649:12;1666:5; 1671:8;1675:13,14 seconds (1) 1675:15 section (2) 1645:14;1658:19 sector (6) 1555:22,23;1567:18; 1580:12:1592:4: 1593:2 sectors (8) 1557:20:1564:11: 1568:10;1620:20; 1626:4,5;1631:13; 1633:19 Security (1) 1564:2 seeing (2) 1653:11;1660:19 seek (1) 1635:4 seeking (1) 1569:3 selected (1) 1573:5 self-contained (1) 1618:8 sensitive (1) 1561:4 sensitivity (1) 1634:4 sent (1) 1581:7 sentence (2)

1609:6;1617:8 separate (1) 1622:6 separately (2) 1562:5;1575:3 September (1) 1593:19 series (1) 1579:19 serve (1) 1565:22 serves (1) 1566:19 service (1) 1581:23 serviced (1) 1600:13 services (24) 1557:16,22;1559:16, 16;1564:14;1572:9,18; 1573:18:1581:21; 1582:1:1600:3.5.6.19: 1602:5,10,13,15; 1603:5;1618:14,20; 1619:8;1633:22; 1649:19 servicing (1) 1627:2 serving (1) 1605:7 several (3) 1578:15:1660:21: 1673:8 sewer (1) 1582:1 Shady (17) 1565:1,14,18; 1566:1.4:1569:11: 1571:9;1578:22; 1607:6;1608:16,20; 1630:21;1662:18; 1663:4,9,10,11 shall (1) 1585:16 share (4) 1571:20;1575:4; 1621:19;1624:3 sheriff (6) 1600:4;1601:24; 1602:3,13,14;1603:2 shifted (2) 1566:9;1567:15 shifting (1) 1564:11 short (4) 1563:20;1568:24; 1671:4;1674:7 shortcomings (1) 1629:18 shorten (1) 1642:23 short-run (1) 1576:2

short-term (4) 1564:7;1569:17; 1593:3,5 show (3) 1589:15;1622:6; 1646:20 showed (1) 1591:3 showing (5) 1558:17:1641:3.14. 22;1643:5 shown (1) 1661:3 shows (4) 1589:22,23;1620:9; 1637:13 sides (1) 1601:10 significant (17) 1557:4;1564:15; 1569:8,23;1575:6,15; 1592:13:1603:14: 1604:8;1637:5,5,15; 1652:23;1653:4,18; 1662:6;1673:9 significantly (3) 1588:15;1592:15; 1660:20 signs (1) 1637:24 similar (5) 1567:10:1586:9: 1630:13;1631:2; 1639:1 Similarly (1) 1568:21 simple (1) 1583:11 simply (3) 1567:15:1597:21; 1616:20 single (5) 1556:19,20;1568:23; 1615:11;1617:1 single-handedly (2) 1660:14,24 site (5) 1564:21,21;1570:2; 1572:6;1602:8 sited (1) 1558:24 Siting (1) 1600:23 six (2) 1563:19;1568:23 size (7) 1569:14;1575:7,13; 1596:3;1623:22; 1637:4.8 skewed (1) 1624:4 skip (1) 1640:20

**SLAGEL (8)** 1668:16.16.18: 1669:11,13,16,18; 1670:6 sleep (1) 1601:4 slippery (1) 1672:19 small (12) 1573:24;1603:8; 1604:4;1615:11; 1617:1,14:1618:5; 1620:17;1621:18; 1637:18;1638:7,11 smaller (6) 1566:11;1571:23; 1572:3,5;1615:13,19 smart (1) 1660:18 social (5) 1576:14:1581:20; 1603:10,17;1664:20 soft (1) 1581:19 software (4) 1625:21;1629:4,5,12 solar (3) 1604:17;1616:8; 1641:18 sold (1) 1557:16 sole (1) 1627:17 solidification (2) 1585:23:1586:3 somebody (1) 1579:3 sometimes (2) 1557:17;1558:3 somewhat (1) 1642:21 somewhere (2) 1592:7;1639:19 soon (1) 1640:18 sorry (11) 1582:10;1585:9; 1587:17;1591:2; 1611:21;1629:10; 1646:16;1659:2; 1668:10,21:1671:7 sort (3) 1578:24;1653:9; 1664:19 sounded (1) 1577:13 sounds (4) 1594:17;1595:7; 1614:8,11 source (3) 1561:9;1607:16; 1618:19 sourced (2)

1561:1:1564:9 sources (1) 1607:14 South (2) 1567:4,9 space (4) 1556:13;1572:10; 1620:18:1627:23 sparsely (1) 1568:13 speak (2) 1672:23:1673:24 speaking (2) 1675:5.6 speaks (1) 1648:14 special (1) 1649:3 specialized (1) 1564:22 specializes (1) 1605:7 specific (15) 1604:23;1621:23; 1622:13,15;1626:7,8; 1635:16,21;1655:14, 15,18,19,21,21;1663:2 specifically (4) 1589:20;1603:19; 1626:2;1633:19 specifics (1) 1585:19 specified (1) 1560:17 specify (2) 1570:8;1574:13 specifying (1) 1625:8 speculate (1) 1646:6 spend (2) 1563:22;1654:12 spending (3) 1558:5;1570:12; 1572:2 spent (11) 1565:22;1572:6,7, 11;1627:1;1661:12,13; 1662:19,20,24;1666:21 spillover (1) 1558:2 spoke (4) 1588:3:1590:8.9; 1670:12 spoken (1) 1648:1 sponsor (1) 1560:21 sponsored (1) 1565:15 stabilized (2) 1567:14:1591:7 staff (2)

January 26, 2015

1618:18:1668:14 stand (1) 1555:9 standard (15) 1557:10;1558:9; 1578:19,23;1602:9; 1606:22;1608:23; 1610:2,16;1611:4; 1612:8;1629:3;1644:6, 10:1667:2 started (2) 1591:17:1607:5 Starting (5) 1589:17:1609:5; 1628:20;1631:7; 1634:7 starts (1) 1625:16 state (11) 1558:22;1568:9; 1598:18:1615:4; 1625:20,24;1631:15; 1635:3,7;1645:9; 1658:24 stated (2) 1613:11;1654:22 statement (16) 1592:17:1595:6; 1596:4,10,12;1600:9; 1606:24;1615:22; 1616:4;1617:2,9; 1642:7:1647:16.17: 1658:9:1673:1 statements (5) 1641:21:1643:22; 1644:1:1645:13: 1657:5 states (5) 1557:7;1563:1; 1572:15;1573:3; 1645:6 statewide (1) 1655:15 Statistics (1) 1631:15 status (1) 1601:13 stay (3) 1594:3;1623:5; 1652:17 stays (1) 1650:24 Steel (1) 1627:5 Stephen (1) 1593:20 stick (1) 1626:21 still (5) 1638:11:1639:20; 1646:23;1647:7; 1657:24 stimulus (1)

**Min-U-Script**®

1661:7 stipulate (4) 1599:21:1602:11; 1603:1:1625:1 stolen (1) 1602:6 stone (1) 1626:18 stop (1)1667:24 stopped (1) 1605:10 stops (1) 1650:3 store (5) 1595:8,22;1596:1; 1662:7,9 stores (4) 1569:16,16,17; 1572:22 strategy (1) 1568:18 Streator (3) 1567:3,9;1663:14 strike (2) 1639:8,9 structure (6) 1567:17:1575:18; 1588:13;1592:15; 1593:4:1637:16 struggle (1) 1616:18 studied (6) 1584:12:1597:15: 1599:15,21:1655:7; 1657:16 studies (14) 1556:5.6.10: 1567:19;1578:21; 1625:6,9;1630:2,6,8,9; 1638:10,23;1664:23 study (30) 1557:8;1561:7; 1568:1;1570:7;1620:6; 1621:24;1630:13; 1631:23;1632:3,20; 1633:10;1634:8,17; 1635:16;1636:7; 1637:10,13,22,23; 1638:1,9,13;1639:2; 1651:15,23;1653:15; 1662:17,18,22;1664:1 studying (1) 1653:8 SU-7-14 (1) 1554:11 subject (1) 1649:24 submitted (3) 1578:4,7:1673:10 subsequent (1) 1591:10 subsidies (2)

1641:17;1666:19 subsidize (1) 1594:18 substantially (2) 1577:14:1629:17 success (1) 1593:24 succinct (3) 1617:21;1673:14,15 sufficient (2) 1564:7;1638:2 suggest (4) 1563:20;1588:14; 1623:24;1663:11 suggesting (4) 1617:23;1624:1,2; 1647:10 suggests (6) 1556:18;1566:5; 1567:14;1573:16; 1576:1:1642:7 sum (1) 1562:14 summarizes (1) 1608:20 summary (2) 1572:4;1658:16 supplement (1) 1564:23 supplied (3) 1560:20;1561:6; 1626:20 supplier (1) 1626:17 suppliers (2) 1563:11;1628:6 supply (10) 1562:13,15;1568:22; 1569:8;1570:5;1574:6; 1579:21:1611:15; 1633:22;1647:13 support (1) 1566:2 supposed (4) 1624:5;1639:15,17; 1671:3 Supreme (1) 1653:9 sure (13) 1593:11;1612:4; 1620:24;1622:1; 1627:12:1628:10: 1633:12;1635:20; 1645:19;1646:10; 1666:12;1671:16; 1674:11 surface (1) 1563:3 surrounding (3) 1560:5:1644:22; 1645:7 suspect (4) 1638:5,8,12;1652:7

suspicion (1) 1652:15 sustain (1) 1644:2 sustained (1) 1576:3 sworn (1) 1555:11 system (1) 1618:8 Т Table (5) 1567:11;1591:3; 1608:20;1609:15; 1611:9 tailoring (1) 1633:19 talk (5) 1585:14;1652:22; 1655:22;1663:15; 1665:18 talked (3) 1656:12;1658:8; 1665:14 talking (15) 1580:1:1584:19; 1585:11;1588:18; 1589:3,10;1590:2,9; 1602:1:1644:8: 1649:20:1651:14; 1662:8:1671:5.8 talks (1) 1644:21 task (3) 1673:24;1674:1,2 tax (9) 1560:8;1574:11,19; 1575:2:1582:20: 1620:4,8;1666:19; 1667:3 taxes (7) 1574:7,19,20; 1599:9;1619:24; 1620:10;1656:20 taxpayer (1) 1666:22 taxpayers (1) 1666:20 teach (3) 1668:19.22.22 teaches (1) 1668:24 technician (1) 1650:5 technology (1) 1556:15 Tegen (1) 1634:3 **T-E-G-E-N**(1) 1634:4 telling (3)

1589:12:1614:20; 1615:1 tempted (1) 1624:17 ten (5) 1594:7;1595:3,9,24; 1605:11 tend (2) 1641:19;1647:13 term (1) 1667:16 terms (10) 1557:12;1561:22; 1586:11;1587:20; 1606:11;1620:8,18; 1630:10;1637:15; 1665:16 test (3) 1630:14;1634:18,23 tested (4) 1630:13;1631:1,7,10 testified (5) 1587:6;1626:19; 1646:1,17;1657:19 testify (5) 1579:16;1605:20; 1654:20;1659:19; 1673:4 testifying (2) 1625:17;1644:16 testimony (34) 1561:14:1563:9: 1569:6;1571:3,16,19; 1574:4:1575:20: 1576:15,19;1580:20, 23,24;1581:6;1584:19, 22;1588:4,21;1589:8; 1590:14.19:1607:14: 1613:4;1625:11; 1626:9;1629:8;1631:6, 21:1647:4:1656:13: 1666:7;1667:1;1675:2, 3 Texas (1) 1565:13 thanks (1) 1662:15 therefore (9) 1562:22;1564:5,12; 1566:24;1571:3; 1574:16:1582:12; 1620:21;1625:3 third (3) 1575:10;1652:6; 1654:18 though (2) 1565:3;1601:10 thought (4) 1612:19;1638:12; 1672:8;1675:6 thousands (1) 1644:18 three (3)

#### January 26, 2015

1604:12:1671:18; 1673:7 threshold (2) 1647:15:1653:6 throw (1) 1660:7 Thursday (7) 1670:19,22;1671:11, 22;1672:22;1674:4.11 thus (3) 1572:4;1608:24; 1610:3 times (7) 1599:1,3,4;1602:14; 1623:10:1629:16; 1644:14 title (1) 1579:5 today (3) 1636:6;1637:21; 1651:12 together (2) 1584:10;1666:12 told (5) 1578:15;1598:20; 1603:24;1649:8; 1652:12 tonight (1) 1554:24 tons (1) 1659:9 took (2)1626:3:1671:4 top (11) 1577:24;1605:3; 1606:5,9;1608:14; 1640:23:1643:16; 1649:7;1664:22; 1665:3:1670:2 topic (1) 1600:21 total (12) 1557:9;1570:14,19; 1571:23;1575:5,9; 1596:2;1603:9; 1612:17,20;1636:20; 1646:4 toward (1) 1616:19 towards (1) 1587:10 towers (1) 1565:8 town (1) 1639:22 Township (1) 1672:15 townships (1) 1601:15 track (2) 1578:21;1663:19 tracked (1) 1630:19

		Γ	Γ	Γ	January 26, 2015
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	traffic (1)	type (8)	1672.23	1630.5.1646.11.	1572.1.1652.10
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$					
$\begin{array}{l c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			-	value (13)	way (11)
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	tried (5)		upwards (1)	1557:15;1598:16,17,	1554:4;1561:14;
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	1585:12;1609:20;	U	1573:17		
					1610:20;1618:2,8;
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			1555:16;1615:13,18,	_	1630:17,18;1650:19;
trouble (1)uncertain (1)1618:91582:17i574:21;1667:201648:101647:16use (26)valving (1)valving (1)1555:22;1600:13,141644:21;1645:71555:16;1556:2.19;valving (1)veshite (3)1655:22;1600:13,141644:21;1645:71559:1;1566:16;variety (3)veshite (3)1633:39:1635:23;1560:5;164:5101601:15;1606:16;1604:3;1613:21;1618:23;1619:1,41673:2umder (3)1621:13;23:1622:3;various (1)1646:17truth (2)1557:4;1633:20;1624:15;1622:3;1607:22week (1)1614:20;1615:21634:131628:15;22:1629:2;various (1)1616:16try (5)umderstands (1)1649:3;1650:15;Vaupel (1)1607:1;1629:191639:6;1670:18;umderstands (1)1656:15;1609:2;1593:22werent (3)1637:16;1670:13;1556:4;15170;3;1593:221565:22;1600:13;141565:23;1603:12;1592:4;1613:6;umemployment (4)1611:3;1616:15;1565:23;1600:13;141565:23;1600:13;141552:15563:5;1661:10;10;111629:6;1634:2;versus (5)1593:7;1607:12;1565:7;1568:5;unist (1)useful (2)1632:3;1663:14;1559:8;1577;1622:18;1641:5;1555:7;1568:5;1661:10;10;111638:23;1667:171559:8;1577;1602:151555:7;1568:5;1661:10;10;14useful (2)1559:8;1577;1602:151555:7;1568:5;1661:10;10;141638:23;1667:111548:4;1577;7;1555:7;1568:5;1661:10;10;141					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
true (3)uncertainty (2)1568:2:1576:13; 1601:15:1606:16; 1638:231608:2:1576:13; 1638:231618:23:1619:21; week (1)1673:2under (3)1621:13:23:1622:3; 1624:15:12:1622:15; 1634:131621:13:23:1622:3; 1624:15:12:1622:15; 1637:221646:17truth (2)1657:4:1633:20; 1634:131628:15:2:1629:2; 1638:23:1605:15; 1639:6:1670:18; 1669:17:16652:7,101641:7; 1653:16:1661:5; 1558:22:1609:2; 1653:13:141646:17trying (9)understands (1)1649:3:1650:15; 1664:17:16652:7,101593:22 1563:13:14ween't (3) 1593:221674:11575:4unemployed (3) 155:18:1570:3; 1564:45:159:1221574:21:1608:21; 1574:21:1608:21; vehicles (3)1596:20;1612:13; 1596:20;1612:13; 1565:23:160:13,141642:18:1659:241991:19.20 1622:2:8:1670:3; 1621:163:16:16:10; 1629:6:163:12; 1622:2:8:1603:12; 1556:16Westwood (1) 1582:3:1587:22; 1566:13;1570:12; 1577:141582:3:1587:22; 1582:3:1587:22; 1579:21;1595:24; 1656:101642:18:169:241991:19.20 1622:2:8:1613:1; 1566:16:10;10;141633:14:1667:17 1623:14:1667:17 1558:16:163:8;9 1658:159:163:8;9 1651:19:1674:221560:15:1563:3; 1661:10;10;14 1611:15;1646:21; 10608:24;1610:3; 16608:24;1610:3; 16608:12;1557:1564:20; 1598:4;1597:7; 1622:15;1563:3; 1655:10; 1624:15;1594:1; 1624:15;1594:1; 1624:15;1594:1; 1624:15;1594:1; 1624:15;1594:1; 1624:1625:15;1663:1]1614:15 1624:12;1577:18;24; 1624:12;1577:18;24; 1624:12;1577:18;24;164:66 1561:3;1594:1; 1644:2;1610:5;1594:1; 1644:2;1610:5;1594:1; 1644:2;1610:5;1594:1; 1644:2;1610:5;1594:1; 16					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					· · ·
truth (2) $1567.4; 1633.20;$ $1624:16; 1625:15, 15;$ $1677.22$ well-ecaphized (1) $1614:20; 1615:2$ $1034:13$ $1028:15, 22; 1629:2;$ $vary (2)$ $vary (2)$ $vary (2)$ $1588:24; 1605:14;$ $1071:23$ $1653:15; 1650:15;$ $1633:15; 1651:15;$ $1633:15; 1651:15;$ $1633:15; 1651:15;$ $1639:5; 1670:18;$ undisclosed (1) $1664:17; 1655:27, 10$ $1693:12; 1605:21;$ $1697:22$ well-recophized (2) $1674:1:$ $1575:4$ used (19) $V-A-U-P-E-L(1)$ $1596:20; 1612:13;$ $1565:15; 1597:23;$ $1595:22$ $1663:12;$ $1583:10, 12; 1590:15;$ $1564:3; 1579:18;$ $1621:6, 99, 15; 16;$ $verbatim (1)$ $1564:3; 1579:18;$ $1621:6, 99, 15; 16;$ $1565:23; 1600:13, 14$ Westwood (1) $1592:14; 1613:5;$ $1591:19, 20$ $1622:6; 1634:2;$ $versus (5)$ $1582:3; 1587:22;$ $1562:15; 1563:3;$ $1661:10, 10, 14$ $1632:4; 1667:17$ $1558: 10570:9;$ $1522:18; 1641:5;$ $1565:7; 1568:5;$ units (1) $1608:24; 1610:3$ $vew (3)$ What's (8) $1611:15; 1646:21;$ $1556:10$ $1508:7; 1564:20;$ $1599:8; 1597:7;$ $1602:15$ $1562:12; 20, 22;$ $1557:16$ $1558:7; 1564:20;$ $1598:4$ whole (7) $1602:9; 1646:14;$ $1649:24; 1640:6;$ $159:23; 1665:13;$ $1642:24; 1613:5;$ $1562:22:20, 22;$ $1557:12$ $1568:21; 191:9;$ $1612:24; 1613:5;$ $1562:21:20:2;$ $1557:4; 1568:21;$ $1612:24; 1613:5;$ $1642:15; 112; 1577:12, 1655:15;$ $1602:9; 1666:12;$ $1649:$					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					1607.1.1629.19
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
turbine (10)unique (3) $1629:6;1634:2;$ versus (5) $1593:7;1607:12;$ $1552:15;1563:3;$ $1661:10,10,14$ $1635:14;1667:17$ $1558:10;1570:9;$ $1622:18;1641:5;$ $1556:5;1568:5;$ units (1) $useful (2)$ $1623:5;1663:8,9$ $1622:18;1641:5;$ $1579:21;1595:24;$ $1656:10$ $1608:24;1610:3$ $view (3)$ White (1) $1611:15;1646:21;$ universities (1) $uses (6)$ $1559:8;1597:7;$ $1602:15$ $1650:5;1669:2$ $1555:16$ $1558:7;1564:20;$ $1598:4$ whole (7) $turbines (12)$ University (1) $1610:19;1613:21;$ vilage (1) $1558:22;1591:9;$ $1552:12,20,22;$ $1617:19$ $1558:32;1665:11;$ $1612:24;1613:5;$ $1594:7;1595:3,9,24;$ unknowns (2) $using (7)$ $virtually (1)$ $1649:23;1655:15;$ $1602:9;1626:14;$ $1645:24;1646:6$ $1551:3;1594:1;$ $1658:23$ $1675:6$ $1627:19;1646:14;$ $melss (1)$ $1626:7;1628:9;1630:4;$ $vitality (1)$ Wholesale (1) $1649:4$ $1648:17$ $1626:7;1628:9;1630:4;$ $vitality (1)$ $Wholesale (1)$ $1606:3;1608:12;$ $1557:4;1568:21;$ $1612:9;10,12$ $1554:14;15;1674:18;$ $163:20$ $1609:14$ $1569:16$ $utilities (2)$ $1675:1,1,12$ $widel (1)$ $1638:9$ $1624:1$ $utility-scale (1)$ $1646:8;1660:3$ $willing (1)$ $1570:20;1576:19;$ $1561:12;1577:18,24;$ $1563:6;1568:11;$ $VP (1)$ $1554:12;1556:23;$ $1570:20;1576:19;$ $1561:12;1577:18,24;$ $1563$	1642:18;1659:24	1591:19,20	1622:2,8;1628:7,17;	1577:14	1582:3;1587:22;
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	turbine (10)	unique (3)	1629:6;1634:2;	versus (5)	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		1661:10,10,14			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
turbines (12)University (1) $1610:19;1613:21;$ village (1) $1558:22;1591:9;$ $1562:12,20,22;$ $1617:19$ $1658:23;1665:11$ $1614:15$ $1612:24;1613:5;$ $1594:7;1595:3,9,24;$ unknowns (2)using (7)virtually (1) $1649:23;1655:15;$ $1602:9;1626:14;$ $1645:24;1646:6$ $1561:3;1594:1;$ $1658:23$ $1675:6$ $1627:19;1646:14;$ $1648:17$ $1634:20;1635:17$ $1559:10$ $1651:7$ $1649:4$ $1648:17$ $1634:20;1635:17$ $1559:10$ $1651:7$ $1060:3;1608:12;$ $1557:4;1568:21;$ $1612:9,10,12$ $1554:14,15;1674:18;$ $1613:20$ $1609:14$ $1569:16$ utilities (2) $1675:11,12$ widely (1) $1638:9$ $1624:1$ utility-scale (1) $1646:8;1660:3$ willing (1) $1570:20;1576:19;$ $1561:12;1577:18,24;$ $1641:6$ $1668:2$ Wind (134) $1579:4;1589:20;$ $1582:9;1585:13;$ $1563:6;1568:11;$ $VP$ (1) $1554:12;1556:23;$ $1570:20;1576:19;$ $1561:12;1577:18,24;$ $1563:6;1568:11;$ $VP$ (1) $1554:12;1556:23;$ $1579:4;1589:20;$ $1532:9;1585:13;$ $1563:6;1568:11;$ $VP$ (1) $1554:12;1556:23;$ $1562:2,1;1642:24;$ $1660:9;1661:19;$ $V$ $W$ $1563:7,18;1564:15,19;$ $1624:24;1629:4,11,14;$ $1660:9;1667:13,15;$ $V$ $W$ $1553:7,18;1564:15,19;$ $164:160:19;1640:14;$ $1666:20;1667:13,15;$ $V$ $W$ $1556:2,11;1566:16;$					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			-		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		-	· · · ·		
turn (3)unlikely (3)usually (3)Vitzthum (5)wide (1) $1606:3;1608:12;$ $1557:4;1568:21;$ $1612:9,10,12$ $1554:14,15;1674:18;$ $1613:20$ $1609:14$ $1569:16$ utilities (2) $1675:11,12$ widely (1)turned (1)untoward (1) $1581:18;1651:10$ VOICE (2) $1557:12$ $1638:9$ $1624:1$ utility-scale (1) $1646:8;1660:3$ willing (1)two (15)up (17) $1641:6$ volume (1) $1585:13$ $1570:20;1576:19;$ $1561:12;1577:18,24;$ utilized (4) $1668:2$ Wind (134) $1579:4;1589:20;$ $1582:9;1585:13;$ $1563:6;1568:11;$ VP (1) $1554:12;1556:23;$ $1590:5;1591:11;$ $1592:6;1600:18;$ $1571:2;1608:20$ $1593:20$ $1558:7,12;1559:12,14,$ $1616:1;1622:6;$ $1639:1;1642:23;$ VW $1563:7,18;1564:15,19;$ $1639:21;1640:14;$ $1666:20;1667:13,15;$ VW $1565:2,11;1566:16;$				• • •	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					
1609:141569:16utilities (2)1675:11,12widely (1)turned (1)untoward (1)1581:18;1651:10VOICE (2)1557:121638:91624:1utility-scale (1)1646:8;1660:3willing (1)two (15)up (17)1641:6volume (1)1585:131570:20;1576:19;1561:12;1577:18,24;utilized (4)1668:2Wind (134)1590:5;1591:11;1592:6;1600:18;1571:2;1608:201593:201558:7,12;1559:12,14,1616:1;1622:6;1639:1;1642:23;VW1563:7,18;1564:15,19;1639:21;1640:14;1666:20;1667:13,15;VW1565:2,11;1566:16;					
turned (1)untoward (1)1581:18;1651:10VOICE (2)1557:121638:91624:1utility-scale (1)1646:8;1660:3willing (1)two (15)up (17)1641:6volume (1)1585:131570:20;1576:19;1561:12;1577:18,24;utilized (4)1668:2Wind (134)1579:4;1589:20;1582:9;1585:13;1563:6;1568:11;VP (1)1554:12;1556:23;1590:5;1591:11;1592:6;1600:18;1571:2;1608:201593:201558:7,12;1559:12,14,1616:1;1622:6;1639:1;1642:23;VW1563:7,18;1564:15,19;1624:24;1629:4,11,14;1666:9;1661:19;VW1563:7,18;1564:15,19;1639:21;1640:14;1666:20;1667:13,15;VW1565:2,11;1566:16;					
1638:91624:1utility-scale (1)1646:8;1660:3willing (1)two (15)up (17)1641:6volume (1)1585:131570:20;1576:19;1561:12;1577:18,24;1668:2Wind (134)1579:4;1589:20;1582:9;1585:13;1563:6;1568:11;VP (1)1554:12;1556:23;1590:5;1591:11;1592:6;1600:18;1571:2;1608:201593:201558:7,12;1559:12,14,1616:1;1622:6;1639:1;1642:23;VW1563:7,18;1564:15,19;1624:24;1629:4,11,14;1666:9;1661:19;VW1563:7,18;1564:15,19;1639:21;1640:14;1666:20;1667:13,15;VW1565:2,11;1566:16;					
two (15)up (17)1641:6volume (1)1585:131570:20;1576:19;1561:12;1577:18,24;utilized (4)1668:2Wind (134)1579:4;1589:20;1582:9;1585:13;1563:6;1568:11;VP (1)1554:12;1556:23;1590:5;1591:11;1592:6;1600:18;1571:2;1608:201593:201558:7,12;1559:12,14,1616:1;1622:6;1639:1;1642:23;1660:9;1661:19;VW1563:7,18;1564:15,19;1639:21;1640:14;1666:20;1667:13,15;VW1565:2,11;1566:16;			-		
1570:20;1576:19;1561:12;1577:18,24;utilized (4)1668:2Wind (134)1579:4;1589:20;1582:9;1585:13;1563:6;1568:11;VP (1)1554:12;1556:23;1590:5;1591:11;1592:6;1600:18;1571:2;1608:201593:201558:7,12;1559:12,14,1616:1;1622:6;1639:1;1642:23;1660:9;1661:19;VW1639:21;1640:14;1666:20;1667:13,15;VW1563:7,18;1564:15,19;				·	
1579:4;1589:20;1582:9;1585:13;1563:6;1568:11;VP (1)1554:12;1556:23;1590:5;1591:11;1592:6;1600:18;1571:2;1608:201593:201558:7,12;1559:12,14,1616:1;1622:6;1639:1;1642:23;1660:9;1661:19;1660:9;1661:19;1563:7,18;1564:15,19;1639:21;1640:14;1666:20;1667:13,15;VW1565:2,11;1566:16;					
1590:5;1591:11;1592:6;1600:18;1571:2;1608:201593:201558:7,12;1559:12,14,1616:1;1622:6;1639:1;1642:23;1639:1;1642:23;19;1560:4,5;1562:12;1624:24;1629:4,11,14;1660:9;1661:19;VW1563:7,18;1564:15,19;1639:21;1640:14;1666:20;1667:13,15;1565:2,11;1566:16;1555:2,11;1566:16;					
1616:1;1622:6;1639:1;1642:23;19;1560:4,5;1562:12;1624:24;1629:4,11,14;1660:9;1661:19;VW1639:21;1640:14;1666:20;1667:13,15;1565:2,11;1566:16;					
1624:24;1629:4,11,14;1660:9;1661:19;VW1563:7,18;1564:15,19;1639:21;1640:14;1666:20;1667:13,15;1565:2,11;1566:16;			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
			V	W	
1660:81669:19;1670:1;valid (3)wage (2)1567:4,6,9,20;1568:2,					
	1660:8	1669:19;1670:1;	valid (3)	wage (2)	1567:4,6,9,20;1568:2,

January 26, 2015

	1		1	Junuary 20, 2010
5,12,15,20,22;1569:10;	1666:6	1554:18	19,000 (1)	1637:4;1661:20
1570:1,14;1573:15;	wondering (1)	Zoning (5)	1655:3	22,350,000,000 (1)
1575:17,21;1579:21;	1607:11	1554:9,10;1576:19;	<b>10</b> 55.5 <b>1970 (3)</b>	1659:2
1583:1;1588:11,15,23;	Woodford (2)	1585:21;1671:24	1555:18;1613:19;	23 (5)
1589:1;1590:6;	1567:6;1590:7	1	1614:1	1570:10;1584:3;
1592:20;1593:18,20;	word (4)	1	1991 (1)	1628:20;1663:10;
1594:7;1595:3,9;	1594:20;1614:24;		1555:15	1670:4
1597:9;1599:5;1600:2,	1654:10;1673:15	1 (16)	19th (1)	24 (1)
22;1602:8,16;1603:2;	words (6)	1575:9,11;1582:24;	1628:19	1625:16
1604:15,20,23,24;	1557:23;1562:1;	1583:10;1597:3;		243 (1)
1605:7;1606:14;	1609:8;1629:23;	1599:15,22,23;1603:7,	2	1573:14
1607:6;1608:16,19,24;	1664:14;1673:14	9;1608:20;1637:5,18;		25 (1)
1610:3,20;1611:3;	work (10)	1653:5,11;1658:9	2 (7)	1660:16
1613:15;1614:3;	1554:7;1556:1;	1,003,527 (1)	1560:3;1605:3;	26 (1)
1622:7;1624:11,13;	1559:9;1564:16;	1659:10	1606:3;1609:15;	1554:8
1625:2,4;1626:13;	1606:16,16;1618:18;	1,040 (2)	1611:9;1645:3;1659:3	28 (1)
1627:13,15,18;	1650:20;1667:20;	1564:4;1591:21	2,092,000,000 (1)	1648:21
1630:10;1632:10,13,	1668:23	1,087 (1)	1658:24	283 (1)
16;1634:2,5,6,19,22,	worked (9)	1645:8	20 (4)	1628:20
24;1635:5,9;1636:14,	1564:18;1578:6,9,	1.21 (1)	1639:13,14,20;	
16,22;1637:14;1638:4,	16;1618:13;1619:5;	1663:8	1664:4	3
13,15,19;1641:6,9,16,	1624:11,15;1625:2	10 (6)	20.1 (1)	
18;1644:22;1645:7,11;	worker (1)	1572:14;1579:22;	1570:17	3 (5)
1646:14,21;1647:2,3,8;	1570:11	1611:18,22;1632:6;	200 (1)	1567:11;1591:3;
1649:3,16;1650:5,9;	workers (13)	1664:3	1567:5	1606:9;1609:4;
1651:11,20;1654:2;	1562:3;1563:19,22;	100 (5)	2000 (6)	1620:16
1655:1;1656:6;	1564:4,10,18;1565:19,	1565:11;1593:20;	1590:12;1632:13,21;	30 (3)
1658:16,22;1660:22,	20;1566:18;1572:16;	1649:3;1652:10,13	1635:2,20;1636:23	1660:15;1664:4,5
24;1661:10,15,20;	1609:9;1649:18;	1049.5,1052.10,15 10th (3)	<b>2001 (1)</b>	300 (2)
1664:3,7,14,16,24;	1669:7	1672:14,16;1674:10	1589:19	1567:3;1593:8
1665:15,16;1669:2;	working (3)	11 (7)	2007 (1)	301 (1)
1674:6	1587:9;1650:3;	1563:16;1585:4;	1591:18	1658:16
Winnebago (1)	1668:13	1588:9;1609:16;	2008 (14)	304 (2)
1568:7	works (2)	1622:4;1652:22,24	1567:4,13;1589:5;	1633:10;1661:18
winners (1)	1600:4,10	11,931 (1)	1590:23;1591:7,9;	306 (1)
1668:7	worse (2)	1614:7	1610:23;1632:13,21;	1620:3
Wisconsin (1)	1592:19;1593:18	115 (1)	1633:1;1634:4;1635:2,	34 (2)
1565:9	write (2)	1577:24	20;1636:23	1561:24;1609:7
withdrawn (1)	1607:8;1629:20	12 (2)	2009 (6)	3757 (1)
1649:6	wrong (3)	1591:14;1608:12	1567:5;1590:12,16;	1614:12
within (14)	1579:6;1623:20;	123 (1)	1591:18;1649:2,4	384 (1)
1557:5;1559:2;	1638:3	1657:4	2010 (12)	1561:19
1560:19;1561:7;	wrote (3)	124 (2)	1567:5,13,14;	
1562:24;1564:6;	1578:11,13,16	1651:20;1654:2	1589:6;1590:15,24;	4
1565:19;1608:21;		13 (5)	1591:7,8,20;1593:20;	
1612:2;1646:20;	Y	1570:2;1576:5;	1649:8;1652:1	4 (9)
1652:11,14;1653:19;		1589:17,22;1604:4	2011 (2)	1570:15;1584:4;
1662:24	year (5)	14 (1)	1567:8;1591:10	1620:16;1630:23;
without (6)	1573:16;1613:23;	1589:22	2012 (7)	1636:21;1637:5;
1554:22;1592:19;	1614:1;1648:19;	15 (1)	1567:7;1589:7,19;	1651:22,22;1661:21
1601:5;1625:8;	1670:5	1566:3	1622:8;1632:18;	41 (1)
1660:18;1674:8	years (4)	16 (1)	1651:21;1654:3	1593:15
witness (15)	1589:21;1591:10;	1568:8	2013 (2)	4260 (1)
1555:2,7;1595:11;	1664:4,5	17 (1)	1645:9;1656:7	1614:9
1605:19;1639:24;	yield (2)	1584:2	2014 (8)	44 (2)
1640:6,10;1642:16;	1569:4,18	1746 (1)	1564:2;1568:18;	1613:23;1614:1
1646:3;1654:19;	· , -	1633:15	1584:2;1625:16;	445,000 (1)
1658:3;1666:10;	Z	1752 (1)	1633:1;1645:10;	1670:3
1667:10,13;1668:14		1634:12	1648:21;1656:5	45 (1)
witnesses (5)	<b>ZBA</b> (4)	1753 (2)	2015 (1)	1584:3
1639:16;1672:21;	1554:21;1673:9,11,	1636:8;1639:10	1554:8	46 (1)
1673:3,18;1674:13	16	185 (1)	22 (5)	1584:4
witness's (1)	Zimmerman (1)	1565:18	1568:3,8;1636:21;	
		1202.10	1200.3,0,1030.21,	

	887,000 (1)	
5	1573:15	
<b>5 (11)</b> 1568:3;1632:16; 1636:19;1640:23; 1644:21,23;1646:23; 1647:21,21;1649:2; 1664:3 <b>5,690,000 (1)</b> 1659:9 <b>50 (1)</b> 1565:19 <b>56 (2)</b> 1570:4;1663:9 <b>5th (2)</b> 1671:24;1674:5 <b>6</b> <b>6 (16)</b> 1563:1;1564:3; 1589:1,8,21;1590:5,20; 1591:21;1620:5,6; 1631:7;1649:12; 1654:1,4,18;1655:3 <b>6:30 (6)</b> 1671:12,22;1672:17; 1674:4,10,10 <b>6:48 (1)</b> 1554:1 <b>60 (3)</b> 1555:10;1565:22; 1600:13 <b>608 (2)</b> 1625:16;1631:7 <b>61 (2)</b> 1555:10;1579:7 <b>62 (3)</b> 1555:10;1607:5,18 <b>63 (1)</b> 1663:8	9 9 (7) 1566:3;1573:2; 1589:6;1611:18,22; 1625:15;1631:6 9:30 (1) 1670:11 9:32 (1) 1675:19 90 (1) 1563:6 92 (1) 1659:3 993,000 (1) 1573:17 9th (3) 1672:14,14;1674:9	
7	-	
7 (2) 1620:5,8 7:50 (2) 1605:14,16 70 (1) 1580:9 768 (1) 1563:19		
8		
<b>8 (3)</b> 1580:9;1616:18; 1652:6 <b>8:00 (1)</b> 1605:16 <b>80 (1)</b> 1573:19		