PUBLIC COMMENTS

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 8, 2009

1:00 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

Holiday Inn Hotel & Suites
20800 Kendrick Avenue
Lakeville, Minnesota

1 I N D E X

COMMENTS	PAGE
Jeff Otto	3
Beth Eilers	15
Unidentified Speaker	15
John Piper	21
Unidentified Speaker	29
Unidentified Speaker	34
Karen Howard	37
Terriann Rice	43
Percy Scherbenske	56
Joel Helmberger	65
Marjory Newton	66
Jeff Otto	72
Gary Prehall	72
Jeff Otto	77
Cindy Helmberger	79
Whitey Whitehouse	87

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: Now, folks that have comments, questions, concerns, alternatives, if I could ask them just to kind of walk up to the mic here, and we have a court reporter here who will transcribe your comments. Let's see if this is on. Yup.

So if you'd just like to come up as you please and orally submit your comment, feel free. And if you could, once you get up there, please state your name and spell it for the court reporter, please.

At the microphone, it's right there.

MR. OTTO: My name is Jeff Otto, O-T-T-O. I live at 25580 Dodd Boulevard, Lakeville's the post office, I'm in Eureka Township.

We've been participating -- and by the way, I'm not only a resident of Eureka Township, but I currently happen to be the chair of the town board for Eureka Township. We have been involved in this process from the beginning, I appreciate this opportunity. I particularly appreciate Mr. Ek representing the PUC (sic) here today to hear this as well.

I've previously submitted testimony. I won't repeat that, but I would like to read some selected sections from it -- bullet points from it,

if you will, that I think will be of general interest, as well as to those of you that are here representing of the project of the PUC, you may be hearing it for the first time. I know there's a mountain of evidence that's already been provided, written testimony and so forth, and I just would like to draw out some highlights as a brief refresher.

On September 21 of 2008, I submitted this testimony in written form to the Administrative Law Judge that was handling the hearings, the Honorable Beverly Heydinger, so this is a matter of record that you can get the full text of.

I've become aware in a very recent study regarding the long-term effects of electromagnetic fields from high-voltage power lines. It raises serious questions regarding health issues, potentially far more devastating in impact than previously understood.

The study is entitled BioInitiative Report, A Rationale for a Biologically-based Public Exposure Standard for Electromagnetic Fields, ELF and RF. That stands for extremely low frequency, which is what power lines generate, as well as RF, which is what things like cell phones generate.

1 What I focused on, of course, were the
2 power line related issues that were brought out in
3 this study. By the way, this study has been
4 submitted as part of the documentation of record for
5 the hearings last year.
6 One of the quotes I have from the
7 document itself is, not everything is known yet
8 about this subject. But what is clear is that the
9 existing public safety standards limiting these
10 radiation levels in nearly every country of the
11 world look to be thousands of times too lenient.
12 Changes are needed.
13 Now, this study was an international
14 study written by 14 leading scientists involved in
15 public health, and public policy experts around the
16 world. In this situation, growing health concern is
17 very much analogous to the extended time frame,
18 decades, it took to fully realize and understand the
19 long-term adverse effects of cigarette smoking.
20 The analogy is kind of interesting
21 because there are two levels of effects from a
22 high-voltage power line. It's kind of like a
23 cigarette, you know you're not supposed to touch the
24 end because you could burn your finger on it where
25 it's lit. Well, a power line can give you that kind

1 of a radiation burn when you get too close to it,
2 and there are standards in place for the people who
3 work around it and have to work and maintain those
4 power lines.
5 But the longer-term effect that's now
6 being better discovered and understood because of
7 pace years is very much analogous to the smoke
8 entering your lungs. People didn't understand or
9 realize the effect that had on the long-term health
10 impact of people until years had gone by and people
11 started starting seeing an uptick in things like
12 lung cancer from these long-term effects of smoke.
13 Well, long-term effects of this radiation is now
14 being seen in -- involving increases in leukemia in
15 children, for example. And it's a very small effect
16 yet, but it's starting to be seen.
17 Quoting again from the study, to ignore
18 the growing evidence of this effect is akin to
19 saying that cigarettes are okay as long as you don't
20 let your fingers touch the lit end, while ignoring
21 the effects of the smoke. The field-induced effects
22 that's -- we're talking the magnetic electro --
23 electromagnetic fields generated by the power going
24 through the power lines, reaches out much further
25 than the tissue-heating effect, which is the burning

1 effect I referred to, just as the smoke travels much
2 further than the heat of the lit end of a cigarette.
3 The concept is it goes far beyond the
4 much more localized heating effect, the medical
5 aspect and analogy also applies. Both smoking and
6 the radiation effect from the power lines -- or the
7 magnetic effect, I should say, both can give you an
8 immediate, obvious burn from being very close, but
9 the distant effect requires much more time to have
10 an impact. And that impact can be far more
11 devastating when the effect manifests itself as a
12 potentially life-threatening disease or other
13 quality of life issues.
14 A direct quote from the study, recent
15 opinions by experts have documented efficiencies in
16 current exposure standards. There's widespread
17 discussion that thermal limits are outdated and that
18 biologically-based exposure standards are needed.
19 Another quote, there is little doubt that
20 exposure to ELF, that's the extremely low frequency
21 exposure, causes childhood leukemia. Another quote,
22 Alzheimer's disease is a disease of the nervous
23 system, there is strong evidence that long-term
24 exposure to ELF is a risk factor for Alzheimer's
25 disease.

1 Another quote, the consequence of
2 prolonged exposure to children, whose nervous
3 systems develop until late adolescence, is unknown
4 at this time. This could have serious implications
5 to adult health and functioning in society if years
6 of exposure of the young to both ELF and the radio
7 frequency result in diminished capacity for
8 thinking, judgement, memory, learning, and control
9 over behavior.
10 Another quote from the report, in the
11 conclusion section, the existing standards are based
12 on thermal limits and do not address nonthermal, or
13 these low-intensity exposures, which are widely
14 reported to cause biodefects, some likely leading to
15 adverse health effects with chronic exposure.
16 I'd like to put this in a legal context
17 that's also being applied to things like utility
18 power lines and it's -- the term that's applied to
19 it is called the precautionary principle. The
20 precautionary principle has be developed to help
21 justify public policy action on the -- based on
22 protection of health where there are plausible,
23 serious, and irreversible hazards from current and
24 future exposures, and where there are many
25 uncertainties and much scientific ignorance. EMF,

1 these electromagnetic fields, is characterized by
2 such circumstances.
3 The lessons from the histories of most
4 well-known hazards show that precautionary-based,
5 yet proportionate measures, taken in response to
6 robust early warnings, can avoid the kinds of costs
7 incurred by asbestos, smoking, PCBs, x-rays, et
8 cetera. Such lessons are relevant to the EMF issue.
9 Is the greater risk in social cost to be
10 among the first benefitting from a new paradigm, or
11 to be among the last to suffer the consequences of
12 the traditional design of very high voltage lines
13 too close to residences?
14 What this affects is things like the
15 width of the easements, setbacks from houses,
16 keeping the lines away from where children will be
17 present. The greatest danger that has been found in
18 these studies is to young children, because they're
19 still developing. That's who has the greatest risk
20 of cell damage and so forth and will have long-term
21 effects on the quality of their life, and the length
22 of their life, as far as that goes.
23 What Eureka Township has advocated is a
24 third route to be considered that would route the
25 power line up along -- approximately following the

1 Highway 70 corridor, the southern edge of Lakeville,
2 through the Air Lake Industrial Area, an area that
3 is zoned by Lakeville as commercial/industrial. You
4 would not normally have young children in this area,
5 it's already commercial/industrial. As far as
6 aesthetics go, people are used to seeing heavy
7 industrial infrastructure, including power lines, in
8 such a setting, not out across beautiful --
9 beautiful, serene fields. That's what we have in
10 Eureka, that's why we're out here.
11 There are certainly very real engineering
12 and cost issues associated with that route because
13 of having to clear underneath the flight patterns of
14 Air Lake Airport. I believe there are technical
15 solutions; they're not cheap, but it's a quality of
16 life issue for the residents of Eureka Township.
17 We ask for continued and serious
18 consideration of this alternative route. There is
19 an existing 115 volt (sic) line in this corridor
20 that would have to be relocated or some other
21 solution found to accommodate the 345 going through
22 it. I believe there are further alternatives that
23 can be looked at here. The initial one we suggested
24 was rerouting when there's -- it's particularly
25 tight for about a two-block region right through the

heart of Air Lake Industrial Park. The initial proposal we had was suggesting that the 115 be rerouted because it doesn't require as wide an easement.

Another possibility that I brought up today that I want to enter into the record, is to consider putting the 115 underground where it is currently so that the new 345 can go aboveground. It's very expensive. From our previous conversations, I do understand it's very expensive to put a high-voltage power line underground. The issue is heat, they have to actually put cooling pipes down there to go along with the wires, as well as, obviously, the cost of tunneling. We've been told that the cost to do that is on the order of ten times the cost per mile to put wire in that way. My preliminary understanding is it would not be nearly as expensive to do the 115s because there's not as much heat generated, you wouldn't have to go as deep, issues like that that may make it less expensive.

So I hope there will be further, continued study of that corridor. That certainly is preferable to bring it down through the township.

The primary route that's been identified

1 goes through the middle of Eureka Township,
2 approximately -- generally following 240th Street.
3 That is where the highest population density is in
4 our township. Also, because of the way typical
5 rural areas develop, a great many of the homes are
6 very close to the narrow township roads. We
7 typically have a road width of about 23, 25 feet. A
8 typical easement -- we don't have easements defined
9 for our roads, but they're typically 33 feet versus
10 about 66 feet for a county road, for example.
11 So there's more potential to overlap,
12 where there's already a public right-of-way. With
13 the alternate route, it goes predominately along
14 Highway 6 (sic) at the southern boundary of Eureka
15 Township -- I'm sorry, I said Highway eighty -- yes,
16 it's 86. I get my numbers confused, excuse me.
17 I would hope there would be more serious
18 consideration of that route. There are more
19 environmental issues down there, but there are also
20 fewer homes in total and many of them are further
21 set back from the road because it's been a
22 high-speed road and just the nature of the rolling
23 land there, more of the homes are further away. So
24 I believe the setback issue would be less of a
25 concern there for those residents.

1 Picking either of those routes over the
2 other is like -- for us, it's like choosing which
3 one of your children to sacrifice. Neither is a
4 good choice. That's why we're strongly
5 encouraging -- knowing it's a more expensive route,
6 but it's also a route through the southern part of
7 Lakeville. It's commercial/industrial, it's mostly
8 adults that are in that corridor working during the
9 daylight hours -- or the day hours, the dayshift,
10 basically. It's not people living around the clock,
11 with children playing, especially during the summer
12 where they're around 24 hours a day, in the house or
13 playing outside under the power lines. So I hope
14 that can be an increased consideration in this
15 routing.
16 Thank you very much.
17 MR. EK: Thank you, sir. And I just
18 wanted to clarify that you're talking about that
19 County 70 route, which is, I believe, in the
20 application?
21 MR. OTTO: Yes. That would be coming
22 east --
23 MR. EK: Right. Right.
24 MR. OTTO: Well, it would jogging north
25 from the Lake Marion site and following an alignment

1 that's basically the corridor of 70 --
2 MR. EK: Okay.
3 MR. OTTO: -- through Air Lake. And
4 then, obviously once it gets close to Farmington, it
5 would either swing back, probably to the south, and
6 join up with the existing options --
7 MR. EK: Sure.
8 MR. OTTO: -- to the east. I'm talking
9 about the Eureka portion that would be --
10 MR. EK: Right.
11 MR. OTTO: -- the most affected.
12 MR. EK: I just wanted to make we had
13 that clear, and that's what you're advocating as a
14 alternative. I also wanted to let you know, at the
15 morning's meeting, we were fortunate enough to have
16 this, the report you referenced, submitted as a
17 comment, so we do have this to look at now.
18 Electric and magnetic fields have come up
19 at every meeting that we've had, we know it's an
20 important issue. EISs don't come along all that
21 often for transmission lines -- environmental impact
22 statements. So I think this is a really good
23 opportunity for us to dig into that EMF issue again
24 and look at the new research, look at the new stuff
25 that's come out. You know, some -- we've been

1 looking at the old stuff. So yeah, this will be a
2 good opportunity and I'm happy to receive new
3 documentation like this so we can take a look at it
4 in the EIS.
5 So thank you.
6 MR. OTTO: Very good, thank you.
7 MR. EK: Next comment.
8 MS. EILERS: My name's Beth Eilers,
9 E-I-L-E-R-S. I'm at 10185 250th Street West.
10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you have them
11 stand closer the mic?
12 MS. EILERS: I'm short.
13 I have to chuckle a little bit at the
14 table on his a little bit here -- on the study, I
15 don't know who put this table together out here, if
16 it was the state or if it was the applicant, but
17 there's a WHO report on the magnetic fields. And
18 it, basically, states that the effects are
19 inconclusive because it's got this little caveat
20 that says that just in case we're wrong regarding
21 the long-term -- short-term effects for people that
22 are working around them, we've established standards
23 just in case we're wrong. So if the workers are
24 there, we have to have some OSHA compliance there.
25 So I think that it would be remarkably

important for you to go page through page on that study and any other study that might be out there, as well, that's maybe more recent than the WHO one, which is about 20 years old.

I had a couple of quick questions, and I don't know if you can answer this or not. I've never heard any information about what factors were used to determine the need for this line to begin with. What are we basing the need on for this line? Is this a Minnesota need, is this a need that's going elsewhere to another state, that it's going to connect on through to another state, what is -- what is the basis for this need? Because I haven't heard about any rolling blackouts in Minnesota yet. So I was just curious, if you could answer that for me when I'm done.

The other thing, again, on the homes, the alternative route on County Road 86, certainly significantly impacts fewer properties -- properties, including property values, fewer people, agricultural places, as well as the wetlands.

That said, urban sprawl is coming there. So I would strongly recommend that you do follow County Road 70 because they're done, and it's mostly industrial there. But you can be guaranteed that

urban sprawl is coming there lickety-split, just like it is coming to Eureka Township.

And I know that there are some of these big lines out elsewhere, but they -- like in Inver Grove Heights, for example, but those houses were built and -- as far as I know, when those power lines came in so they didn't have them planted in their backyard after they put a house up.

So the other question I -- the other comment that I have -- and this is just an observation, sir, you talked about that there were community meetings that you had as you were getting up to this permit process, and I appreciate that you guys did that. However, you did put a spin on it that it sounds like the community and the leaders and all the representatives of the state, as well as the people doing the permitting process, have all agreed that this is a good idea and that this is the best place for it to go. And I would be one of the people in the community that strongly disagree with you.

Thank you. If you could answer that first question.

MR. EK: Yeah. Well, just the question you had -- your last statement, my part of this

1 project, as a project manager -- this is all a
2 proposal. So we're not necessarily saying at all
3 that this is the best place to go --
4 MS. EILERS: Right.
5 MR. EK: -- so that's --
6 MS. EILERS: I'm not -- I'm saying that's
7 the spin the other gentleman made.
8 MR. EK: Oh, okay. No. But here's the
9 deal, this is the reason for these meetings we have,
10 so we can get your input that it's maybe not the
11 best place to go, so we can take a look at that when
12 we go through this process. That's why it's
13 important to get your comments. And no, we're not
14 advocating anything right now, at all. So --
15 MS. EILERS: Can you answer that first
16 question, though, on the need?
17 MR. EK: The certificate of need, yeah.
18 And here's how that goes, I'm not part -- there's
19 two parts to this, there's a need process, which is
20 a different docket. It's still the same project,
21 there's actually four projects, I believe, involved
22 in that need that are included in what's the CapX
23 initiative -- the first CapX initiative. This right
24 here, what we're doing today and the meetings we're
25 having and that process I described, is the routing.

1 So in the past couple of years, they've been going
2 through this certificate of need and having comment
3 periods, having hearings, having public meetings as
4 it regards to the need of even having this line.
5 Now, I'm not part of that process so I
6 can't answer details about it. But what I can tell
7 you, it's come to a close. And next week, next
8 Wednesday and next Thursday -- Wednesday, they're
9 going to -- at the Public Utilities Commission they
10 will be having oral arguments. The public's welcome
11 to attend; however, it's not an opportunity for the
12 public to raise their hand and comment. It's an
13 opportunity to listen. The oral arguments are from
14 folks who have been involved with that whole need
15 process for -- what, a couple years I believe it's
16 gone on. So Wednesday that will happen, the
17 Commission will listen to that.
18 Thursday is what -- is called
19 deliberation, the Commission will then deliberate.
20 You're welcome to attend that as well and listen.
21 And that's when the Commission would make a decision
22 on whether this project is needed. If they say yes,
23 it's needed, we continue with this routing process.
24 If they say no, it's not needed or some other --
25 let's just say no, it's not needed, this whole

routing process ends as of that date because the project and the line would not be needed.

So you're more than welcome to attend those meetings, and if you want to get with me after, I can give you the times and the locations.

MS. EILERS: Do you know if that document is online anywhere?

MR. EK: Yeah. I can't -- not off the top of my head because I'm not --

MS. EILERS: Okay.

MR. EK: It's a separate process.

MS. EILERS: Okay.

MR. EK: Off the top of my head, I can't get it to you, but I can --

MS. EILERS: Okay.

MR. EK: -- get you the information --

MS. EILERS: Okay.

MR. EK: -- you know, after the meeting so you can look that up and find that.

MS. EILERS: Okay.

MR. EK: And so --

MS. EILERS: I do have to say that it would be kind of ridiculous if they found that there was no need at this point with all the money that we've already spent in this process, just in your

road show that you're doing alone.

MR. EK: Actually, the utility companies are spending the money. It's their gamble right now. It's their gamble on whether --

MS. EILERS: So they're paying your salary?

MR. EK: Huh?

MS. EILERS: They're paying your salary?

MR. EK: Yeah. They are paying -- yeah, it comes out of the permit process so --

MS. EILERS: All right.

MR. EK: -- they have to pay for the permit process and so forth.

MS. EILERS: Okay.

MR. EK: So it's the power company's gamble that it would be needed or not needed --

MS. EILERS: Okay.

MR. EK: -- and whether it goes forward.

Very good comment, thank you.

Yes, sir.

MR. PIPER: John Piper, 11770 250th Street East, Lakeville.

You know, on with that -- you know, I saw that -- is it Great River -- is a consortium of many power supplies and that article in the Pioneer

1 Press, I'm sure you're aware of it, where it looks
2 like it's going to be shipped to Chicago; is that
3 right?
4 MR. POORKER: I haven't seen the article,
5 so I don't know.
6 MR. PIPER: At first it goes, you know,
7 down to Madison, then Milwaukee, then Chicago, so
8 why do we care? Why?
9 MR. EK: I guess we don't understand, why
10 do we care --
11 MR. PIPER: Well, I mean, why are they
12 running it through Minnesota? Isn't it because they
13 can't get it passed in Wisconsin?
14 MR. EK: That -- yeah, that comes down to
15 a need issue and that's part of that --
16 MR. PIPER: Right.
17 MR. EK: -- need process --
18 MR. PIPER: Yeah.
19 MR. EK: And so in routing -- you know, I
20 can't answer, I don't know. I really don't --
21 MR. PIPER: Right.
22 MR. EK: -- have an answer to your
23 question.
24 MR. PIPER: Well, from an engineering
25 standpoint, it's ridiculous. And I'm sure you're

1 going to point out, too -- I figure it's going to be
2 70 percent loss; is that not correct?
3 MR. POORKER: Incorrect.
4 MR. PIPER: Okay. What's the loss, then,
5 what do you figure it is?
6 MR. POORKER: I would say -- I've been
7 told by our engineers, five to ten percent.
8 MR. PIPER: No. In heat, due to
9 reactants and inductants, I don't buy that.
10 MR. POORKER: Okay.
11 MR. PIPER: What he just said a minute
12 ago, where they have to put cooling pipes just for a
13 115-k (sic) line would show everybody here that
14 obviously there's a lot of energy being wasted with
15 heat.
16 It makes more sense, if you're going to
17 be using that, to use it locally. You know, whether
18 it's nuclear or coal or wind, it's kind of stupid to
19 go clear across the country pushing power, and AC is
20 the most inefficient way, obviously. You know, he
21 beat Tesla, obviously -- Edison beat Tesla, but DC
22 would have been a much better way for transport.
23 Then you don't have all these other problems with
24 reactants and inductants.
25 But I think some of the things that, you

know, haven't been discussed is why aren't -- I believe somebody out there said -- that lady there said there's a state law that it can't go down an interstate highway, well, why? Let's change that law, why can't they come across at 90, come up 52, and not affect anybody?

MR. EK: Actually, that's not true. You can go down state highways.

MR. PIPER: Well, then why aren't they doing it, why are you affecting all these people? You've got people here -- there you go, let's here it.

MR. EK: No. There's no state law, there's negotiation between MnDOT and right-of-ways and so forth, but maybe Craig can -- you know, I can't answer why the route's placed where it is right now, but there is no law that says you can't go down a highway right-of-way.

MR. PIPER: Well, she said something about that; isn't that right?

MR. POORKER: All right. The issue is, sometimes -- the criteria that we look for in routing this transmission line, and some of the information that we got from people all along the corridor was -- number one criteria was proximity to

homes. That was our biggest issue in routing this transmission line.

Number two --

MR. PIPER: Okay. Then why aren't you coming up --

MR. POORKER: Number two --

MR. PIPER: -- across 90?

MR. POORKER: Number two, people said do your best to follow existing infrastructure that's already there, that's roadways, existing transmission lines, railways, and things like that. And that's -- we also made an attempt to do that.

Other folks told us, don't go along the roadways, follow field lines or quarter section lines, property lines, things like that. Following I-90, that's a long, long ways from here and that would really, I would guess, introduce some significant energy losses by the time we got all the down to 90 and then back up Hampton substation.

MR. PIPER: Your own company, in that -- that same article, trying to get this thing passed, said that it wasn't true, that it was just coal coming out of South Dakota, that it was picking up wind energy coming from that corridor, you know, Pipestone and on over. So that -- you know,

1 somebody's lying.
2 MR. POORKER: Again, I haven't seen that
3 article, but I can tell you what I know about this
4 project. So I'm not sure what project that is, this
5 project is running from Brookings County area in
6 South Dakota, which is one of the most wind-rich
7 production areas in this country. And there's a lot
8 of wind generation coming on line, there are wind
9 projects waiting for this transmission line to get
10 that product to the market, which is here in the
11 Twin Cities area.
12 At the same time, there will be other
13 generation sources coming on line all along the
14 project and that's why we have substations every 25
15 to 50 miles. Those are off ramps to get the
16 electricity to where a lot on the growth has
17 happened, which is in, for instance, Marshall --
18 Marshall, Minnesota, the New Prague area, in Helena
19 or Derrynane Township, and the Twin Cities area. So
20 that it is a significant resource out there in
21 Minnesota and South Dakota and North Dakota.
22 I think that your comment is, is this
23 going to be carrying coal-fired generation? The
24 answer is most likely, yes. When that wind isn't
25 blowing and you have a transmission line sitting

there and there's a big draw in the Twin Cities pulling electricity that way, the wind's not blowing, it's going to be coal-fired, it's going to be hydroelectric dam, or it's going to be nuclear energy on there or some other -- possibly a clean energy.

MR. PIPER: Well, then I think you need to publish the exact figures then for what's going to be -- where is this power going to be used? Is it going to be used mainly in Minnesota, or is it going to be used in Wisconsin where it's going to Madison, Milwaukee and Chicago?

MR. POORKER: Ah --

MR. PIPER: If we've got to suffer this because of Wisconsin and Illinois, there's going be a lot of unhappy people here, I think.

MR. POORKER: Yup, I can understand that. That is -- and again, you're talking the need issue which has been out there for two to three years now and that has been studied. But one thing about Minnesota, overall, we are an energy importer. We do not have enough generation in this state to satisfy all the needs in Minnesota alone, so we import more electricity than we export.

Does it cross state lines? It crosses

state lines. This line is not being built to go all the way to Chicago, this line is being built for the Twin Cities area and the surrounding region -- surrounding five-state area. There has been a significant population increase in this state in 30 years. That's the last time we built a big transmission in this state, was 30 years ago. The population has doubled in that time, our electric consumption has doubled in that time, if not more.

So there is a huge demand in the Twin Cities, and not just the Twin Cities, but all -- in the five-state area and some of these areas that have grown so rapidly.

MR. PIPER: Well, then what's the point of building the line, then, to Madison and Milwaukee and Chicago?

MR. POORKER: That I don't know. I'm not familiar with that. I'm working on this project, which starts at Brookings County and it ends at Hampton.

MR. PIPER: Well, they need --

MR. POORKER: We're here to talk about that project and that route, that's all I know.

MR. PIPER: You're going to have to talk with the powers that be, then, and, you know, get

your stories straight.

MR. POORKER: I gave it to you just straight, just now.

MR. PIPER: Okay. All right. Well, then somebody's going to have call the Pioneer Press and refute that article, then.

But the other thing -- I've got a whole bunch of questions here. You know, the biggest thing is a lot of people here with farmland that they have purchased and used and hoped, when they're near retirement age, that they could sell that for development. Now, when you run a line that's going to go right between -- it's going to -- my rear fence line between me and Storely (phonetic). And as far as I'm concerned, I would be willing to bet it's just going to be like that sewer line, they're going to offer us agricultural prices at 5,500 an acre. And yet, you know, it was selling for approaching 100,000 an acre.

So our -- what's going to happen with the loss of property value, what was -- we're hoping to sell for close to 100,000, now it was going to be worthless because who's going to want to build a house or a home --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's all about

money.

MR. PIPER: That's right, it's all about money. Who's going to want to build -- who's going to want to build homes there? So I've lost my retirement and I've been paying taxes all these years for nothing.

So I mean, that's not going to be -- is that going to be included? Are you going to give these people like myself and my neighbors, are you going to give us the difference, then, what we're going to lose?

MR. EK: Craig can talk to the easement process because the State doesn't get into that, of course. It's a negotiation between the company and the landowner.

But just to let you know, you know, what you see on these maps and when you go back to these stations here, you can suggest. Just because you see the line on these maps and it may go by your property, along your property line, you have an opportunity during this comment period to submit an alternative to what you do see and have that -- you know, suggest that that line be moved to a different location off of your property. And that is -- I just want to let you know that is an option. So I

do suggest --

MR. PIPER: Well, what if it's not an option, are you going to make up the difference? I'm looking at two million and I'm going to lose it. Am I going to get less than 100,000 to sell, then, strictly for agriculture -- 200,000, big deal. So are you going to make up the difference of 800,000 -- or I mean 180,000 -- or 1,800,000, are you going to make up that difference?

MR. POORKER: Okay. Let's talk a little about easement acquisition. We do have to acquire easements for this project, that is required by law. That is required by our constitution in the United States, that we do have to pay just compensation. The definition of just compensation is left up to the State. We do pay for our easements for this transmission line and we will -- no matter what property we cross, every single property we cross, we have to get an easement.

What is that easement going to be? Your property is different from anybody else's, so each -- we look at each and every property and pay them to how we affect it.

So easement value, we pay based on a per-acre value and I have a tough time believing

that property's only worth $5,000 where you're at, because I know it's much higher than that in this area.

MR. PIPER: Well, I said, but after this goes through, that's what it's going to be worth.

MR. POORKER: So we pay for easements, we pay for crop damages, we pay for soil compaction, we pay for damage to your fences, we pay for damage to drain tile, we pay for impacts to land values. If we have impacted your land --

MR. PIPER: No. I'm talking, are you going pay for the -- land values, are you going to make up that difference --

MR. POORKER: And --

MR. PIPER: -- that we're going to lose?

MR. POORKER: -- we pay your impact to your land value. So if we impact the value of your property because of this transmission line, yes. The answer is yes, we do pay you for that.

And there are ways to figure that out, there are appraisers out there that specialize in this kind of work. Your land values now, as opposed to when -- if there's a transmission line crossing it, and that is the difference that we pay. Not just for easement value, but your impacts to land

value as well.

MR. PIPER: I guess I can't hardly believe you're going to do it for 1.7 million (sic), then.

MR. POORKER: Okay.

MR. PIPER: Anyway, but I had two more questions. For example, you're -- what about interference for radio, cellular, and television?

MR. EK: Yeah. We've done plenty of those studies in the past. We've done studies with 115 kV, 345 kV, we've found that not to be an issue. We've studied that, found it -- the transmission lines not to impact television, radio, and GPS and so forth.

However, we will be studying that further in this EIS --

MR. PIPER: Right.

MR. EK: -- just to look at that and make sure we have the up-to-date data.

MR. PIPER: I think people that are receiving signal, once we do finally cut over to high definition, it's going to be much more critical than when it was just a --

MR. EK: Yeah. And that might be something to look at because that's something new

that's on the horizon that we haven't looked at in the past.

MR. PIPER: I think there's going to be a lot of people that aren't going to receive television, for example, over an antenna anymore after this goes through. And I would guess that it's probably 2,500 feet on either side.

MR. EK: Yeah. Well, then -- just as a comparison, then, people in the Twin Cities area with transmission lines running everywhere, that would -- the logic would say that they're not receiving television signals as well.

MR. PIPER: Well, yeah, but they haven't cut over yet.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, they have.

MR. PIPER: Not completely.

MR. EK: Well, there's plenty of people that have cut over and that are receiving over-air signals. I can just say we've studied it and we found it not to be an impact. And that's a good comparison, if you're in the Twin Cities, we're still receiving television and radio reception, and there's many more power lines crisscrossing the Twin Cities area, just as a comparison for you.

MR. PIPER: Okay. Well, then the last

question I've got is on the -- someday if this is moved, who removes the 30 foot of concrete then for the towers? And are you going to have to build a road, too?

MR. POORKER: A road to --

MR. PIPER: Maintain them, yeah.

MR. POORKER: If we're routing a transmission line along a road, the road's already there for us to get to it to maintain it.

MR. PIPER: Well --

MR. POORKER: If we're going along a field line or a property line, we would not build a road. We would restore it after it's done and it does take some time to restore ag land after it's been compacted like that. It does take some work and it does take some time. But we won't be building a road to that.

We do inspect them, we can inspect it from the air in those cases where we are going along a property line or a field line or through a field or something like that, so that we're aren't driving out there all the time.

If we need to look at it from the ground, we would most likely do that in the wintertime when everything is frozen.

MR. PIPER: What about if you do decide to move it or tear it down --

MR. POORKER: Um-hmm.

MR. PIPER: -- are you going to rip out that 30 feet of concrete, then?

MR. POORKER: We would -- we do have to remove some of it, but 30 feet would -- most likely, no, that's pretty tough to do. And we've had to do that in the past. And we negotiate with the landowner, how far down do we need to go that so it's not impacting your ag or future building plans or anything like that. And we have had to relocate them in Dakota County and generally, it's a -- to a four-foot level, anyway, that we have to remove that concrete. And it's -- just to remove that four feet is a significant project in itself, it's an effort.

MR. PIPER: So basically you're saying the most you'd take away is four -- the top four feet?

MR. POORKER: Well, we'll work with you as the landowner. If we need to take more than that because you have some plans, we can certainly work on that. If you need to do some earth moving for something, say you need to do some gravel mining, we'd take out what you need to get down to that

level. We can take out four, five, six feet and do your excavating. We'd probably come back and take out -- if you need to go deeper, take out some more.

We're not in the business of preventing something -- what you need to do if we need to remove something like that.

MR. PIPER: Okay. Okay. Thank you.

MR. POORKER: Thank you.

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

Yes, ma'am, if you could state and spell your name, please.

MS. HOWARD: Karen Howard, and I live at 24580 Dakota Avenue and that's Lakeville, city of New Market.

I have one of the bigger properties in Scott County. And the other three speakers covered a lot of what I want to say and some of them really know more than I know about your routing. But what I do know is one mile, minimum, of my property line is what you want to cross. And I don't like it and my daughter who runs the ranch doesn't like it, nobody in our neighborhood likes it. Plus, you're going over one of my neighbors' homes.

Now, the first letter I got mentioning

this project was from someone in Scott County that said it could go to Rice County and would give us -- it would be affecting 109 homes, whereas in the town of New Market, it's Scott County there, it's 124 homes that it would affect.

And mine is more personal. You know, I bought the property 11 and a half years ago, it's a farm and it is farmed. We have animals, we have horses, we have a bald eagle nesting where you want to take down trees on my property line, because you would have to take down almost all the trees we have on that property because that's exactly where you want to go.

I don't care where your line goes, just don't go on my property and don't go on my neighbors' property because I don't want it to cross their homes.

Many years ago in Bloomington there was a home I was looking at. Then I looked at the next -- home next to it and then I realized, oh, my goodness, they have the power lines going over it. Not just power lines, your big ones like you want to put in. And then I found out that there was the electromagnetic fields going over it. That property has never sold, will never sell because there is too

many electromagnetic whatever they're called, fields coming out of it.

And people in that area were sick. Now, true, when you want something bad enough and you have all these studies, they're inconclusive. Well, I'm telling you it does affect people. Because they're -- the lines are humming all the time, what do you think happens to dogs and wild animals and things like that? We have deer, we have fox, we have blue herons and ducks and geese and everything in our pond. You want to go right through my pond, my wetland that we've been preserving because we like the animals, we like the wildlife, we like our tame animals.

But mine's really personal because I don't want the noise, I don't want the disruption. I lived through my father having a farm, putting a gas line through the middle of his property. It disrupted it for over two years. I don't want the disruption, I moved out there for peace and quiet. I don't want it on my property.

One -- you know, whether you have ten acres or you have a mile that it's going across, it's disruptive. Now, move it to Rice County, I think most of us would be happy. Move it to

Wisconsin, I'd be happy, they probably won't be happy either. But the value of my property is significant now, it will not be if you cross my property line. It will not be.

And right now, we're doing everything we can to maintain our drain tile, to maintain the property and, quite frankly, none of us have a lot of money to throw out the window right now. And I don't want the property values decreased there. And I have not been planning on selling my property now, but you better believe I will at some point. I would not buy a property myself with major high-line wires running across it, nor would I have bought my property if I thought it was going to run across it.

When I moved there, the city of New Market made me bury my lines. All of the lines going into property, the mouse (sic) sits -- or the house sits one half-mile off the property, so it's way back because we wanted quiet and solitude. Well, all the lines are buried. Now you want to put those big ugly lines across my property with the humming noise and the electromagnetic fields?

I am not happy personally with that. I don't care how much money you give me, I won't be happy. And right now that property is extremely

valuable to me, personally, but extremely valuable to somebody who wants to buy it. And I don't want to lose that value, whether it's real or imagined, I don't want to lose it.

Thank you.

MR. EK: Thanks for your comment. Just to clarify, you were directing your comments as you/me. I work for the State of Minnesota, we're not in the business of proposing transmission lines. My job is to --

MS. HOWARD: You, me, or whoever you represent.

MR. EK: I'm with the State of Minnesota.

MS. HOWARD: Okay, fine. I don't want the State of Minnesota crossing my boundary lines.

MR. EK: No, the State of Minnesota is not proposing this transmission line.

MS. HOWARD: Okay. I don't want the power line on my line (sic) -- on my property, period.

MR. EK: Right. And what I suggest --

MS. HOWARD: There's no amount of money that could make up for it.

MR. EK: So what I suggest to you is, this is your opportunity, you've provided your

comment. One, I heard a comment that you suggested that the alternative route would be better than the preferred; am I correct?

MS. HOWARD: Any alternative route, just don't go over my neighbors' property or mine.

MR. EK: Certainly. And here's what I also suggest, then, is you go into the back, have a map printed out of your property, that general area, and as I've told folks here before, show us a route around your property, show us an alternative that we can look at so it doesn't cross your property. We need to know where you live, where your property is so we can take a look at that in the EIS and look at that as an alternative. Because if we don't hear from you and we don't know where your property is --

MS. HOWARD: You will hear from me.

MR. EK: Yes. I hope so, I really hope so.

MS. HOWARD: Well --

MR. EK: Because that's part of this whole process and it's really important, because if we don't, then we can't look at an alternative of going around your property. So --

MS. HOWARD: Okay. Thank you.

MR. EK: -- I really hope you do submit an

alternative.

Thank you.

MS. RICE: Terriann Rice, 4500 222nd Street in Hampton.

I am going to suggest a proposed routing change for Highway 50 going east from Blaine Avenue to Hampton, instead of going down 220th Street to go up and go on 215th Street. The proposed line right now coming off of Highway 50 -- Highway 50 turns, it goes, like, straight and then it turns. Well, where it turns, the proposed line is supposed to go straight. There's two houses directly, in effect, right there. The first one are my neighbors. It's supposed to go right by their house, it's a brand new home, it's a beautiful home. They have three little kids, they're very concerned about it.

And then the next place is my home. We have six acres out in the country. Unlike the woman who just talked right now, we bought the place for the intrinsic value. It's out in the country, we're a half mile off the road. It's -- we have a portrait photography studio right now there, that's why we bought the place.

And the proposed line -- my first question was, if this line does go through our

1 home -- well, first off, the yellow route affected
2 28 homes from Highway 50 to the station (sic). If
3 we go the alternate route, which I'm proposing,
4 there are only four to six homes affected.
5 Though that routing would go along an
6 existing road, which I know for a fact, that's my --
7 road, just down the road, all those houses are off
8 of the road, so none of them would be affected
9 because the poles would be right on the road. All
10 those houses are offset as well, they all have long
11 driveways, we're all out in the country there.
12 So 28 to 4, so I suggest that. I will
13 turn this in so that it can be reviewed. But some
14 of the questions that I had were, number one, our
15 property is kind of unique in that we're surrounded
16 by farm fields. We own a six-acre section -- a
17 five-acre section in the middle of farm fields, with
18 a mile -- half-mile-long driveway, one acre being
19 driveway.
20 So here's our driveway, here's our lot,
21 farm, farm, farm (indicating). Now, all the farms
22 around us are owned by different farm owners and
23 they don't farm their land. In fact, some of them
24 don't even live around here. The line is actually
25 proposed to come through -- not really on our

1 property, go over the driveway, which is only
2 66 feet because that's where it turns. But then it
3 comes right in front of our house, which isn't
4 technically on our property because it's on the
5 farmland, but it's right out our window.
6 As the woman before just suggested, too,
7 when our home -- our home was built in 1890, it's
8 been restored, it's a historical -- it's very
9 beautiful. And the lady that had restored it
10 actually had the buried phone lines and electrical
11 lines so there is absolutely nothing around a whole
12 two-mile area there. It's actually beautiful. So
13 putting these power poles on our land would affect
14 that, not being able to sell the property. I would
15 have never purchased the property had those power
16 lines been there.
17 And number two, with my business,
18 photography studios are very competitive. I'm a
19 sole proprietor, a woman-owned business, trying to
20 make it on my own. That's my only income, I'm
21 there -- we've been there for six years, been
22 building things, waterfalls, we've landscaped, we've
23 planted 300 trees. It's a beautiful property.
24 And here the line comes through, people
25 start questioning, oh, we're not going to go there

anymore because now there's these power poles. And the pregnant mothers that come to get their pictures taken at my studio think, well, there might be poison radiation there.

The little kids that come out and take pictures out by the pond and all that kind of stuff, they'll see these power poles sitting there and it's like, wow, I don't really care to go there anymore, I can just go down the road to the next photography studio.

So my question around that, not only from a business point, is the decreased value and all that kind of stuff, when the power line comes across our land, because it only technically comes across 66 feet of it, how much compensation would that be for me since it's not really on my land, it's on a farm field but it will drastically affect my business, I believe, and cause us to probably want to even move?

Moving a photography studio is not an easy task, it's not like moving from a building to a building. It's establishing landscaping, it's -- everything. It takes years and years and thousands of dollars of work, so that would be my question with that.

MR. EK: Yeah. That's an easement question, I'll have to ask Craig --

MS. RICE: Right.

MR. EK: -- to answer that. But you've already submitted a comment, I believe?

MS. RICE: Yeah. You just got it, yeah.

MR. EK: And I read it, yes.

MS. RICE: But now I -- this new one, I went out and took pictures today and I drew in where the line was going to be so you can physically see. Because I'm not so sure that someone's actually physical come on my property and figured out, you know, how close it really is to my home and our land and the value. So I have pictures that I'll be turning in.

MR. EK: No. That's great. I just wanted to let you know I read your comment letter already.

MS. RICE: Okay. Thanks, Scott. I appreciate it.

MR. EK: Craig, if you could answer the easement question, please?

MR. POORKER: Unfortunately, we do pay for easements that cross property. So if that easement line goes up to your property line,

unfortunately, there's no way to compensate an adjacent landowner for that. That question has come up before, what if you live across the road from the transmission line, what do they get for an easement payment? That is, however, an aesthetic evaluate -- aesthetic criteria that needs to be evaluated. It was evaluated by us, but now it has to be evaluated by the State and their consulting engineer as well and the impact that that may have on adjacent landowners.

So regardless of whether or not you have a pole on your property, if that easement line does cross onto any private property, we have to pay that person for an easement.

MS. RICE: Okay. And how close can a line be to a house? I've read in studies that they should be at least 400 feet away, as far as health concerns. It looks like, according to the printout that I got, that it's not 400 feet, it's like, you know, right off our property. So what's the -- how far are they staying away from the homes?

MR. POORKER: With this project, there will be no houses -- occupied homes within our easement. Now, that's pretty close, that's only 75 feet either side of the transmission line. And

we are making an effort all along the project to stay as far as we can away from any occupied homes.

To get through Scott County, Dakota County, it was a really significant challenge for us because this is the metro area. There's been a lot of growth, a lot of urban sprawl, and it was really, really difficult for us to get across those two counties.

MS. RICE: Right, I understand.

So then going back to the suggestion, being, it would be great to, you know, look at that alternative routing going up to 215th Street and then reducing the number of people involved in that. And then also, you know, has anyone thought about burying the lines? I mean, is there issues with burying that in pipe? Other lines are buried, has that been considered?

MR. POORKER: That is a question that comes up very frequently, burying 345 kV transmission lines. These are significantly large, I'm not going to kid you about that, they are big transmission lines and they run hot enough that it makes it very, very difficult to bury a transmission line of this size for very long.

It may be investigated -- or it could be

1 investigated at possible river location sites,
2 sometimes that becomes an issue. But for burying
3 something this size, there's so much heat coming off
4 those wires, it makes it difficult to bury that.
5 And also, it's -- trenching it involves a lot of
6 trenching. And we've heard significant concerns
7 about wetland issues and trenching, of course, is
8 very invasive.
9 And then, also, it comes down to a
10 maintenance issue as well. It's easier for us to
11 inspect the line when it's aboveground and find a
12 fault if there is one, if something goes wrong. If
13 the line is buried and something goes wrong, it's
14 not so easy for us to find out what did go wrong.
15 And once we find it, it takes considerably longer to
16 repair what is -- whatever the fault may be,
17 whatever's wrong. Because now, again, we're digging
18 up your property to repair whatever may need
19 repairing.
20 MS. RICE: Right. Okay. A couple of
21 other things is, since our driveway's a half mile
22 long, in order to put those poles in, people would
23 have to be driving down our driveway and -- with big
24 machines. One of the other gentlemen said that it
25 was a two-year process or whatever, however long

that takes. And that would probably disrupt my business quite a bit and really affect our driveway, so how would that be handled?

MR. POORKER: Yes. It is a construction project, no doubt. And it is significant for a period of time, and we'd have to probably look at that. Impacts to businesses have significance because that is your livelihood. And that is something we would need to address, is that impact to a going concern, it's called -- I think that's a legal term for that.

Construction wise, it would probably take a couple years to get the whole project done. What it would be in one specific area, I don't think it would take that long. But again, there would be some restoration period in there to reestablish what was there beforehand.

If there's damage to roadways or driveways or anything, that is something that we either need to fix or pay you as a landowner so that you can fix it the way you want to fix it.

MS. RICE: Okay. The gentleman was talking about decreased value in the sale of his farm. And since I only have 66 feet of easement -- or of right-of-way or whatever, when they cross,

when we go to sell our home, that's going to drastically decrease the value of that, even though it's technically not on our land. So you're saying that we would not, in any way, be compensated for that just because it crosses our driveway only?

MR. POORKER: If it crosses your driveway that -- right, that's your private property, I believe. The driveway -- I'm not sure if they have an easement to get back to your property or if you actually own the --

MS. RICE: No, we own the driveway.

MR. POORKER: Okay.

MS. RICE: 66 feet.

MR. POORKER: Yeah, so -- yeah, you're right --

MS. RICE: We would have no compensation for the decreased value of our home at all?

MR. POORKER: If there would be decreased value, I'm not sure. But there is no avenue to pay people for an easement or anything like that when they're in the vicinity. I'm not sure how that would --

MS. RICE: Even though it's really close?

MR. POORKER: Yeah. And I understand that, and there are issues -- and where would it

end? People think that if you're 100 feet away, that's too close. I've heard people say that they're a mile away and that's too close. And so it's a significant issue that we wrestle with.

MS. RICE: And as far as the structures themselves are concerned, we had a tornado go through our property this last year and, you know, it took out tons of things. Do those things go down in tornadoes, and if so, I mean, who's going to be responsible because it's going to come right down on our land and our trees and so --

MR. POORKER: Yup, tornadoes are an issue. That same tornado took down our other transmission line, a small wood pole transmission line, that went down, too. That was an issue we had to deal with quickly. These poles are designed much more robust than that. They sit on a concrete pier, like somebody said, 30 feet into the ground -- 30 to 40 feet, depending on soil. It's a significant steel structure. When these lines -- and it's also built for a lot of wind load and for significant ice load.

And so are these going to fail? I can't say 100 percent that they're not going to fail, but these types of structures do not tip over. If there

is a failure, it's going to up toward the top where the mastrus (phonetic) folds over and hangs there. So it's not like these things are going to tip over when a tornado comes through. I think a way to look at it is if these towers tip over from some storm, it's pretty significant and we'll have bigger issues to deal with if something like that were to happen.

MS. RICE: And Great River Energy, I mean, where are your closest offices, like, if something happened to it, how long would it take before someone came out to fix something?

MR. POORKER: Ah --

MS. RICE: Like if a line snapped or something.

MR. POORKER: I'm not sure where our nearest field office is, if they would come out of Elk River. But we do have satellite offices all around our territories so that they can react very, very quickly. And if we can't be there, we have other electric co-ops that help us out, Dakota Electric is pretty quick at responding as well and they're, of course, real close by.

MS. RICE: Our neighbors, one of their concerns was that it was actually going to go right by their home, over their home -- or just slightly

offset. And they were wondering about -- you know, they immediately want to sell and get the heck out of there. So in that case, does Great River Energy buy their home from them at value, or how do you deal with people who will not want to live there when that final line is -- route is determined?

MR. POORKER: That goes along with the easement acquisition issue. There is a statute out there -- I don't know the number of that statute, but there is one, it's nicknamed Buy the Farm. If you as a landowner want to be bought out by the power company for a transmission line of this size, that is your option, to have us go through the process to do that. So that -- it's called Buy the Farm and it doesn't have to be a farm, it's just a residence or your contiguous property.

MS. RICE: Okay. I think that's it -- oh, he asked about -- we have satellite, so is satellite affected by that at all?

MR. POORKER: A question we get a lot is -- has to do with GPS and how that affects things. And for those of you that are big farmers, you're using GPS to do your farming. And the same thing goes with satellite, that is based on a satellite, that has not been found to have an

impact. Our own surveyors use GPS to do survey work, and of course our surveyors are working directly underneath the wires and transmission lines when they're doing their work, and they have found no impact because of the wires there.

MS. RICE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. POORKER: Thanks.

MR. EK: Thanks, Craig.

Thanks for your comment. And I do suggest a good first step is to submit that alternative that you have tonight or through the mail.

MS. RICE: Okay. I will.

MR. EK: Thank you. Thank you.

Additional comments?

Yes, sir, if you could state and spell your name, please.

MR. SCHERBENSKE: My name is Percy Scherbenske, do you want me to spell it? S-C-H-E-R-B-E-N-S-K-E.

I've got some concerns here, I own the Castle Rock Thoroughbred Farm on Highway 50 between Farmington and Hampton. My address is 3140 220th Street East.

And my horse farm consists of 65 acres.

I have a half-mile frontage on State Highway 50, and my farm roughly starts about where the south branch of the Vermillion River is, that goes right across the edge of my property and goes towards Hampton, which is 2.2 miles away.

I have lived here on this farm with my wife and children for over 25 years and have operated the Castle Rock Thoroughbred Farm, which is a breeding and boarding farm for thoroughbred race horses. Also living on this farm is some farm employees, my farm manager and his wife live there and they have two younger children.

My thoroughbred farming operation consists of pregnant broodmares, yearlings that we board, and foal for clients from a three-state area, which basically would be Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. Most of my clientele's mares are in foal to Kentucky stallions, whose stud fees can approach upward from $25,000, $35,000, $50,000. These are -- they're expensive broodmares.

It has been documented in some of the literature that exposure to ELP (sic), or extra-low frequency magnetic fields greater than 16 milligauss has had a six-fold increase in miscarriages in humans. Thus, I'm a little bit concerned about the

health of the pregnant mares that I board on my farm.

You know, while many of us know about the potential detrimental health effect to humans with these high-voltage power lines, the CapX 2020 project, with this projected route down Highway 50, could affect my business because of these ELP fields. Thus, in turn, could conceivably put me out of business if some of my clients may not want to expose their pregnant mares and foals to such fields.

I also presently have a north-to-south existing 115 kV transmission line on the west end of my property. And with the proposed route of the CapX 2020 project, I would literally be boxed in on two sides by these transmission lines. Besides the health risks and the economic impact on my livelihood, my property value would be extremely deflated.

I'd like to urge the State Office of Energy Security to request that the CapX 2020 seek an alternate route for their 345 kV line which does not impact so many people and businesses as the current route plan does.

And I've also got some comments to make.

We heard about compensation of landowners and some of these -- and this doesn't affect the power company, but I know when they rebuilt Highway 50 they do the process of eminent domain and they take your land. I lost some acreage to that when they redid Highway 50. I was compensated at less than what the Dakota County was taxing me at per acre, so that's not necessarily a fair process that happens.

The next thing we're talking -- the one gentleman over there talked about the impact fees, that when they go across, you know, and construct these lines. It's been two years ago, now, the transmission line that's on my property, 115 kV, when Xcel came through, they redid all the poles. They rooted up my alfalfa fields, I had ruts three to four feet deep. There's gravel spread all over from when they were -- used packing to put their poles in.

I received zero dollars in compensation, nothing. And they rooted up my alfalfa fields, they were bringing in their big trucks with their poles, I received nothing. My driveway was rutted up, I had to take care of that myself. So necessarily -- what they're saying you're going to get compensated for isn't necessarily what's going to happen.

And I, too -- just to give -- you know, this is hard for people to see, but I've got some pictures on how this is going to impact me. There's an aerial picture of my farm, you can see my barn, right here (indicating) is Highway 50. And you're proposed right (sic) is right on the north side of 50, correct?

MR. EK: I can't -- it's a long line, so no, I can't answer that right now.

MR. SCHERBENSKE: You can't answer that, okay.

MR. EK: It's a long line.

MR. SCHERBENSKE: Well, that's where it is on your drawing. And this -- my property border's right here, here's my home (indicating). Like I said, it's 65 acres, these are my different paths for my mares. So this transmission line would be within -- from here to the end of the other side of that room, you know, close to me.

And here's Highway 50 and you can see the way my farm sits and here's (indicating), I believe, the proposed transmission line coming right down there. So these are some photos that I took, if you might want to --

Anyway, that is some of the concerns I

1 have. It's not only I live there, I've lived there
2 for a long time. It's my livelihood, this is how I
3 make my living. So --
4 MR. EK: Certainly. Very good comment,
5 sir.
6 And I guess the first one, kind of, stray
7 voltage and EMF, you referred to you're raising
8 horses and so forth --
9 MR. SCHERBENSKE: Right.
10 MR. EK: -- and that's an issue.
11 Actually, I don't know -- usually it comes up with
12 livestock. It has, actually, this whole week with
13 cows and so and forth, and pigs. But it will be
14 interesting to take a look at what the impact on EMF
15 and stray voltage does have on rearing of horses and
16 so forth.
17 MR. SCHERBENSKE: Well, it's both -- my
18 concern is like with pregnant broodmares because we
19 foal out -- like I say, these mares and they're
20 foaled to extremely expensive stallions. I mean,
21 the economic loss with all these wires coming over
22 my farm like this, you know, my clients, they're
23 going to come out there, are they going to want to
24 subject these pregnant mares to that? I don't think
25 so. It literally puts me out business, and I've

1 been in business for over 25 years.
2 MR. EK: Yeah. And it's our job to find
3 out that information for you and put that in the
4 environmental impact statement so it's there for you
5 to look at and then comment on later so we're sure
6 to get it right.
7 On your question about the construction,
8 it's -- I'm sorry. It's unfortunate that that
9 happened to you during the construction.
10 MR. SCHERBENSKE: Yeah.
11 MR. EK: It should not have happened. In
12 the permits we issue, it's very clearly stated, any
13 damage -- the damage you talk about, the rutting,
14 the compaction, the crop damage, whatever it may be,
15 fences, clearly stated in the permit. And as a
16 matter of fact, we've just been talking, there is a
17 complaint form that goes along with these permits.
18 And with this project, we just thought -- we intend
19 to beef up that complaint form, and that complaint
20 form goes out with the permits.
21 And so what folks can do, if you're not
22 satisfied after this construction and after the line
23 goes in, or even during maintenance when they come
24 out, whatever -- three to five years, whatever the
25 interval may be, you'll have that complain form, you

send it to us. And then go ahead and take care -- go through the channels to make sure that the problems you're having is rectified. Because it is defined in the permit, it is something that needs to be followed and it's unfortunate. I'm sorry to hear that that happened.

MR. SCHERBENSKE: I know it's defined and I received a letter, you know, reporting the damages that you had to your property when we were wrapping things up. I was being real reasonable, I said alls I'd like to do is them to dig up my field and replant what they dug up, and never heard from them again.

MR. EK: Yeah.

MR. SCHERBENSKE: Ever. And I finally -- the next year rolled around, I just did it myself, paid for it myself.

MR. EK: Yeah. And I can say I'm sorry to hear that. That should not have happened and will not happen in the future. You know, we don't want it to happen in the future and I guess it's a matter of people contacting us, too, if it does happen. Contact the Office of Energy Security, contact the PUC, and then we can go through our channels to make sure that any problem's rectified.

1 But I'm sorry to hear about that.
2 But just to let you know, we are
3 intending on beefing up that complaint form --
4 MR. SCHERBENSKE: Right.
5 MR. EK: -- and these procedures.
6 MR. SCHERBENSKE: And that -- you know,
7 like I say, that's small potatoes compared to what
8 this proposed project could do to me right now.
9 MR. EK: Right.
10 MR. SCHERBENSKE: I mean, literally, it
11 puts me out of business.
12 MR. EK: Right. And yeah --
13 MR. SCHERBENSKE: I mean, not only do I
14 live there, my livelihood, the health risks, it
15 literally -- that's how I feed my family.
16 MR. EK: Certainly. And I know you've
17 heard me say this over and over again, but suggest
18 an alternative, suggest an alternative route.
19 You're not -- folks, you're not limited to just, you
20 know, the yellow and blue areas. You don't have to
21 keep that alternative that you have -- just limited
22 to those areas, you can go out of them. And if you
23 see a better route or want to talk with your
24 neighbors and folks around there and say, hey, maybe
25 this line might be better going this way and

connecting up here instead of going, you know, right along my farm, along this line.

That's the whole point of these meetings, is to get that information out. And so I would suggest you go, you know, get a map or go home, pull a map off our website, send it in as a comment before April 30 so we can then take a look at it and maybe solve that problem that you have.

MR. SCHERBENSKE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. EK: Thank you.

Yes, sir.

MR. HELMBERGER: My name is Joel Helmberger, I live in New Market Township.

And I'm going -- if it's okay, I'm going to take the mic and go over to one of these maps. What I wanted to point out to people, because I don't think that a lot of people know about it, this is the Lake Marion substation. This the prime target for this power line coming in, this is the one they really want to hit. I paced that off at lunchtime, here, it's roughly -- it's under two acres right now inside the compound. They're going to add 15 acres to that, they're going to make it into a mega substation. If they do that, we're all going to be at meetings like this in the years to

1 come because every power project that comes through
2 is going to hit here.
3 Thank you.
4 MR. EK: Thank you for your comment.
5 MS. NEWTON: My name is Marjory Newton.
6 I live at 10550 East 245th Street in New Market
7 Township. I'm also representing my dad,
8 Charles Cole, he lives at 10560 245th Street. He's
9 87 and not able to be here.
10 Six years ago we bought 25 acres. Like
11 all these people who bought to be out here, we never
12 would have done this if we knew this was going right
13 over the house we built three years ago. One of the
14 questions I have, it's really difficult, looking at
15 that, to determine exactly if it's really on your
16 property or how close it is, how do you find that
17 out?
18 MR. EK: I'd like to meet you after --
19 MS. NEWTON: I mean -- what, that little
20 dot is our house, but --
21 MR. EK: Yeah. I'd like to meet you
22 after the meeting. There has been complaints about
23 the little dots and that they're not -- they might
24 not be located correctly. They might be located on
25 a barn versus a house versus this or that, or on a

1 corner.
2 The main -- I guess the important part is
3 that that aerial data -- it all comes from the same
4 source, so we're looking at the same base data. So
5 I -- at the state, when I look at these maps, all
6 those little dots to me just point out that there's
7 homes. And I can see the homes on the aerial photo,
8 regardless of how far they are right now.
9 The point of the EIS is to take a look at
10 that information that was supplied in that
11 application and those distances that they supplied
12 and to ensure that they are correct. And vet that
13 information and make sure it's correct in the EIS,
14 then.
15 We don't necessarily -- you know, this is
16 the application that was submitted, but we'll take
17 this data and look at it. I guess the line you see
18 is the -- you're talking just about that little
19 solid line that goes through that shaded area?
20 MS. NEWTON: Well, I mean, I'm on this
21 map down here, but let's say that was my house
22 (indicating), is that -- is that power line going
23 over it, is there a tower going there?
24 MR. EK: Oh, you're talking about the
25 large shaded line. Okay. Yeah. I failed --

1 MS. NEWTON: I mean, how do you know if
2 it's impacted you?
3 MR. EK: At this point -- at this point,
4 you don't. This -- those large shaded areas, most
5 of it's 1,000 feet and that's what's called a route
6 width and that's what the PUC permits, is a width.
7 And --
8 MS. NEWTON: So for 1,000 feet -- I guess
9 the way I visualize it is a tower. Do you pay an
10 easement -- or do you get an easement for the tower
11 or for the line going over your property?
12 MR. EK: Right. Within that
13 1,000 feet -- and you know, there's -- they
14 wouldn't -- they're requesting 1,000 feet, they may
15 not be permitted for a 1,000-foot width. And why
16 they ask for this large of a route width is so the
17 150-foot right-of-way -- I think is what you're
18 getting at, the actual transmission line. You know,
19 if I was a transmission line standing here, there
20 would be 75 feet on my left, 75 feet on my right,
21 that would be the 150-foot right-of-way. And that
22 would be placed somewhere within that 1,000-foot
23 route width. And they ask for that large a width so
24 they can work with landowners or environment --
25 sensitive environmental areas, river crossings.

Sometimes they can -- so they can avoid places and work with landowners.

MS. NEWTON: So if one of the objectives is to impact as few people as possible, why isn't Rice County the preferred route because you are impacting so many fewer people than in Scott County?

MR. EK: Yeah. This has been -- yeah, that's kind of confusing when they call it preferred and alternative. From my understanding, either route -- either route is suitable. I guess the company, you know, would have to come out with a preferred -- this is pretty standard for any transmission project, there's a preferred and alternate. We look at both.

MS. NEWTON: So what exactly -- how do you exactly go about objecting? I mean, I'm -- obviously standing here today isn't really going to do anything, who do you write to, what do you say? I mean, how do you go about it?

MR. EK: Oh, okay. Yeah, exactly. Today's a good start and today is where you can put your comment in. All you simply would have to say -- you've already stated your name, and say, for example, you prefer that southern alternative route over the preferred route --

MS. NEWTON: Okay.

MR. EK: -- that would be a comment and we could put that into the record. You could do that orally here, right now, you could send it, like I said, by e-mail, send it in the mail, go print out a map, hand that to me today. You have many options on -- I guess it depends on what your concern is or what your suggested alternative --

MS. NEWTON: Well, like every single person, it's I don't want this thing going over my property --

MR. EK: Certainly. Certainly.

MS. NEWTON: -- and impacting the value of the land, not just today, but in the future.

MR. EK: Certainly. Certainly. But yeah, if you wanted to get a comment in, you can do it now, here, hand it to me, write it, e-mail it, just say it in the microphone here, it will be transcribed, it will be part of the comments and part of the record as well.

MS. NEWTON: And then lastly, how far apart are all the poles in your --

MR. EK: The poles are -- the span is 1,000 feet. They'd be 1,000 feet apart and, you know, they can go a little further or a little

closer, you know, depending on the topography or the area we're talking about so they can be adjusted accordingly when -- if the project's permitted and they meet with landowners --

MS. NEWTON: So who at the State -- we received this and they have state senator, representatives, Scott County Board Members, are those all people that will have a say in this? I mean, are those people to write to or --

MR. EK: Oh, yeah. See, I -- well, myself, too, you can write to me. That's where -- and I can give you a comment form.

MS. NEWTON: What was your name?

MR. EK: Actually, why don't I give you a comment form --

MS. NEWTON: Okay.

MR. EK: -- when we're done here.

But yes, it would be important to talk to your own county and city officials.

MS. NEWTON: Okay.

MR. EK: That's very important and that's part of our process, too. We want to hear from those local governments, the townships, the cities, the counties, the regional development commissions. They know what's going on and they have a little

more information because they're working with a smaller area of your community which they know more about and they're representing you.

MS. NEWTON: Okay.

MR. EK: So they would have a little more input. So if they hear from you, hopefully they can translate that information back to us. But at the same time, if you want to submit a comment, submit it to me.

MS. NEWTON: Do you have that here?

MR. EK: And I do have a form, I'll go grab one --

MS. NEWTON: Okay.

MR. EK: -- once we have a chance here.

MS. NEWTON: Okay. Thank you.

MR. EK: Thank you for your comment.

Any additional comments?

MR. OTTO: Can I make an additional one?

MR. EK: I think we have another gentleman coming up.

If you could state and spell your name, sir.

MR. PREHALL: My name Gary Prehall, P-R-E-H-A-L-L. And I just have a couple comments.

Number one comment is, I just had the gas

line go through my farm, a mile and a half -- or a mile and a quarter through my farm. And our friend over here from Great River says that they take care of the landowners pretty good on the condemnation. Believe me, it doesn't happen.

And when you condemn my land now for this power line, I'm going to remember your name and when they come in at a real low price, I'm going to say, you know what, he told me at a meeting, he told me that they pay you in relation to the future development rights -- or value of that land. So what are you going to say when they come to you and ask you about that?

MR. POORKER: Ah --

MR. PREHALL: Yeah, I'm talking to you, you're the one that said it.

MR. POORKER: Okay. What I said --

MR. PREHALL: Are you going to buy my land -- when they come and want to put the power line on it, I'm going to say I've got a 240-acre farm in the middle of Eureka Center here, you said that you would buy the land.

MR. POORKER: We will -- yes, that is one option.

MR. PREHALL: And at what price?

MR. POORKER: Whatever your land value is worth.

MR. PREHALL: Oh, it's just the land value now, it's not what the development -- the future development --

MR. POORKER: Future, that is correct because I'm --

MR. PREHALL: That isn't what you said a little while ago.

MR. POORKER: No. I --

MR. PREHALL: So I don't think you were being very truthful.

MR. POORKER: No. I said we pay for impacts to land value, I did not say what it might be worth 10 or 20 or 30 years in the future. We're -- there's no way to determine that. I'm not a land speculator, we're not in the business of speculating what land might be worth. We pay for what it is worth right now, at the time of our negotiation, that is what we --

MR. PREHALL: And you pay for total cost of the land or just the -- what you deem that you destroyed on the value of the land?

MR. POORKER: We pay for the easement itself and also impacts to your land values.

MR. PREHALL: But what value do you put on the easement?

MR. POORKER: The easement itself is based on what land values are right now.

MR. PREHALL: A percentage of that?

MR. POORKER: A pretty high percentage, yes.

MR. PREHALL: No, a percentage of it, isn't it?

MR. POORKER: Yes.

MR. PREHALL: It's not the whole value, is it?

MR. POORKER: Actually, when our -- by the time we pay for everything, it's probably above that, it's probably above 100 percent.

MR. PREHALL: Well, I don't agree with that, I just went through that with the gas company.

MR. POORKER: I have no -- and believe me, for the last year and a half that people have been coming to our open houses, we have had a lot people in this area tell me about their experience with MinnCan and I'm not, certainly, going to defend MinnCan, but I did hear --

MR. PREHALL: I didn't have a good experience with them.

MR. POORKER: And there were a lot of people that were at our open houses and our work group meetings that had a lot of -- a lot to say about MinnCan.

MR. PREHALL: I had experience with Northern Natural Gas.

MR. POORKER: Um-hmm.

MR. PREHALL: And it didn't turn out that way, believe me.

MR. POORKER: Yeah.

MR. PREHALL: And so don't tell the people that they're going to get a fair value for their land because they don't. Because once this goes into the courts, you get -- it doesn't work out that way.

So just to clarify something, last year -- or two years ago, they took a 50-foot swath all the way across the south edge of my farm, a mile and a half. Now, today, you're going to take a mile and a half on the north edge of my farm. So I've got a gas line on the south side and now these rotten lines on the north side, and I just don't think it's fair.

MR. POORKER: Yeah. I can understand that, a lot of people -- I mean, that's why people

are here --

MR. PREHALL: Yeah.

MR. POORKER: -- because they are interested in this transmission line and its impact to them, that's why we're here.

MR. PREHALL: You know, I just think you ought to be honest, then, when you're talking to people about the values that you're giving them, and I don't think you are.

MR. POORKER: Okay. That's your opinion, but I am doing my best to be honest with how we pay for our transmission line easements.

MR. EK: Thank you for your comment, sir.

You had a comment, if you could restate your name, please.

MR. OTTO: Jeff Otto, Eureka Township.

On the subject of easements and the payments -- I'm sorry I didn't get a chance to check exactly where it's at right now, but approximately two years ago when the state did some things to adjust the eminent domain laws because of a U.S. Supreme Court decision, they wanted to come back and plug some holes.

At that time, the power companies were able to get an amendment into that bill that

1 exempted them from covering certain costs that a
2 landowner could get reimbursed for if they disputed
3 an appraisal on an easement for them. And I don't
4 know if that's been corrected, I know there's been a
5 legislative initiative that's supposed to be in the
6 works to correct that so that they have to play by
7 the same rules that other public utilities have to
8 abide by.
9 So that's something to check with your
10 state legislator, your senator and your
11 representative, to find out where that's at to make
12 sure they're aware that this is about to happen. We
13 want to make sure that we do get the protection that
14 we deserve.
15 The way this works is, an appraisal that
16 will come in at below market value, below what you
17 think it should be, you have to fight it as an
18 individual. So it's at your expense to get an
19 attorney involved, to get your own appraisal, to try
20 and get a court decision in your favor. And even if
21 you win, you wouldn't get reimbursed for your costs
22 for having to have to fight it.
23 So what this legislation is about, is
24 about correcting this imbalance so it's not so
25 one-sided. And I just want to make you aware of

that, and that's at the state level. You need to address your representative and senator to help make sure that this gets corrected so that we're not affected by it on this particular project.

Thank you.

MR. EK: Thank you for your comment, sir.

MS. HELMBERGER: Hi, I'm kind of a repeat customer coming to these meetings, but my name is Cindy Helmberger, H-E-L-M-B-E-R-G-E-R.

I keep hearing more things, so I just, of course, have to keep coming up here. So until these meetings are over, you're going to see me. One thing that Lake Marion -- and Joel pointed it out, is that right now it's 1.5 acres (sic), just south of here on Pillsbury. You guys are looking at acquiring 12 to 16 acres, so that doesn't mean that you're going to now all of sudden have two acres, you obviously are going to do something with that 12 to 16 acres plus what you already have.

So you can just imagine the magnitude of not only the size of those lines, the massiveness of the poles, but how much is generated out of there. So now you're talking so many homes that are affected by -- I mean, I know it's not the size of Koch Refinery, but to me, I think it's going to be

kind of the same impact. It's going to be a huge eyesore. You've got safety issues, health issues. To me, that just -- you're going to just keep adding and adding and adding. And once it goes through, how do we stop that from being added? That is -- I can't imagine.

The other thing, too, is just hearing the gentleman with the thoroughbreds, that fact that -- and I don't know if it was Great River or if it was one of the groups in your consortium, but if they didn't bring it back to how he had it, I really recommend that in the impact study that there be severe fines to whoever is responsible for not putting it to the restorative -- I lost the word, place that it was at or condition that it was at. I think that should be strongly added into a requirement and I mean steep fines for it. There's no reason why he should take his time and his money to restore it and have to make all the phone calls to get to the point where he's like, I give up, I'll do it myself.

The other thing, too, is that I don't know how long it takes to do -- let's say if you're going across a section of land, does that take you, you know, three months or six months? But let's say

that on average you say it takes three months, but it ends up taking you nine months, I think there should be steep fines for that as well.

Because not only do we have to deal with the whole thing that we all agree we don't want, now we have to deal with construction, beat-up roads, beat-up land, having to see workers out there all the time, worrying about the lines until they actually get in place. I think there should be steep fines for not getting it done on time. I'd like that to be for sure noted on record as a consideration.

And then just as a clarification on the values, I know we talked earlier, but I'm trying to still understand -- okay. So if you take an acre of my land and you say it's worth $10,000, but because of the fact that I could have had some lots on that strip right by there, maybe it's not in that 75 feet, but it's very close to that, if I know that right -- today if I could develop those and sell those and that would be, let's say, $400,000, I need to understand today, right now, will I be compensated for that in addition to the easement?

The $10,000 means nothing to me. I'm worried about in the future, if I'm going to be

1 losing $400,000 to a half million dollars and you,
2 obviously, all are going to be losing, you know, a
3 lot of money, too. And that's what we need to know,
4 is -- you know, you're kind of saying that we will
5 maybe get compensated, but you don't know what it is
6 going to be in the future. But as of the time of
7 the project, I could tell you that that's how much
8 I'm going to lose. I need to know, I am going to be
9 compensated for that?
10 So I'm going to kind of put you on the
11 spot to answer that.
12 MR. EK: Let me just answer the
13 substation question, that's -- any impact or
14 anything having to do with the substation, that's
15 included with the transmission line. It's all one,
16 it's an associated facility. So we'd study anything
17 at a substation, just as we -- anything that applies
18 to the transmission line would apply to the
19 substation being studied in the EIS.
20 As for imposing fines, that's a new one I
21 haven't heard. And I think --
22 MS. HELMBERGER: Add it, come on, you've
23 got to add it in there.
24 MR. EK: Well, here's the deal. The EIS,
25 that's not the document that would address that

issue. I think that goes up to the powers that be, your legislators and so forth.

MS. HELMBERGER: Okay.

MR. EK: I'm not sure, we have it on the record, it's something that we can take a look at, find out what the process is. I'm no legal eagle and no, I don't know how that works. It's a new one.

MS. HELMBERGER: Actually, I'm going to add on to that, the penalty of those fees go to the landowners that are directly impacted rather than having it go into the coffers of, you know, something that might fund something that none of us care about, so add that on there, too.

MR. EK: Okay. No. It's a good -- interesting comment. Interesting.

And I'll give the mic to Craig about the easement issue again.

MR. POORKER: All right. Thanks, Cindy. Real quick about the substation sites. We are looking at the Lake Marion area at purchasing 15 to 20 acres. That's not how big the substation will be. Wherever we buy a substation site -- and most sites we're looking at are anywhere from 40 to 160 acres, depending on what a farmer or landowner may

want to sell.

It's addressed in the application itself, how big the substations are -- or how big the fenced area is. And I think that's four to five acres, if I remember right, for each substation site. And that's the fenced-in area, that's not even how much equipment is in there.

Cindy, you asked a lot of questions, help me out, again.

MS. HELMBERGER: Oh, okay. Well, the other thing, too, is -- I'm just going to state this --

MR. POORKER: Yeah. Okay.

MS. HELMBERGER: -- and I know, we'll submit it. But send it as far south -- southern end of Rice County where you have nowhere near the population, head it east and go up to where you can on Highway 52. You don't have to worry about the Hampton people, the New Market people, the Eureka people. You've got a lot less people down there.

So -- okay. So back to my question, so I had --

MR. POORKER: Yeah. You had a question on land values, compensation --

MS. HELMBERGER: Right.

1 MR. POORKER: -- and it's not necessarily
2 what it's worth right now, because, I mean, things
3 change with real estate values quickly. I think
4 we've all learned that. My house isn't worth nearly
5 what it was just two years ago, and a lot of us are
6 in that same boat.
7 But when we acquire easements, it's not
8 based on, necessarily, how it's being used right
9 now, but when it comes to appraisal of your
10 property, we look at the highest and best use of
11 your property. So if -- you may have a residential
12 area, but perhaps it could be used as something
13 commercially, which would probably increase its
14 value. It may be highly developable land, and if
15 that's the highest and best use, is subdividing into
16 one-acre lots, that is something that we'd have to
17 compensate for, is for the highest and best use of
18 your property. Not the way it's being used now, but
19 the highest and best use possible under current
20 zoning.
21 MS. HELMBERGER: Okay. So then, like,
22 let's say that you take 75 feet and that totals an
23 acre, but let's say that I've got 20 acres -- that
24 includes 20 acres or whatever, so let's say that
25 that really is worth $400,000 at whatever

given point in time the negotiation is done, so not only will you give me, let's say, $10,000 for that one acre, would I be compensated $400,000 additionally for the fact that I'm losing lots to be built there?

MR. POORKER: Yeah, that's a good point. If it's -- if your highest and best use is lots and blocks subdivision, that would -- we would -- and your land is worth 400,000 an acre, I think that's then --

MS. HELMBERGER: 400,000 total for, like, 20 acres.

MR. POORKER: So 20,000 an acre, that is what would we have to look at paying you for that.

MS. HELMBERGER: Okay.

MR. POORKER: And again, it's not --

MS. HELMBERGER: And that helps clarify, because I was kind of starting to hear one thing and get, you know, led a different direction. So I think that that helps clarify.

MR. POORKER: Sure. Sure.

MS. HELMBERGER: So okay. Thank you.

MR. POORKER: Thanks.

MS. HELMBERGER: Thank you for your time.

MR. EK: Thanks for your comment.

Additional comments?

Well, with that --

MR. POORKER: One more.

MR. EK: Yes, sir. If you'd like to sit down, sir, I'd more than happy to -- oh, all right. If you could state and spell your name, sir.

MR. WHITEHOUSE: I can yell if I have to.

My name is Whitey, last name is Whitehouse, one word. Make it two words, that's that building in Washington, that's not me.

I thank you for putting up with all of the comments from the people that are concerned about their land values. It's important to them, it's also important to them that they take a look at what their tax evaluation is by -- and I'm in Dakota County. What happens to it next year from what the tax evaluation is this year, it's about 20 percent lower.

I'm assuming that everyone is going to have that same, or close to it, reduction in land value. If you paid, in the last five years, so many millions of dollars for your piece of property because that's what the Realtor told you it was worth, when in reality we've got dooped by a Realtor, don't take it out on the state and don't

take it on the right-of-way people.

The right-of-way, as I understand it, is tentatively 1,000-feet wide (sic), correct?

MR. EK: No. The right-of-way is 150-feet wide.

MR. WHITEHOUSE: Okay. What is the width on the green (sic)?

MR. EK: That's the route width.

MR. WHITEHOUSE: How much -- how wide?

MR. EK: 1,000 feet.

MR. WHITEHOUSE: 1,000 feet. All right. In the past, if there's something in the way, you can go zigzagging to avoid structures, land, whatever, roads, you can zigzag?

MR. EK: Correct.

MR. WHITEHOUSE: It isn't a true, straight line?

MR. EK: Correct.

MR. WHITEHOUSE: I think a lot of people here assume it's a true, straight line. I don't know that anybody's ever brought this out in your meetings, that you can zigzag.

MR. EK: No. I've actually brought that up several times.

MR. WHITEHOUSE: Okay. I haven't heard

1 that today and I'm not condemning.
2 The other thing that I have a question on
3 is EMFs, there is always the fear factor of the EMF.
4 For about 40 years I sold industrial piping products
5 to refineries and power plants, I have not yet heard
6 OSHA or the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers saying
7 that people that are around power generation are
8 dying. I don't hear that.
9 Has there ever been a study on the people
10 that work in the power plant right next to the
11 generators, has there ever been a study on that?
12 MR. EK: Yes. There are studies out
13 there.
14 MR. WHITEHOUSE: Okay. And how does that
15 compare to the EMFs off -- from a power line?
16 MR. EK: We include those studies in our
17 literature searches and in the EIS.
18 MR. WHITEHOUSE: Just a Reader's Digest
19 version, how does that compare, is there a greater
20 incidence for those people working next to the
21 generators and turbines in a power plant? I think
22 OSHA would close them all down, we'd be back to coal
23 lamps and candles.
24 And by the way, those of us that go home
25 and we don't want to turn on that light switch

tonight because we're against this project, maybe we should light a candle.

MR. EK: You are correct, there is no difference -- there is a safety hazard, a shock hazard --

MR. WHITEHOUSE: Right.

MR. EK: -- if you're going to touch it.

MR. WHITEHOUSE: Right.

MR. EK: But the EMF, no.

MR. WHITEHOUSE: And what did your mom tell you -- and your dad?

MR. EK: Don't stick your finger in a light socket.

MR. WHITEHOUSE: What else did they tell you? Don't fly the kite near the power lines. Let's have some common sense.

Thank you.

MR. EK: Thank you for your comment, sir.

Additional comments?

Okay. All right. Again, this is important, this is the scoping. This is where we're trying to get your input into the environmental impact statement, into scoping for this proposed project. So please call me, grab a comment form, submit it today. Print out a map, submit it today,

take it home, mail it in, e-mail me, go online, any way you can. I want to be sure we hear your comments so we can include them so this is an all-inclusive EIS.

So all I can say is thank you for coming and please submit your comments, April 30.

Thank you.

(Meeting adjourned at 4:02 p.m.)