PUBLIC COMMENTS

THURSDAY, APRIL 9, 2009

5:00 p.m.

In the Matter of the Route Permit Application for a 345 kV Transmission Line from Brookings County, South Dakota to Hampton, Minnesota

PUC Docket Number ET2/TL-08-1474

Grandpa's Event Center
31846 65th Avenue
Cannon Falls, Minnesota

1 I N D E X

WITNESS	PAGE
Tom Rice	3
Paul Schlueer	23
Jerry Huddleston	28
Trish Johnson	30
Marlin Reinardy	32
John Huseth	37
Robert Johnson	42
Greg Soule	61
Beth Topp	69
Joyce Osborn	75
Mary Ann Enggren	79
Allene Moesler	81

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. EK: So now we'll open it up to public comments. So if I could have folks who would like to comment, if they could come up to the microphone here. And I'm going to kind of turn it this way so the court reporter can kind of see you talking as well. It helps her transcribe. So you're welcome to come up, just kind of form a line and submit your comments and we'll get them down.

MR. RICE: Someone's got to be first, right?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, that a boy.

MR. RICE: My name is Tom Rice, R-I-C-E, and I live at 4500 222nd Street in Hampton. I own about 60 acres of property over there that I think will be severely negatively impacted by the high-voltage lines.

My wife did attend the meetings in Lakeville this week and turned in some proposed route stuff and some additional information on the property itself. And so I don't need to resubmit that, right? It's in the -- in the queue already.

What I would like to do, and try not to come across as a whiner, is to bring up a couple of things and ask a couple of questions and make a few statements. You mentioned in the presentation here

that there was a human element and a financial element. And I'm wondering, how does a company go about drawing that line where you say, you know what, it's just too darn expensive, heck with the people, we're going to go here? Is there a process that Great River or the Applicants went through to determine that? I mean, is there a -- you guys answer that now do I just keep talking?

MR. EK: No, I can comment on the state. We don't -- I can't comment for the process that the Applicants went through to decide on how they came up with what they came up with and the criteria, but what we do is we take the information that was provided in the application, we vet that information, we make sure it is correct. We take all the public comments we're receiving, you know, this past two weeks and up till April 30th here, and look at those impacts -- proposed impacts that were suggested to us and the potential impacts this line would have, human, financial, whatnot. There may be some areas where the human impact is greater than the financial -- and it all depends along the line. There's nothing that -- I guess we don't rate financial above human or human above finance -- it depends on the impact in the specific area of the

line and that specific route that we're looking at, and then we compare the routes and pick the one that has the least impact.

And particularly we'd look -- we'd look to the public on, you know, those items that have kind of floated to the top to being the most important. And in this case, every meeting I've been at it's been proximity to homes as well as electric and magnetic fields. So that is an item we're going to definitely study along the entire route and in depth, because it's been made evident to us that that's a very important subject.

Now, I can let Craig maybe answer how or why the criteria they use when, you know, designing these routes and putting them in the application when it compares to finances and human settlement and so forth, because, you know, the state wasn't a part of that process.

MR. POORKER: That's a good question, Tom, and I can address that real quickly. When we were looking for these routes across this corridor, we -- we did not look at what it was going to cost. That's not what I do as a routing person. I'm not an engineer. And if you look at the routes, there are several turns. We're not going in straight

lines. We're turning where we had to to try to avoid homes. And the estimates that are in our route permit application are based on the routes that we came up with first. We were not told here's how much money we're going to spend; now go route it and keep it there, keep it under that budget. We came up with a route, and then the engineers came up with their estimates. So it was the route that came first, and then what's in the application as far as dollar estimates for the project was based on the routes that we came up with.

MR. RICE: Okay. Thank you. That kind of fits into these other questions. And I got quite a bit here, but I'll try not to take too darn much time. Was the route originally to run through Rice County versus Dakota County?

MR. POORKER: I'm not sure what that refers to. We came up with two routes.

MR. RICE: Right.

MR. POORKER: And one of them does go through Le Sueur, Scott, and Dakota, and the other one dips down, I believe, through Rice County.

MR. RICE: Okay. All right.

MR. POORKER: So we have two alternates.

MR. RICE: Some of this might sound kind

of redundant. What percentage of the power provided by the system is going to consumers in Minnesota, do you know? Or what is the end result of the line? Who is it going to serve, and...

MR. EK: That comes to a question of need that's answered -- or analyzed, I should say, analyzed and addressed in the need process. And I guess I should describe that there's -- we're here tonight, it's called the routing process. What's been going on for two, maybe three years -- I'm not part of the need process, so I can't get into real detail, just big details. But what it is, they've been discussing the need for the project and the need for the energy in Minnesota and the need for where it's going, the need for the power lines, the timing, the type, the size, all that stuff is need. And that's -- that's kind of wrapped up here in the last month.

And, as a matter of fact, next week the Public Utilities Commission on Wednesday will hear oral arguments from all those folks that have been intervenors and so forth and have been involved in that need process. They will -- they will hear their final, you know, oral arguments when it -- when it pertains to this need issue. Thursday, the

16th, the next day, the Public Utilities Commission will deliberate. And essentially what that means, they'll -- there's five commission members, and they will sit and go through all the data they have been going through and look at the summaries and the oral arguments, all the information, and they will make a decision that day on whether this project is needed.

MR. RICE: Okay.

MR. EK: Should they decide it's not needed, this whole routing goes away. We end there. There's no more routing because the transmission line is not needed. If they say yes, it is needed -- and there may be some fashion, different types of need they put in there, elements of need -- the project would continue, the routing would continue from today on. Those meetings are open to the public. They're not opportunities for the public to raise their hand to comment. Essentially it's just an opportunity to listen --

MR. RICE: Right.

MR. EK: -- on what's -- you know, what they've heard. It's been a long, long process, a lot of input from a lot of folks. So that would be an opportunity just for the public to listen and finally hear what the PUC might decide when it comes

to need. And this need decision not only includes this Brookings line, but three other lines that are included in this CapX -- broader CapX.

MR. RICE: Right.

MR. EK: Yeah. That question, when you get the percentages where it's going, that's a need question that I couldn't answer tonight.

MR. RICE: Yeah, I was just concerned that, you know, if it's for the neighbors, it's different than if it's going to Chicago, I guess. For me personally, that's all I was getting to.

MR. EK: Oh. Oh. Well, I can answer that. You know, the line is being built to pull some of that -- the wind energy that's coming on line on Buffalo Ridge in southwest Minnesota, and the reason for building the substations and upgrading the substations is to -- those are -- those are points where they can start to -- where they can distribute the energy that's coming on this new line into those local areas.

MR. RICE: All right.

MR. EK: So, no, it's not just a line to go across Minnesota to transfer energy somewhere else.

MR. RICE: Right.

MR. EK: There are those stopping points that will allow -- you know, hook the energy into the local areas along that line from those substations.

MR. RICE: All right. Thank you.

Let's see. You have a map here. But as my own property is laid out, the proposed power line, the yellow one, I think it's plan A, is to cross my driveway, but actually run parallel to my property about 75 to 100 feet away from my house. It's actually on someone else's property. So all it's got to do is cross my driveway to get -- my driveway splits two 40-acre lots, basically, is what it is. Is that -- hopefully that's clear.

My wife took from the Lakeville meeting that, you know, with all the easement negotiations and payment, that as this line comes across and it only crosses 33-and-a-half feet of my land, that's what's negotiated. It's not the devaluation of the property with this huge tower structure and 350,000 volt line 75 feet away from my house. I find that hard to understand.

MR. EK: You're the photography studio, right?

MR. RICE: Yes, I am.

1 MR. EK: Okay.
2 MR. RICE: I'm getting to that one.
3 MR. EK: Sure. The state doesn't deal
4 with the whole easement issue and the easement
5 negotiation.
6 MR. RICE: You say it doesn't, Scott?
7 MR. EK: No, no, no. So I'll let Craig
8 talk to you about that whole easement process --
9 MR. RICE: Okay.
10 MR. EK: -- and how that goes about.
11 MR. RICE: All right. Thank you - --
12 MR. POORKER: Yeah, you bring up a good
13 question, and an unfortunate -- unfortunate one.
14 The easement acquisition process is a process where
15 we acquire easements from only properties that are
16 encumbered physically by the easement. So -- and
17 that question's come up a lot in the project about
18 the proximity. Some homes are going to be across
19 the road from the transmission line, and the people
20 whose property we cross will be compensated, and the
21 people on the opposite side of the road don't get
22 anything.
23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How can you
24 justify that?
25 MR. POORKER: That's the way the easement

system works. And that's one we do wrestle with, both my boss and I wrestle with that. And we certainly understand that gets --

MR. RICE: -- is that correct, though, Craig? I mean, does that -- I understand the rules, but does that seem right?

MR. POORKER: That's the question that my boss and I wrestle with. My background is easement acquisition, and we do wrestle with that one. Would we be opposed to that? That's something we'd like to do, but I'm not sure what avenue we would take to do that, because we've heard people along the route corridor at some of these meetings say -- for instance, a guy was a mile away, and he thought that was too close, and he wanted to be compensated as well. I'm not sure where we start or where we end on that or what the amount would be.

MR. RICE: You'd think it would be a graduated thing. I will tell you that, as I sit on my deck at my home, this line is probably going to be 100 feet away from my deck, right there out my front window, off my front step, on my neighbor's property. And you're telling me that, you know, tough, you'll get your 33-and-a-half foot and you'll like it. And I'm not sure I want to like that.

MR. POORKER: Yeah. And there are several instances like that on the 237-mile route, most definitely.

MR. RICE: Okay. That's unfortunate. I will tell you, though, from a devaluation standpoint, that if that line was there when I bought the property in 2002, I never would have purchased it. Plus, I can almost guarantee you that, even with the bad times in the real estate market, I know for a fact that as people drive my half-mile-long driveway and as they drive up to my house and if this line goes in and they see it there, I guarantee some potential home buyer would turn around and head back out to the highway. I'm almost positive that's going to happen because of this line, and I can't do a darn thing about it. That doesn't seem right to me.

MR. POORKER: That's a good point. There are some people that will not buy a house by it or buy a house near a power line, and other people that don't care.

MR. RICE: You actually have people that don't care if they live 75 feet -- I just can't believe that.

MR. POORKER: I would invite you to take

a look in Monticello, Big Lake, Sherburne County, Elk River, St. -- St. Michael and Albertville, some of the fastest-growing real estate in the country. And if anybody knows anything about electricity and generation, Sherco -- Sherburne County -- Sherburne -- Xcel Energy has a plant up there, two plants, and there are transmission lines everywhere, bigger than we're talking about, and there are homes that are built right up against the right-of-way --

MR. RICE: All right.

MR. POORKER: -- in those cities.

MR. RICE: Yeah. Okay. I don't doubt that for a second. I would like to get a list of potential buyers from you in the event the house does go on the market.

I am -- so, Craig, just to follow up on that, just one little thing. I promise I'm just about done.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You're doing fine.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Keep going.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Take your time.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hang in there.

MR. POORKER: I've got all night. I'll be here till the last person leaves.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Forget about him.

MR. RICE: So are we clear that you don't pick routes because -- I can't remember if I said this or not. But the land in front of me is owned by someone else, and they live in Marshall, Minnesota. Is the decision to -- I think you kind of covered this in the economic or human element. But is the decision -- they don't care if the line is there. They'll get a fat check because it's going to cross 80 acres of their property, and I'm the one living 75 feet away from the power line. Is the decision to put that power line -- hopefully the intent is not to go for absent landowners. Is that coming into the equation?

MR. POORKER: No. When we routed this transmission line, we did not look at who owned what. That's not how we routed it. In fact, we route some of this transmission line by people that are co-op board members for our company. And so we did not take a look at who owned what. But we do try to -- in your case we tried to be -- I think we drew a proposed --

MR. RICE: Right.

MR. POORKER: -- center line in there. But that's where the center line is going to be, unless the State tells us that's where it's going to

1 be. But we moved it over a little bit because of
2 the tree situation. That's why we kind of pushed it
3 in that gentleman's field.
4 MR. RICE: Okay. And that rolls into
5 kind of the last couple of points here. As
6 submitted previously, my wife does run a pretty
7 decent, thriving photography studio out of our home
8 north of Hampton. The land that we have there has
9 helps grow business and attract future customers.
10 We've done kind of an informal deal with some folks
11 that have used -- she has about a thousand clients
12 that have come over these last few years. And I
13 don't have it in paper and I can't submit something;
14 but, informally speaking, some of those clients say,
15 oh, 350,000, no thanks, and turn around and head the
16 other way.
17 Impact a business, impact a female-owned,
18 sole proprietor business. Is there any -- any
19 credit given to something like that that I
20 perceive -- and maybe you guys don't, but I perceive
21 will be huge when a pregnant woman wants baby
22 pictures, they takes pictures of herself pregnant
23 and three months later comes with her kids -- or kid
24 or kids, depending on octu-mom or something. But
25 the literature in a lot of the papers written about

1 EMF, as Scott had talked about, there's concern,
2 health concerns with infants, with pregnant women.
3 I'm concerned that having that line 75 feet from my
4 house, every customer that comes to the studio is
5 going to drive underneath it. What's that going to
6 do to potential customers? My wife is 38 years old.
7 For the next 25 years, what's that going to do? And
8 how does that -- how is that right?
9 I don't -- and I'm just a little guy, a
10 little drift in the sea here. I understand that.
11 But to me that just doesn't seem right that all
12 those folks -- that the line could come through
13 virgin territory and impact -- help your business or
14 other businesses, but hurt ones that are established
15 and already there. I don't understand that. And I
16 need an explanation on why that's okay.
17 MR. POORKER: Is it okay? I would not
18 say that it's okay. But if there's an impacted
19 business, I'm not sure what the law says on that,
20 but that's probably something different. Just like
21 if the county put a median in front of a gas station
22 and impacts that business, even though they didn't
23 have to buy an easement from that person, they may
24 have affected his business. And I believe there's
25 law there that addresses that. And the law, I think

1 it's called going concern --
2 MR. RICE: Okay.
3 MR. POORKER: -- which affects a
4 business.
5 MR. RICE: Where would I find that
6 information?
7 MR. POORKER: Probably a land attorney.
8 MR. RICE: Land attorney.
9 MR. POORKER: Certainly. Sure.
10 MR. RICE: David Paulen (phonetic) -- I
11 don't know if anyone else has gotten that, but I've
12 gotten four or five pieces of mailing from
13 attorneys. So I may have to do that. I heard one
14 of the fellows here talking about the hair, when you
15 stand underneath these high-power lines, the hair on
16 your arms going up. I'm not an engineer and I'm
17 obviously not the smartest guy in the room, but I'm
18 concerned about that. Lots of people at the
19 business. I have a wife and a child, a 14-year-old
20 daughter. I'm concerned about that. And I -- what
21 assurance do I have that that isn't going to screw
22 us up, this being 100 feet away from my front door?
23 What assurance does an average homeowner have?
24 MR. EK: I can tell you we've studied
25 this over and over the last 30 years. You know, I

1 live in the Cities, I drive under transmission
2 lines, my hair doesn't fly up. I have transmission
3 lines -- or distribution lines with transformers
4 right 30 feet from my house. The literature we've
5 studied in the past has said there is not a
6 causal -- they have not found a causal link between
7 electric magnetic fields and cancer or leukemia.
8 They have found that the link, if there is one, it's
9 little. So science has continued to study that
10 research because it is little. It's not -- it's not
11 none. There is still -- there is still the
12 possibility of a small impact. They don't -- you
13 know, there's two sides to this, two sides of the
14 fence. And that's something we're -- we are going
15 to study in this EIS. In the past we haven't found
16 it to be an issue.
17 There's many studies. And, fortunately,
18 throughout those scoping meetings, I have received
19 additional new studies and information and links to
20 information and documents. We're going to work with
21 the Department of Health. We may even go farther
22 than that to beef up this whole subject on electric
23 and magnetic fields and the impact that it could or
24 could not have in this EIS. And this is a great
25 opportunity for us to do that.

MR. RICE: Okay.

MR. EK: So we're taking this very seriously. You know, it's a tough subject, because you have people out there that say no, it's not a problem. You have people out there that say they do -- that it is. So it's -- and you don't know who to believe. So -- but we're going to tackle this subject as best we can --

MR. RICE: All right.

MR. EK: -- and try to provide the greatest amount of information and the proper information to folks in the environmental impact statement. And I just wanted to comment, you seem -- you sound like you're relegated that this line is already going to go through your property, it's a done deal. And I know your wife submitted to me an alternative and everything. And that's -- that's exactly what we're looking for. This is, remember, a proposal.

MR. RICE: Right. That's why I wanted to treat it like it was going to happen. I don't want to be lulled into complacency and one day wake up and have the forms of a 100-foot tower poured outside my front door.

MR. EK: Sure. But at the same time you

1 don't want to stand still and not let your voice be
2 heard.
3 MR. RICE: Right.
4 MR. EK: So we don't know.
5 MR. RICE: Right.
6 MR. EK: So I do have your wife's --
7 MR. RICE: Yep.
8 MR. EK: -- letter, the map.
9 MR. RICE: Yep.
10 MR. EK: Even the brochure of your
11 photography studio.
12 MR. RICE: Yes. If you need some
13 pictures taken before the power line.
14 MR. EK: I'd be happy to bring my
15 daughters over there.
16 MR. RICE: That would be great. We'll
17 give you a good deal.
18 MR. EK: But don't -- don't let it
19 discourage you, because we look at these
20 alternatives --
21 MR. RICE: Right.
22 MR. EK: -- and they are considered. So
23 very, very often, routes change --
24 MR. RICE: Right.
25 MR. EK: -- in applications as they

1 come -- once they come in and once they go out, they
2 can look very different --
3 MR. RICE: Right.
4 MR. EK: -- and that is due to public
5 comment --
6 MR. RICE: Right.
7 MR. EK: -- so -- and impacts that we
8 study in environmental impact statements.
9 MR. RICE: Thank you, Mr. Ek, I
10 appreciate that. I'm just not sure what to tell a
11 customer that says is that going to hurt me and me
12 quoting somebody's paper, when there's just as much
13 information that states otherwise. I'm not sure how
14 that's going to carry.
15 MR. EK: Yeah. I understand. I
16 understand.
17 MR. RICE: Okay.
18 MR. EK: It's a tough subject.
19 MR. RICE: All right. I guess, in
20 closing, then, I'll say that, you know, there's 11
21 utility companies -- I think I read that in the
22 literature -- taking part in the project. And I'm
23 sure every one of them's got a full staff of smart
24 engineers and designers, and the State's, obviously,
25 Office of Energy Security, filled with good smart

1 people. And it seems like there's lots of other
2 options on the table or potential tweaks that would
3 decrease the human impact and decrease business
4 impact. And I hoping that as you work your way
5 through this process at all that you consider -- I
6 wouldn't move in next to a line, and I bet you most
7 people in this room wouldn't move next to a line --
8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Why don't you ask
9 for a show of hands?
10 MR. RICE: I don't know that that's
11 appropriate. But I will tell you that we were here
12 first, and I wouldn't move in if it was there. And
13 I think -- don't lose sight of that, please. And
14 thank you for the opportunity.
15 MR. EK: Thanks for your comments, sir.
16 If you could state and spell your name
17 for the court reporter, please.
18 MR. SCHLUEER: Paul Schlueer from Stanton
19 Township, S-C-H-L-U-E-E-R.
20 Some of the questions I have --
21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can't hear you.
22 MR. SCHLUEER: My question is how many
23 other power lines of 345 kilovolts are in the state
24 right now? You mentioned a little bit ago that
25 Sherco was one. And how many miles of these lines

are presently in the state, and -- do you know? Can you tell me or...

MR. EK: You know, offhand there are other 345 kilovolt lines. Off the top of my head, I couldn't tell you how many.

MR. SCHLUEER: Do we find it on the map or your website or something?

MR. EK: Oh, yeah, yeah. Actually, on our website there is a map of transmission lines throughout Minnesota. It's on the website that's in the handout, as a matter of fact.

MR. SCHLUEER: Can we look at them or...

MR. EK: Yes, sir.

MR. SCHLUEER: Anything higher than 345 kilovolts.

MR. EK: I believe there are -- there are -- there are one or two that are higher than 345.

MR. SCHLUEER: Is it possible that this line could be increased beyond voltage higher than 345 in the future?

MR. EK: That's an engineering and, I guess, that's a planning question by the power companies. I couldn't answer that from the state's perspective.

MR. POORKER: There are several hundred mile -- hundreds of miles of 345 kV transmission lines in the state. An example of one is right up northeast of Hampton, just on the northeast corner of Hampton on the easterly side of Highway 52. Those are an H-frame, wood-frame structure. There's a corner out there in the Mauers' (phonetic) field. It's a big lattice structure. That is a 345 kV transmission line, and that's one that we want to hook into to connect that grid system.

There's another 345 line that goes through Le Sueur County and Scott County and Helena and Derrynane Township. It kind of runs at a diagonal. That's a 345 kV line. There are bigger lines. There's a 400-kV DC line that runs from North Dakota down to the southwest metro area, and there's also a 500 kilovolt line running from -- I'm not sure what the starting point is in Chicago County, but it does go through Chicago up to the north into Manitoba. And there are several 345-kV lines.

MR. SCHLUEER: Okay. Has there been any studies of people that live right under those lines that have been affected or people complain about the effect of the EMF?

MR. POORKER: Let me address your other question first.

MR. SCHLUEER: Okay.

MR. POORKER: And that was, could this line ever be upgraded to something bigger.

MR. SCHLUEER: Yes.

MR. POORKER: Without going through a whole process just like this one, it could not. I'm not sure if you're talking physically or if you're talking by easement or whatever.

MR. SCHLUEER: No. That might be voltage wise, going to a higher voltage.

MR. POORKER: No, if it's built at 345 and that's what the permit is for, that's all it can operate at. It can't operate higher than that. It has to be 345 because of the transformers that are in the substation.

MR. SCHLUEER: You would have to get another permit to go higher?

MR. POORKER: Right, that's exactly right. Go through the whole process, both need and routing permit, too.

MR. SCHLUEER: Do you know if there's been any studies about under those big lines that people have had problems with electromagnetic fields

1 or anything?
2 MR. EK: No, no. The State put out a
3 White Paper, and I forget the date, but in those --
4 you know, this is before my time. So I can say that
5 I guess I can't comment on all the studies, but the
6 studies we use and we have in our literature for
7 EIS's and EA's today, we indicate that no, that
8 there is -- is no risk. And what the Department of
9 Health said in their White Paper that was issued --
10 done in Minnesota, they called for prudent
11 avoidance. What that means is, you know, just have
12 common sense and stay away from the power lines.
13 But here's the thing. This is old data,
14 you know. This has been done -- this has been done
15 way back. You know, we're talking 30-year data. So
16 this is -- this is our opportunity now, for this
17 project, to take a look at some of that new data
18 that has come out and really dig into that and, you
19 know, supplement or maybe even refute the data that
20 we've had in the past with the new data that's come
21 out, because they're constantly doing studies. So
22 it's hard for me to comment on old projects because
23 I wasn't even around. So -- but I can just -- all I
24 can tell you is that this is very well known to us,
25 just talking to my boss today about it, that EMF is

high, probably number one here on this project to take a look at and beef up on that subject and the information that we provide to the public.

MR. SCHLUEER: All right.

MR. EK: Thank you.

MR. HUDDLESTON: My name is Jerry Huddleston, H-U-D-D-L-E-S-T-O-N. Well, I'll see if I can be any more awkward going forward.

Well, I'd like to thank the Office of Energy Security for the opportunity to listen to our voices and concerns that we have about working transmission line. It's great to see so many folks and see representatives from the state and from.

Like all the folks here, we are certainly concerned about the effect that the transmission line is going to have on human and environmental futures in our community. We are planning to pass a resolution at the next city council meeting, which would be next Tuesday, asking the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission to locate the transmission line outside of the city of Hampton.

I can briefly summarize some of the concerns that we have. We're concerned that our residents and our businesses will not receive market value for property taken for the purpose of the

transmission line. We're also concerned about the effect on the market value of property adjacent to the transmission line, such as the gentleman who spoke first. We're concerned about the environmental impact of the large structure, conductors and the substation. We're concerned about the human impact, the noise and electromagnetic fields of transmission lines and the potential health risks it may pose to our families and our children that live near the transmission line.

I'm not sure how much influence we can have over the routing process, but we certainly ask that you take into consideration the concerns we have and the effect that this transmission line will have on our community, our homes, our businesses, and our property. You know, there's really no question in my mind that I wouldn't buy property that had a power line running through it, like this gentleman said earlier. And I can't imagine more than just a handful of people that actually would do that.

That's all I have. Thank you.

MR. EK: Could I just ask you -- or confirm something? You said you were going to send

a letter to the Public Utilities Commission? You're more than welcome to do that. But I would also ask that you send it to me as well, to the Office of Energy Security, because it would be as a comment and an alternative. So just to make -- because we handle that part of it and we funnel all that information to the PUC. And you can send it to the PUC too. I just ask that it comes to us as well so we have that, just so it doesn't get lost somewhere in the PUC and so we have that information.

MR. HUDDLESTON: Okay. Thank you.

MR. EK: Thank you.

MS. JOHNSON: Hi, I'm Trish, T-R-I-S-H. Johnson, S-O-N. And I have a letter here from a neighbor who was not able to be here and he wanted me to read it into the record.

Dear Ms. Johnson, I will be out of town on business and will be unable to attend the April 8th or 9th power line public meeting. Please read this letter in its entirety into the record at that public meeting.

I am not in favor of routing a large power line in front of my property at 2757 East 220th Street between Farmington and Hampton, Minnesota. I already have a power line in front of

my property, and it disrupts my farming activities. My property has been offered for sale. One of the selling features is an excellent view of the woods to the south. This view would be compromised if the proposed power line were built in front of the property.

A number of health issues exist with respect to cancer and other diseases caused by electromagnetic fields which arise from electric power transmission. This would result in a major reduction in property value. The proposed power line route following 220th Street would disrupt wetlands and woodlands, which add much to the appeal of the area.

I have reviewed the proposed power line route information provided. There are other possible routes and technology which would cause less loss of market value and less potential health hazards.

Sincerely, Bruce Lamp.

And that's L-A-M-P. Thank you.

MR. EK: Thank you. Thank you for your comments.

MS. JOHNSON: I need to give -- I'll give this to Ray.

MR. EK: Okay. Great.

MR. REINARDY: Marlin Reinardy, R-E-I-N-A-R-D-Y, the City of Hampton. I'm involved with both this line and also the line going to Rochester and La Crosse. I'm aware that this meeting isn't about that line, but on the alternate route that runs through Hampton, also the same proposal that they're proposing for that line. I realize the permit hasn't been put in for it, but at least their plans are to put it.

And I guess my question is, how close would you put two high-voltage power lines? Now, I understand that one could possibly carry up to 750,000 volts. Now, we've got this one. They're saying that it would probably carry 345 plus that 750. So all of a sudden we're talking 13,000 volts together. How close together would you put these two lines?

MR. EK: The State's not aware of a 700 or higher volt line. Craig, are you? I'm not quite sure.

MR. POORKER: The other transmission line, I think, is the one you are talking about that goes down to Rochester and La Crosse?

MR. REINARDY: Yes.

1 MR. POORKER: That's also a 345.
2 MR. REINARDY: I just got back in town.
3 I was out of the town for the last two months, but I
4 have read this since I've been back the last two
5 days. So either somebody's got erroneous
6 information -- but even if it's just a 345, how
7 close would you put these two together?
8 MR. POORKER: That's something for the
9 planning engineers. I think that's probably
10 addressed in the need portion of the project. I
11 think it's -- I've heard talk that they can -- and I
12 think this is probably changing, but it used to be
13 that they were supposed to be a mile away, and that
14 is so that -- from each other, and that is so that
15 if one line went down in a storm, perhaps the other
16 one would stay up and it wouldn't have such a
17 serious situation as if the two of them went down.
18 But I'm not 100 percent sure on that, because that
19 has changed recently in some FERC rules.
20 MR. REINARDY: Okay. In this
21 right-of-way, this 150-foot right-of-way, what
22 restrictions are in that?
23 MR. POORKER: Okay. When we purchase an
24 easement for an electric transmission line, the
25 rights that we purchase from you as a landowner

would be the right to build that transmission line and to maintain it and to operate it, and that's all. It's still -- there are no other restrictions other than restrictions on buildings in it, new buildings, and also tall trees or anything that might come in contact with the wires. It's still your private property. Nobody else can use it. They can't put a bike path on it or other infrastructure of any kind in that. It's still your private property. And if anybody else wants to bury something in there or put anything else, even on the poles, they would have to get another easement from you as the landowner.

MR. REINARDY: Okay. Where this would border the highway right-of-way, will these two right-of-ways overlap? For instance, if you got 150 feet in the highway sitting there -- say State Highway 52, I believe, is a hundred feet of right-of-way -- does yours go outside that or will yours border into that 100 feet?

MR. POORKER: That's something we'd have to negotiate with MnDOT. But in most cases when we go along a highway, we like to be right up against the right-of-way line of that highway so that the over -- so that the rights-of-way do overlap.

MR. REINARDY: So you're saying then it would run under the east side of 52, as the alternate plan; for 150 feet back, it would be nothing. That's a commercial area where it would be going through. So we basically kill the commercial; is that what you said?

MR. POORKER: I don't know exactly where the route is that's going to be chosen. I think part of ours does run up Highway 52, and I'm not sure what the zoning may be right there or what is there offhand without looking at it.

MR. REINARDY: It's commercial now.

Mr. POORKER: Okay.

MR. REINARDY: I guess that would be my concern, is that basically -- for the city of Hampton, basically the only business district they have and the only potential in the future for commercial growth. And this line goes near within 150 feet, we've basically killed any commercial.

MR. EK: Just -- I think maybe you might be talking about sharing right-of-ways. It kind of sounds like it. And that's one of the options that I think Craig was getting to in dealing with different county or MnDOT transportation departments. What would happen is they'd work out a

deal where they'd put the transmission lines as close as they can to the right-of- way. They'd share -- they'd share that 75 feet on one side of the transmission line with that existing road right-of-way. So then they'd only have to incur the other 75 feet on the other side of the road right-of-way. So it wouldn't be that 150 feet because they'd be sharing 75 of it. And, then, depending how far out from the road, you know, you'd subtract that from 75 and whatnot and add to it, I guess I should say. So...

MR. REINARDY: How about the frontage road, can a frontage road be within that 150 feet?

MR. POORKER: That's a good question. Frontage roads are usually probably owned by the city or the township or the county, something like that. Again, we'd have to visit with the land -- or with the transportation authority of that, whether it's the county or the township or the city. We have to get permits from all those folks and visit with them about where they would like it placed. And usually they're going to want us right close to the right-of-way so we're not a hazard to the driving public.

MR. REINARDY: There's currently a

frontage road in the area. What happens to that?

MR. POORKER: We're not going to be setting poles in the middle of a roadway, so I don't know that specific location. But I think if you have concerns with the highway, with the frontage road and with the City of Hampton, I think what Scott is looking for is for those comments or concerns.

MR. REINARDY: I would -- if it's going to go there, I would recommend it went further east to the city line. Obviously you're pushing it, but it would at least have less effect as far as the City of Hampton and the residents. Thank you.

MR. EK: And, sir, what I might suggest is the computer stations back there, Maybe you could go and they can zoom in on that area, print you out a map, and you could submit it to me or Ray and show us the area you're talking about, and we can include that in our comments, and it's something we'll look at as an alternative.

MR. REINARDY: Thank you.

MR. EK: Thank you.

Additional comments?

MR. HUSEETH: John Huseth, Sogan (phonetic) Valley Trail, Dennison, Minnesota.

H-U-S-E-T-H. Hi, my name is John Huseth, Sogan Valley Trail, Dennison. And I'm just going to breeze over this. I put together a packet of comments that I'll be able to submit as information for you.

Fourth generation dairy farmer. We're not involved with the siting here right at Hampton. But it's south of here, so the siting at Hampton does have an effect here. To me there's been not enough research done and there needs to be more research done on the effects of transmission lines with concentrated feedlots of hoofed animals. There's been a few research. And if you look out for that research, it's done, out there, but clearly it hasn't been done on a level with enough cows to look at the number of variations that can happen.

Unfortunately, my family's lived through this on another feedlot site, and we choose not to live through this again on another one of our feedlot sites with unwanted ground current. What I've done for you, in just summation, is I included in here some general losses of our concentrated feedlot at another location. If you wish to contact me further and talk further and get more in depth in the amount of losses we lost there, I'd be more than

1 happy to go through that with you.
2 I also included in this packet an
3 advertisement from Xcel Energy that came out about
4 three months earlier, and I did present it to the
5 individuals that are working on our part of the
6 line. But it was kind of humorous because, as I was
7 working on the presentation with them, it says, Xcel
8 Energy wants to partner with you to help solve your
9 voltage problems. So obviously Xcel Energy, through
10 this advertisement, is admitting that there could be
11 a problem out there, and they want to work with the
12 dairy farmers to figure out how we can solve the
13 problem. So what I guess we're here today telling
14 you and what I told folks before is we're willing to
15 partner with you to help solve these problems, and
16 that's why we're here today.
17 The other part of it is a transmission
18 line study done by Donald Hillman. He's a Ph.D. out
19 of Michigan State University. And that dealt with a
20 transmission line and some of the readings they were
21 taking off underneath that transmission line that
22 was built in very close proximity to a feedlot. I
23 also included another study, also by Dr. Hillman,
24 Charles Ishi and Richard Moser that was presented at
25 the 12th International Conference on Production

1 Diseases of Farm Animals. So for your reading
2 pleasure, I would appreciate it if you would also
3 look at that.
4 I also included in here, which I'm sure
5 Xcel and your lawyer department, you're well aware
6 of, there are a number of cases which you have been
7 involved with regarding concentrated feedlots and
8 the effect of unwanted ground current. In that
9 particular article, it just talks about the cases,
10 some of them settled. Some have not been settled.
11 But if you're not aware of the problems out there, I
12 would suggest you talk to your legal department
13 because they're fully -- they've been fully
14 entrenched in those.
15 And then last, I'm not a hog guy, but I
16 did also include a study from National Hog Farmer
17 Magazine, and that one also outlines, actually, a
18 case study of a very, very large hog operation that
19 dealt with breeding animals and the affects of
20 unwanted currents on that particular operation.
21 So I would encourage you to read through
22 these. I would encourage you to do your due
23 diligence, and you need to really research where
24 you're going to site this thing and what in
25 proximity. Because economic activity in this state

is kind of a buzzword right now. According to the governor and the legislature, I don't think we have enough of it right now to pay our bills. So we're asking that we -- we're asking you, please let us pay our fair share of taxes and make a buck out of it. Thanks for your time.

MR. EK: No, thank you. And I'll tell you what, thanks for -- can I just grab that information now?

MR. HUSETH: You bet.

MR. EK: Because that's fantastic, because that's exactly what we're looking for. And to answer your -- this is just going to help. And just to let you know, that subject of stray voltage and induced voltage and so forth has come up at every single meeting we've had since last Monday. So we know it's an issue.

We do know, of course, across this whole line it's not going to happen, but there are -- it is -- it happens. I will tell you it does happen. And we will -- that's another one of those subjects that are right up there at the top that people are really concerned about, and it's fantastic that we're getting this new information to take a look at and include in an environmental impact statement.

And we will do our due diligence and provide the best information possible when it comes to proposing -- or I guess funneling all this information to the PUC for their decision on whether to permit the line and where it should go when they make that decision. So thank you very much.

MR. HUSETH: Thank you for your consideration.

MR. JOHNSON: This is Robert Johnson. Well, I'd like to touch on a few points before reading part of a prepared statement for the record with respect to the CapX Brookings to Hampton transmission routing issue.

And the first point I'd like to make is that a lot of us are frustrated with this whole process and the prospect of having power lines going near our homes and power poles on our properties. And a lot of that frustration, I think, comes from the fact that we feel perhaps our destiny -- our control of our destiny is outside of our personal control. Somebody else has taken over. We're battling a group of 11 utilities with respect to the need and the routing in this whole project. And, unfortunately, nice people such as Scott come out to these meetings, and they're the face of the

utilities.

Scott and I don't know each other; however, I do know that he's been at any number of these meetings, six, seven, eight or nine of them in the last week or so, and I've got to believe that he's been beaten up on at every single one. I don't think that -- of all the reports we've heard from folks we've had at the Marshall meeting, Henderson meeting, New Prague meeting, Lakeville meeting, I don't think that anyone has come forward and said, this sounds like a wonderful idea to me, I'm happy to have these power lines coming through. So all this negativity gets brought past toward these two gentlemen. And I want to say, Scott, you've probably got the worst job in Minnesota right now. And we're aware of that and appreciate what you're going through.

And at the same time when you and your staff get around to writing the environmental impact study, I hope you'll remember that these are real people with real lives who are all here and maybe overlook some of the beating up you've gotten, if that's possible, and think about what you've really heard as you've been out in the communities of Minnesota and give consideration, seriously, to what

it is you're supposed to be doing with that environmental impact statement, which I'm sure you will. And I can tell just by looking at Scott, he's pretty tired.

A couple of other comments. I'd like to share some thoughts with you that have come back to me. And by way of introduction, my name is Bob Johnson. I and my wife live just west of Hampton along 220th Street. I'm a professional in the national real estate investment industry. I've owned a company that's operated nationally for 39 years. I'm considered somewhat of an expert in real estate analysis and valuation. My wife and I own 100 acres of property around along 220th Street and are highly concerned about the part of the transmission project that's proposed to come along 200th Street and then go to the substation that's proposed to be built north of Hampton for tying the 345 line down to Prairie Island, and then from there to La Crosse and Chicago and places beyond.

A couple of -- a couple of points, without wanting to personalize this. I do want to mention, just as a citizen, that it's important that all of you and all of us attending these meetings -- and this is the last one, I believe -- I understand

that Craig's a great guy, but he's here as a representative of the utilities who are for profit or which are for-profit companies. And I think at the end of the day what the utilities would really prefer, probably, that these meetings didn't occur or went away or something. You know, what they want is for the lines to go in in the most efficient, cost-effective way possible. And I'm not standing up here proposing to you they just trample on people's rights without caring about it, but I didn't get the feeling in any of the meetings that I've attended that I could really rely on the utilities to look out for my best interests as a property owner. I have to look out for my best interests, and they're looking out for their interests, and that's a tension between the two groups.

And while it's okay to attend these meetings -- and it's great to attend these meetings, and Scott's office needs and wants input from all of us. What we say here tonight really probably doesn't amount to a whole lot. What really counts is submitting your concerns and your comments in writing to Scott's office. You need to write to your state legislators. You need to write to the

1 governors. You should write to the executives of
2 the companies involved. You should make phone
3 calls. You have to be as vocal and as outspoken,
4 preferably in writing, as you possibly can.
5 Somebody told me that in these sorts of
6 process, if you don't write it and send it in, as
7 far as the utilities and governmental agencies are
8 concerned, you're invisible. You've got to do this
9 writing. Last Saturday I wrote 25 letters. It
10 didn't take long. There's no reason when you go
11 home this week you can't write 50. You have to do
12 that kind of thing. Otherwise it really doesn't
13 count.
14 And I suppose the flip side of that is if
15 these power lines end up going over your home or
16 there's a pole in your living room, figuratively
17 speaking, you've got nothing to complain about if
18 you didn't stand up and exercise your rights as
19 citizens and express your thoughts and your
20 concerns.
21 A couple of responses to some comments I
22 heard this evening which echo questions and answers
23 from other meetings. With respect to the PUC, one
24 of my concerns as someone who has been studying this
25 issue for about the last three months -- and some of

1 my staff has been helping out with that as well --
2 one of my concerns is that of the five members on
3 the Public Utilities Commission, none of them are
4 electrical engineers. And, Scott, if I say
5 something that's all wet here, stop me, or Craig. I
6 don't believe that any of them are electrical
7 engineers. There are no urban planners. There are
8 no Ph.D.'s in medical studies or transmission,
9 nothing on that. Three of them are lawyers, I don't
10 know the other two.
11 This is the largest project to come
12 through the state of Minnesota in 30 to 50 years,
13 maybe, since the '70s. It's the largest project of
14 this sort that the Office of Energy Security has
15 handled. And I'm a little concerned that the
16 members of the PUC at least -- I'm sure everyone in
17 Scott's office is familiar with this thing. But I'm
18 concerned about the members of the PUC may be in
19 over their head determining whether or not the need
20 is really there and whether or not it really makes
21 the best possible sense. There's a great deal of
22 money on the table. This is a 2 to $4 billion
23 project when you add everything all up. There
24 are -- there's lots of money to be made. And in my
25 experience in business for 39 years, I've learned

one thing; and that is, when there's lots of money on the table, there are lots of conflicts of interest that float up and other strange things happen.

I have concerns about the process involved in all of this. And if you have concerns about any of that, I hope that you, like I, will write to Scott, write to your legislators, do those kinds of things.

Somebody asked where most of this power is going to go. Eventually it seems to me that most of it goes to Chicago and markets east. There's a proposed upgrade of the lines from Buffalo Ridge wind farms into the metroplex area and some improvements up around the St. Cloud area. But the 345 lines -- which, by the way, the utilities have already -- have either already applied for or are already planning on upsizing to double the 345 in the Hampton area. Most of this stuff is going to tie into the lines going out to Prairie Island, La Crosse, jump the river to La Crosse, and go to eastern markets.

I think that's right, is it not, Craig?

MR. POORKER: I don't know.

MR. JOHNSON: Don't know? Okay. Well,

1 Craig's a -- Craig's a senior field representative,
2 and you can get on the websites and check some of
3 these yourself.
4 With respect to wind energy -- and we're
5 all interested in green energy. The wind -- the
6 wind energy thing in Minnesota is rather
7 interesting. And without a lot of detail, I want to
8 share with you that, as far as I'm aware, neither
9 Xcel nor any of the CapX utility members have any
10 contracts to take any wind energy at this time.
11 And, in fact, they don't have any obligation under
12 the law to do so. I believe that's accurate. And
13 according to the news release put out last Thursday,
14 with a 180-page supplement added to it by CapX, the
15 coal-fired and hydrocarbon-fired generating plants
16 northwest of the Twin Cities, if they're brought on
17 line would, in fact, tend to squeeze out the energy
18 coming up from the wind farms. That's in CapX's
19 document, their news release last Thursday.
20 So where wind energy is concerned, I'm
21 not convinced personally that this project and the
22 pain that Minnesota is going to go through to pay
23 for all this, really gets us much of that. The
24 initial project is -- costs about $1.72 billion.
25 I've seen any number of estimates. Even though the

electricity that's generated in the Dakotas by burning coal and shipped east across Minnesota is sold in other markets, Minnesota will pay about 80 percent of the whole project through rate increases.

Somebody asked at Lakeville last night if the rates will go up. And I'm not sure that the answer really was that your rates will go up, but I saw on the website -- and I've made a copy of it, which I'll put in the record -- that either Xcel or CapX has already submitted a rate increase -- rate increase application for this. So to the extent that anybody thinks rates aren't going to go up to pay for all this, they will, and you're going to be the ones doing it.

A couple of last thoughts, and then I'm just going to read a few comments for the record.

Somebody asked about the fairness of not being paid for property real close to an easement. I think that was Mr. Rice back there. And Craig said that he and his boss struggled with this. Sorry, Craig, I would suggest that a way you could stop struggling is to simply write some checks. Xcel alone, in the last 12 months, made net after tax $641 million. I would suggest that, out of that

$641 million in net income, maybe Craig and his boss could convince some of the folks to write some checks and make some payments.

Last night at Lakeville Craig said that 3,500 homes are negatively impacted between Hampton and the Brookings western end of this thing. Run a little numbers -- a few little numbers, and if you paid each one of them a half a million dollars cash, you wouldn't burn up much of the CapX total profit very fast, unless you paid them all off. Anyway, if CapX or Xcel or Great River is struggling with the ethics or the morality of all this, I suggest that one thing that you could do so you won't feel badly at night is you and your boss get up there and go see those white collar guys and get a checkbook out and start writing some checks to people. That's not going to happen, but that's -- that would make Craig feel better.

With respect to EMF transmission, there's a report on the Internet from Dr. Carpenter. If you haven't read Dr. Carpenter's report, that's a good place to begin. The research that's out there indicates fairly strongly that there is a reasonably good connection between a doubling of the rate of leukemia in children under three, the spontaneous

1 miscarriage of women, pregnant women in the first
2 trimester. There's no literature that says I
3 believe it's causative of cancer, but it acts as a
4 precursor, a conditioning for cancer to occur. I
5 will stand here up in front of you and say as an
6 adult, I sure as hell don't want to live underneath
7 one of those things, and I don't know anyone else
8 who does either. You can get Dr. Carpenter's report
9 off the Internet. If you can't find it there, then
10 I'm going to have a phone number for you where you
11 can call and get it.
12 Lastly, if you're a concerned citizen, I
13 would refer you to a couple of resource websites. A
14 very good one sponsored by a group in Minnesota
15 named CEF -- CEFT or CETF. Citizens Energy Task
16 Force is a group of citizens, volunteers, dedicated
17 to educating the public in Minnesota about this
18 whole issue. They're on the web at www.cetf.us, and
19 you can find some pretty good resources and
20 information on health there as well.
21 And also on the web, of course, are the
22 names and contact information of all your state
23 legislators.
24 And, with that little bit of background,
25 I'd like to read just a few comments into the

record.

As I mentioned, my wife and I own a hundred acres of homestead property fronted along 220th Street west of Hampton. We built our home in 1980 and have been working since then to improve it. What was once soybeans and cow pasture today is biologically diverse habitat of natural prairie grass, ponds, and woodland. While the city of Hampton serves as a bedroom community to Minneapolis and St. Paul, Hampton Township remains one of the largest, close-in rural areas in the southeastern metropolitan region.

Together, the city and the township create a unique rural environment that remains conveniently accessible to the residents of the Twin Cities. On any given spring or summer day, families and tourists by the dozens can be seen hiking and biking in the Hampton area. 220th Street and County Road 81 going north from it is filled with routes for bicycle clubs and individual biking enthusiasts. And Hampton Woods is, I believe, the last largest remaining stand of original hardwoods in Dakota County, if not all of southern Minnesota. Hampton Township is a clean, healthy place to live. Some of the families who live in Hampton are in their third

1 and fourth generations.
2 Through conscientious planning, the
3 members of the town council and township board have
4 over the years remained true to a farsighted vision
5 with preserving valuable rural area. Routing
6 high-energy lines along 220th Street, the only
7 primary access into Hampton from the west, would
8 harm the health, nature and character of rural
9 Hampton Township and Hampton City. It would degrade
10 a rural two-lane blacktop street into a transmission
11 corridor that would be aesthetically, ecologically,
12 medically, and socially unacceptable.
13 Even if one were willing to ignore the
14 seriously negative, if not downright dangerous,
15 aspects of this project, there are three important
16 reasons why this power line should not built along
17 the 220th Street corridor to a substation around
18 Hampton.
19 The first is that the route is not
20 required because the demand does not exist. And I
21 know this touches on the need question, but the two
22 are related and it's relevant. Here's some
23 important information that some of you may not have
24 about what's happening to demand in this area. The
25 assumptions and pro forma used by CapX to predict

growth in electrical demand, assumptions upon which CapX built its entire case for need are erroneous. The numbers are not real. Xcel represents about 43 percent of CapX. Based upon Xcel's February 2009 ten-page filing with the Securities and Exchange Commission, the current demand and projections of future demand are misrepresented. Contrary to what CapX projected in its needs filing last year, demand across Xcel's system is not going up but going down and has been going down each year, every year for the last three years. When we project that out into the future, it's apparent that the current transmission grid in the metroplex Minnesota area can probably handle the demand -- the supply and demand needs without the building of new power lines.

A second concern some of us have is that this first CapX project is a Trojan horse for even larger transmission projects to follow. In Reader's Digest form, once a transmission line is established and constructed along a particular route, that action establishes a corridor with other power lines expected to follow. And there are up to three other power line projects already slated for Minnesota. Consequently, in addition to the havoc that would be

1 caused by the existence of CapX line itself, the act
2 of siting the transmission power on 220th Street
3 into Hampton or north of Hampton will more likely
4 than not open a corridor for the construction of
5 additional lines by CapX or other companies. The
6 construction and existence of a CapX power line
7 along 220th Street will cause irreversible and
8 noncompensable damage to property owners along
9 220th Street and to the residents of Hampton City
10 and Hampton Township.
11 In brief, if you haven't -- if you
12 haven't seen a report put out by a local group
13 called the Institute for Local Self-Reliance, here's
14 their phone number you can write down and get a copy
15 of it and some other materials. You can call
16 866-839-7744, and they'll supply you with resource
17 information.
18 Lastly, I'd like to touch on the subject
19 of EMF, the electromagnetic fields and field
20 radiation. Some knowledgeable sources that I find
21 call EMF the asbestos of the 1990s and 2000's.
22 There's credible evidence supporting the rationality
23 of this concern. It's connected with leukemia in
24 small children. A growing body of research points
25 to the opinion that EMF causes risk, including some

forms of cancer. Locating lines of high levels of EMF near homes and businesses is, I feel, irresponsible. It's endangering the health of people who live or work near them.

The perceived dangers of living 24/7, 24 hours a day, all the time, near power lines of the size proposed by CapX with high levels of EMF transmission emissions, stands to damage not only our health but our property values as well. Because of public concerns over dangers associated with high-voltage electric transmission lines, property values along the proposed CapX route will take substantial hits. Local Realtors, professionals experienced about property values in Dakota County, already tell us that property values along the route could drop by 30 to 100 percent. Those properties not immediately adjacent to the power line are likely to also suffer appreciable loss in value. Acreage sold just two miles east of us for 34,000 an acre. And it's my opinion, as a real estate professional, no one's going to pay anywhere near that kind of a price if there are large, ugly potentially dangerous power lines nearby.

On that point, I brought a letter dated April 9th of 2009 from a local Dakota County real

estate appraisal service I'd like to read. It's brief. It says, Based on a drive-by inspection of the homesteads located east of Lane Avenue, which is County Road 79, along 220th Street to Darso Avenue East, the proposed location of transmission line along this route could have a significant impact on the value of real estate. An appraisal either before and after would need to be completed, the value of the land would need to be established. In addition, severance damages will need to be determined. So much damage is estimated in the decline in the market value of the remainder that arises as a result of construction of a public transmission line. Given the size and scope of this project, along with the close proximity to homes would be to the new transmission line, the damages, in my opinion, could be very significant. Signed by the licensed real estate appraiser. And we'll give that to Scott as well.

Finally, with respect to property values, we have -- my wife and I have two remaining concerns. When it comes time for us to sell our hundred acres west of Hampton, there are a limited number of groups who could buy our property. The first group would be families with small children.

I don't believe that, willingly, families with small children are going to come and buy property situated under or in close proximity to 345 kV lines. The second group would be retired folks, yet many retired people have medical or other conditions that they perceive would be aggravated or could be aggravated by being in close proximity to EMF.

Some of those people such as Buzz Gahler (phonetic) have defibrillators installed. Buzz's doctor has told him that it would be dangerous for him to be near those 345 lines. So Buzz has a decision to make. He can stay and take that risk or he can move out. It doesn't seem appropriate to expect somebody who's living in their retirement home to have to potentially vacate for that reason.

Now, you've all heard that the right-of-way for the CapX transmission lines is 150 feet, I believe. That's about 17 yards each side of the center line. I can produce studies for you which will tell you that the minimum safe distance to a 345 -- or from a 345 line is 600 meters. Call it 600 yards. Not a paltry 17 yards, but 600. 1,800 feet. If you're living closer than that, you're inside of 600 meters, that study at least would tell you that you're moving

1 into the danger zone.
2 So when you think about where these lines
3 will go, or could go, whether the primary -- whether
4 the preferred route or the alternate route, and
5 consider what the effects may be on you, your family
6 or your property, if you're concerned at all, what
7 you really need to do and why I'm standing up here
8 tonight is you need to go home and take a pen and a
9 paper or computer or typewriter, whatever you have,
10 and you need to start writing letters. An outcry
11 from the public can have political consequences.
12 We don't have much pull at all in
13 meetings like this. In my own opinion, the PUC is
14 really -- helps promote projects like this. Scott's
15 department in the Office of Energy Security is under
16 the Commerce Department. None of those agencies act
17 as advocates for citizens in Minnesota. I'd like to
18 think they do, but I don't really think they do. To
19 the extent that that happens, then I applaud it.
20 However, whether they function as our advocates or
21 not, the way for you to express your concern is to
22 get written comments to the people who make the
23 decisions that control these sorts of things. So
24 please, please give your written comments and
25 concerns to Scott's office, send copies to your

state legislators, send copies to your governor, write to everyone you can, and at the end of the day it possibly can have some positive effect.

Thank you very much.

MR. EK: Thanks for your comments. If you have documents you'd like to hand in for the record, sir. Mr. Johnson, documents.

MR. JOHNSON: Did you want to take them or leave them with her?

MR. EK: I'll take them.

MR. SOULE: My name is Greg Soule, S-O-U-L-E. 2915 345th Street, Dennison.

My name is Greg Soule. I live at 2915 345th Street in Warsaw Township. I want to echo some of Mr. Johnson's comments. I certainly appreciate them.

Scott, as I understand it, the primary purpose of tonight's meeting is to discuss with you what we think the scope of the EIS should be, what issues you should consider; is that correct?

MR. EK: Correct.

MR. SOULE: And on the sheet you provided, number 3 is economic and land use resources. So one of the appropriate scopes is what the economic impact would be of this line; is that

1 correct?
2 MR. EK: Yes, that's something we will
3 study in the environmental impact statement.
4 MR. SOULE: Then what I'm going to
5 request formally -- I will submit a letter to you as
6 well. I'm going to request formally that you
7 provide an appraisal of each parcel that's going to
8 be affected to the line and delivered to the
9 homeowners. That will be assessment of the economic
10 impact of this property.
11 Now, you may say to me it's too
12 expensive. But I think anybody who's going to be
13 affected wants to know what the impact is going to
14 be. And unless you actually have a formal
15 appraisal, there's no way -- some vague
16 calculations -- to determine what the actual
17 economic impact is going to be for that line. Any
18 appraiser will tell you, a real estate person,
19 Mr. Johnson would say, location, location, location.
20 So you can't tell me in general farmland would be
21 affected this much or somebody's house would be
22 affected this much. You really need specific
23 appraisal information for each of the parcels that
24 are affected. And I would formally request that you
25 do engage as part of your EIS that part of your

1 mission is to assess economic impact. I would say
2 there's no realistic, credible way you could do that
3 unless you have actual appraisals.
4 Now, interestingly, the appraisal issue
5 really dovetails with how these properties are
6 acquired. There is -- there is right now in the
7 state of Minnesota a bill that was proposed by
8 Senator Dahle and Representative Bly that you may or
9 may not be familiar with. Back in 2006 when
10 citizens were pretty upset as to how the state is
11 taking property for all kinds of purposes, the
12 legislature passed a law that it holds a number of
13 reforms on how that condemnation process would
14 happen. For example, they required the utility to
15 provide their appraisal to the landowner in the
16 process of negotiation. They required the utility
17 to reimburse the landowner more than the $500
18 pittance, but a real cost for an appraisal, between
19 1,500 and $5,000, for the whole purpose of the
20 property owner to go get a real appraisal to be able
21 to negotiate on an even footing with the utility.
22 They had a provision that said if a utility comes in
23 and makes an initial lowball offer to you and that's
24 their final lowball offer and then you take them to
25 condemnation court and if your award is more than

1 40 percent bigger than what their last informal
2 lowball offer is, then they got to pay your
3 attorneys' fees. And that's not to make attorneys
4 rich, it's to say to the utility don't feed these
5 people a lowball offer, because if you do and they
6 actually take you to court, you're going to have to
7 end up paying their attorneys' fees.
8 So there were some wonderful provisions
9 that were enacted in 2006 that protect it. It also
10 required that the utilities negotiate in good faith.
11 Seems pretty simple, I mean, that the condemning
12 authority negotiate in good faith. They also had a
13 reimbursement of going-concern, sir, which you
14 addressed earlier. There was one little problem
15 with this bill that was passed in 2006. It applied
16 to the state, so it applies to your town or your
17 county or the state. So when MnDOT comes and does a
18 condemnation for a road or they put a new sewer -- a
19 public sewer line to your property, it applied to
20 the county, it applied to your state, it applied to
21 your township. But guess who they put an exception
22 in for? The utilities. So the utilities have an
23 easier row to hoe when it comes to doing
24 condemnation. They aren't subject to any of these
25 restrictions or any of these limitations, and it's a

1 real curiosity to me as to why that was done. You
2 would think that any laws and restrictions on
3 condemnation that apply to your government would for
4 sure apply to a private utility, but they don't.
5 The utilities have an easier route when it comes to
6 doing condemnations, and they can do it to you --
7 I'm not saying they're bad people. I'm just saying
8 they have far fewer legal restrictions when it comes
9 to condemnation than it would -- than applies to our
10 own government.
11 Now, Senator -- if you want to write a
12 letter, Senator Dahle and Representative Bly, who
13 are both from the north area, have introduced bills
14 this year that would require utilities be subject to
15 the same requirements as the government is already
16 required to. And I testified on that bill twice.
17 I've been there when these two representatives of
18 these same utilities have, guess what, testified in
19 opposition to that rule.
20 So you might say why are you wasting my
21 time talking about this bill? Number one, I'm just
22 talking to you to say, if you want to do something
23 to protect yourself, if you're going to go in this
24 process and they're going to take your land, you
25 better try and get your representatives to change

1 the law so that utilities are subject to at least
2 the same requirements.
3 Now, when we -- when we've gone and heard
4 testimony, the representatives of Xcel have said,
5 there's no problem, we hardly ever condemn anybody;
6 there was this 115-mile long line, and we had to
7 deal with over 500 property owners, and we only had
8 to condemn two people. Now, there's two reasons why
9 that might be. Number one, maybe they're offering
10 really fair prices, and so no landowner had to take
11 them to condemnation court to get a fair price. The
12 other alternative though might be this: The
13 condemnation process is so disadvantageous to the
14 homeowner, to the property owner, that when you go
15 and talk to the lawyer and say, I want to challenge
16 these guys in court, the lawyer may tell you, well,
17 you're going to have to pay all my attorneys' fees,
18 you're going to have to pay for your appraisal, your
19 appraisal is going to be an expensive appraisal, all
20 you get is 500 bucks back from the utility and your
21 appraisal is going to be a lot more than that, so
22 it's going to really cost you a lot of dough to go
23 through this process. So maybe that person then
24 says, well, it's a lowball offer, but it's going to
25 cost me so much money to fight it, forget it, I'll

1 just take the offer. I don't know which of those
2 two things it is.
3 It struck me as kind of ironic that if
4 utilities are really fair in their prices, then I
5 don't understand why they were fighting this bill.
6 It was curious.
7 In terms of whether it really is fair, I
8 have a letter, and I don't know the -- personally
9 the circumstances of this, but it talks about when
10 there was -- when Great River Energy was putting in
11 115-volt electric lines that ran through, I believe,
12 Empire Township on 210th Street in 2007. And this
13 letter indicated that the original offers from the
14 utility were $14,600 and many residents accepted
15 them, until finally a few of them hired an attorney
16 and said, you know, maybe this isn't as good as it
17 ought to be. And according to this letter, the
18 appraiser confirmed that a power line across the
19 street would diminish their homes' property values
20 by around 10 percent and that FHA loans would
21 prohibit FHA loans within certain distance of high
22 voltage lines and that buyers with pacemakers and
23 their families would likely not be able to own these
24 homes close to power lines. Suddenly the money
25 awards jumped to $55,000. Now, I don't have all of

1 facts of this, so I -- you know, this is a letter
2 that somebody else wrote that communicated that
3 experience, but I've heard stories like this before.
4 So, now, how does this all relate back to
5 the scoping issue? That's the reason why I'm asking
6 you to do appraisals. Because with the current
7 process, you would get an appraisal from the
8 utility, but it's their appraisal. I think the
9 state ought to do appraisals. If you are really
10 assessing the economic impact of the property from
11 these lines, you need an appraisal just to satisfy
12 your mandate. But, even more importantly, given the
13 current status of the condemnation law and what an
14 incredible disadvantage the property owners are put
15 to, they need to be able to see an appraisal done by
16 the state, a disinterested party who would get a
17 fair appraisal for the property. At least then the
18 property owners entering into that negotiating
19 process with the utility would have the state's fair
20 appraisal to guide them in terms of how they should
21 be negotiating when the utility comes to call and
22 wants to buy your -- buy an easement for this line.
23 So I hope my comments -- while there's a
24 political element to it in terms of changing the
25 condemnation law, I had to bring that forward just

to indicate the significance of asking for an appraisal to be able to establish the economic impact of the lines.

Thank you very much.

MR. EK: Thank you, sir. It's a complicated comment, but it's in the record, and it's a comment that we will consider. So thank you.

MS. TOPP: My name is Beth Topp, T-O-P-P. I'm from Eureka Township. And I did make some formal statements last night into the record, but there's a few things that I would like to say tonight. I am the chair of the Citizens Energy Task Force, which is what Mr. Johnson was talking about, CETF. I started that group because I followed the application process for CapX with the PUC very closely, and exceptions seem to be what happens in every phase of this project. They received a number of exceptions from the Public Utilities Commission that I could see meant a lot of information would not be given during the certificate of need process.

I started our group, and we hired an attorney, and she participated in the certificate of need process all last summer. And we submitted a significant amount of information, had an expert witness on the stand that called into question the

numbers that they used to create the case for need, just as one of the issues that came up.

I'd like to talk to you about just a few things tonight. By the way, I have some information on CETF with a website and a couple of other things. So if you want to see me after the meetings, do that.

I would like to talk about the routing issue. We have a citizen in Eureka Township who studied her section of the routing very carefully, and you might want to do this. You can go onto the CapX site and go onto the Brookings line, and they actually have little toggles numbered 1 through 17, whatever it is, to find your area. You can zone in very, very closely. When she did that -- and she knows a lot about GIS -- she discovered there were many, many mistakes on this segment of the land. Houses weren't there. So obviously the data set must not be up to date, because there were houses that had been built that were not on there. I believe when she talked to Mr. Poorker, he looked and found that a center pivot irrigation system was called a house. So you will want to take a look at that information very carefully. This was submitted to the OES.

The OES is set up to -- as I understand, to protect the public interest. But when they were asked at the task force meeting where they got their information from and were they going to check them, they just stated to us that they just accepted what CapX gave them. So I think that creates a problem.

I know we talked a lot about EMF tonight. There were a number of things that I was going to talk about, but many that I don't need to because of the excellent testimony by people. But a couple of things I'd like to point out about EMF. Scott said that they found not to have really much of a problem with it but that many reports are updated. It is true there are some variable reports. But when my task -- when the Citizens Energy Task Force submitted comments to the environmental review for the certificate of need process that was before the routing, we pointed out a number of studies since 2000 that showed, for example, the miscarriage problem in women that are in there and also leukemia.

I would just like to read something to you. You've probably not had a chance to read all of your information tonight. But if you go to the sheet on the World Health Organization and we talk

about the incidents of leukemia, I'd like to read something. Childhood leukemia is a comparatively rare disease. And they talk about the average of field exposures above .3 in homes are rare. But what it ends up saying is the association from magnetic fields and childhood leukemia is causal. The number of cases worldwide that might be attributable at magnetic field exposure is estimated being from 100 to 2,400 cases. And then they talk about how, therefore, the damage is limited. I don't know about you people, but one of these cases is too much in my opinion. And it doesn't sound like a lot; but if it's your child, it's a lot. And I think we need to pay attention to these speakers.

Scott announced April 15th for the PUC. They're going to actually -- the information that our attorney presented, along with other intervenors along with CapX, put in a case for need is going to be presented orally at the PUC on April 15th starting at 9:30 in the morning. Mr. Johnson talked about the fact that it is very important to show up, not just by sitting in a meeting like this, but to write letters to the legislators about the exceptions to the eminent domain, about the need for CapX. But I want to tell you I think it's really

important that you show up on April 15th at the PUC offices. It's called Seventh Place -- Seventh Street, Place or something. What is it, Craig, do you know?

MR. POORKER: I think it's Seventh Place East.

MS. TOPP: You can look it up on the web, too, for the address. The PUC needs to see citizens sitting there and letting them know that this is about real people and that it is about a lot of real people who are going to be affected. So I can't encourage you enough to show up for that meeting.

And everything else has been covered, so that's all I'm going to say for the night. Thank you.

Oh, wait, one more thing. I find this really interesting. These (indicating) are fluorescent tubes that were placed under electric lines and lit up by EMFs under the electric lines. This came out -- there was an artist, Bristol Artist Wins the Bombay Sapphire Prize in 2004. It was created by planting 1,300 fluorescent light tubes in the earth underneath an overhead power line. The electromagnetic fields from the power cables lit the tubes. No danger; right? And then the other one,

this picture, as I've been told, that gives you how many lights, how far into the easement. It's a little hard to see it from there afterwards. But I don't know about the arguments about no dangers. This causes concern for me.

Thank you.

MR. EK: Thanks for your comments.

I just wanted to clarify one statement that you made about just accepting the application as it is. We do accept the application. We need to accept that information. And as a matter of fact, the Applicants have done a lot of hard work to put that information into the application. And there are standards in Minnesota statute and law that they're required -- items they are required to put in those applications. We're required to look and make sure that everything is in that application to make -- and then deem it to be adequate. So this is the first step is the application.

So, indeed, we do take the application and the information. Right now we take your comments. We take the application. We use the help of our third-party consultant. We vet all the information in that application, all the data in that application. We supplement it with new

information. We supplement it with your comments. This is just the start of the whole process. So to say we just take the application -- and Mrs. Topp made it sound like we rubber stamp it and just let it go as is. No, we take it, we go through it, we find inconsistencies, we correct them, we add to it, and we also supplement it with your comments. So I just wanted to make that clear.

Any further comments?

MS. OSBORN: My name is Joyce Osborn, and I'm from Burnsville. Good evening, Ladies and Gentlemen. I am an individual who has gone to a lot of -- a lot of meetings in the last three-and-a-half years. I am a survivor of the MinnCan pipeline. I have never, ever gone through such a mess nor dreamed that I would ever go through such a mess. And I've listened to Craig and now you, Scott, and I can understand where you're coming from. But you're going to have to forgive me when I say this. I've heard other people say the same thing, granted from a different company, but it's the same stuff. This is a high-voltage transmission line that is getting a new corridor. The MinnCan pipeline got a new corridor. And one of the questions that we asked at meetings with Scott last year was, well, I suppose

now that the MinnCan has a new corridor, I would imagine that the high-voltage transmission lines are going to be real close to it. And we were told -- and I don't know if it was you, Scott, or somebody else I was talking to -- they said, no, they can't put that over an underground pipeline because it would corrode the pipe. Well, if it corrodes the pipe -- we're not made out of metal. I'm hoping everybody here knows that. We're not made out of metal. If it will corrode the pipe underground -- and maybe this is just a bunch of BS that people are spreading around. I wouldn't know. I'm not metal, but I don't want to live under one of them. I just plain do not.

There's a lot of other issues. You're talking about the PUC. We've been through that process as well. And three to five years ago a member of the PUC was running around from state to state advocating for this very project.

Now, there's another issue called the Green Power Express that is coming from Michigan going into Chicago. That's a 765-kilovolt line. And I just wonder how much this line coming from North Dakota, South Dakota, and going east isn't going to tie up with that 765 Green Power Express.

The grid is 17 states. Goes all the way back east. New York has said they don't need the energy there. Chicago has said they don't need that energy there. The economy is such right now who the hell needs any more energy?

Nobody talks about conservation. I have very rarely heard conservation. Lord knows I can really squash down my energy coming into my house or out of my house. I can turn off lights. I can do a lot of things. That's called conservation.

There's a lot of other issues. How about local generation? I'm way more interested in local generation than I am in a cross-country high-voltage transmission line that may or may not be dangerous. Local generation is a bigger avenue. It should be way more explored than what it has been. And I know that energy companies don't like to hear this kind of thing because they're out there to make money. Hey, aren't we all out here to make money. As long as we live on this earth, we need money to survive. And our government right now has put us into a real squeeze. And bailing everybody -- every corporation in the entire world out with money that we taxpayers have to foot the bill on is insane. If you people don't start writing Washington or your congressmen

in both Washington but especially our state, then we deserve what we get, which will be nothing, and nothing will have changed.

Every single one of you need to really wake up and understand this is our country. This is my country, and I am pissed at what's happening to it. I have never been so mad in my entire life. I'm pushing 70 real hard, and I don't feel like I want to go through this garbage. But then I only have a few more years to live. Maybe 20 at the most, God willing. But I hate to think of what our -- my grandchildren, your grandchildren, our descendents further on down the line, what are they going to get? They're not going to have what we had at one time. And America is disappearing, and our government is doing it to us. And that's really sad.

So send your letters out to Washington and every single representative and senator in the state of Minnesota and advocate everybody else to do the same. Thanks.

MR. EK: Thank you for your comments.

MS. ENGGREN: My name is Mary Ann Enggren. M-A-R-Y, capital A-N-N, E-N-G-G-R-E-N. I was at the Lakeville meeting yesterday and did my

long paper. This is much shorter. Anyways, I live on 220th Street East, and I'm going to be the jog where the power line is going to be to the west side of my home and to the north side of my home. So I'm going to get corroded. But there's no reimbursement for me, because it's not my property.

Anyway, I'm concerned on this road. 220th Street a very narrow two-lane road. There are flat areas. There are hilly areas. I happen to live right near a hill. This road drifts very easily and frequently. Hard to go through, and it's directed back again. I can't tell you how many accidents there are and how many fatalities there have been on this road. With the current poles, at least a person had a chance to not hit a pole, if you're lucky and have that second to try to save yourself. These poles have an eight-foot base. That's huge. Your chances are -- have just gone down tremendously for not hitting a pole. Very difficult to avoid solid structures. There are numerous fatalities on this road. I don't have the statistics on that. Dakota County has those. This road does not have a legal shoulder, and this road does not have an obstacle clear free zone, both of which are required for MnDOT. Again, the road is

very narrow. I think it's a poor choice. Several have power and poles. Another distraction. So, anyways, I'm very concerned about the safety.

As to an earlier statement, when you were talking about human life and financial, it was stated financial first. I'm very insulted by that. I work to save people's lives as a profession, and I believe in it. And I believe in helping one another. I lost my spot here. So, anyways, I just wanted it to be stated that I am insulted. Human life should be first. And if we don't make and continue that to be first, we're in a real world of hurt here. And I think the CO for the company -- we just -- with government buyouts and everything like that, I think we saw what financial does -- what financial greed does. And maybe if some of those people had put human life first and have values, none of that would have happened.

And that's all. Thank you.

MR. EK: Thank you for your comment.

MS. MOESLER: Allene Moesler. M-O-E-S-L-E-R. A-L-L-E-N-E. Allene Moesler, Randolph Township. And I hadn't really planned on speaking; but listening to the process and seeing how things have evolved, it seems to me that the

1 entire process is a little backwards. It seems to
2 me that it's rather absurd to do all the siting
3 before the certificate of need is even accepted.
4 From a taxpayer standpoint, it seems it's a waste of
5 my taxpayer dollar to have state agencies holding
6 all these hearings in these kinds of things before
7 the certificate of need is even approved. So that
8 to me is a problem.
9 But in terms of looking at the
10 environmental impact statement that you're going to
11 be doing, I suggest that you look at existing power
12 lines, where they are and how they impact the
13 landowners, so that you're looking at everything
14 collectively.
15 One of the things I know in the
16 permitting process and I've dealt with some of it
17 with the MPCA, is that permits are issued on a
18 case-by-case basis with collective impacts rarely
19 looked at. And that's particularly true in terms of
20 everything that's an issue here. But I would like
21 to suggest that you take a look at what the
22 collective impact of our energy resources are on the
23 communities through which this line will be going.
24 The other thing I would like to comment
25 on, it seems like the Office of Energy Security

should be driving the process of how we develop our energy and how that energy is transmitted rather than having -- or having the reverse done; that there should be a master plan, perhaps even going so far as to have a generic impact statement on energy for the state of Minnesota so that we're looking collectively at how the ener -- or what the needs are, where the energy is produced, how it's getting from place to place. And what was mentioned before, someone had mentioned about having looked at regional use of energy -- or local use of energy, we're seeing places like Carleton and St. Olaf put up wind mills and creating -- they're reducing their dependence on long transmission lines.

So I think we really need to be looking down the road not five years, not ten years, but we need to be looking down the road a hundred years. And what -- what are we doing now that's going to impact our great, great grandchildren, and what are we going to be leaving them with? Are we going to be leaving them with miles and miles of high power transmission lines that could possibly threaten their health or are we going to be leaving them with safer greener alternatives perhaps more locally-produced energy, which is a possibility? So

I think we're really relying on old technology rather than looking at something in the future and having future view.

But in terms of the EIS, I really hope that you take a look at the collective use or the collective impact of the transmission lines, whether they're -- regardless of voltage that's coming through the areas so that people have some sense of what they're going to be exposed to.

Thank you.

MR. EK: Thank you for your comments.

Do we have additional commenters tonight?

Well, with that, then, we will wrap it up. Again, I urge you -- strongly urge you to either -- before you leave tonight pick up a copy of the handout that I had on the presentation that gives you the websites to go to, the online website to sign up for the mailing list. I urge you to sign up for the mailing list, pick up a form, a comment form. That will have all the information, the mail, U.S. Mail, e-mail, online. And please send it in. It's of great importance.

And, again, the comment period ends April 30th of this month. So please have the comments in prior to -- or April 30th before

1 4:30 p.m.

2 And thank you for coming. I appreciate

3 all your comments.

4 (Public comments concluded.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25