Ek, Scott (COMM)

From: Don Hendricks [dongeo@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, May 11, 2010 10:33 AM
To: Ek, Scott (COMM)
Subject: gre route in hubbard county

mr. ek-----we support an alternate route for the gre power lines--destroying the scenic beauty of highway 18 or 40 doesn't make any sense when hubbard county depends so much on tourism. a direct route from emmaville west to 71 makes more sense to us. thanks, don & georgia hendricks

Your Touchstone Energy® Cooperative
The power of human connections

RECEIVED
MAY 13 2010
MAILROOM

May 10, 2010

Office of Energy Security
Scott Ek, State Permit Manager
85 7th Place E., Suite 500
St. Paul, MN 55101-2198

CASE # 53884-TS
DOCKET # TL-10-86

Dear Mr. Ek:

In earlier letters sent to you by property owners from the Potato Lake area, they mentioned the many lakes in our county. Because of these lakes, Hubbard County is a popular tourist area and an enticing place to purchase a cabin or RV lot, build a retirement home or stay at a resort.

Up until 2009, our service territory had an annual growth rate of five percent. During that time, Itasca-Mantrap Co-op. Electrical Ass'n. was hard pressed to keep up with the requested new services, let alone rebuild our existing main lines and substations. The economic slowdown is allowing us to catch up on our system reliability upgrades.

The reason for building the Potato Lake substation is not future growth; the substation is needed to serve the growth that has already occurred and exists today; it is this growth that is causing voltage support concerns and an increasing probability of reliability issues in the Potato Lake and surrounding areas. We can only stretch our main distribution lines so far away from our substations before the voltage begins to deteriorate. We presently have several inline voltage regulators to maintain proper voltage in this area.

The same people who like this lakes area are adding onto their cabins and making them year round homes, installing hot tubs, electric heat, big screen TVs, computers and many other appliances, thereby increasing the loading on our already taxed feeder lines. From the letters you received, you can see that these homes are enjoyed by several generations of family members, which causes more loading on our lines than a plain single family dwelling.

It is this type of growth that makes the location of our Potato Lake substation so critical. The existing proposed Potato Lake substation is centrally located within the load area that it will serve. When we see economic recovery and the trend for purchasing property in the North Country returns, it is the people who live around Potato Lake who will see the ill effects of not having this substation in place.

I understand that our projects sometimes evoke emotion among the property owners, and we do the best we can to find solutions that work for both property owners and our system needs. That said, Itasca-Mantrap's responsibility is to serve our members with the proper voltage and reliable service they expect from us. I urge you to keep the technical information we have provided at the forefront of your decision-making process. We welcome any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Michael Monsrud, President-CEO

PO Box 192 • Park Rapids, MN 56470 • 218-732-3377
www.itasca-mantrap.com

10-86

RECEIVED
MAY 03 2010
MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
121 7th Place E. Suite 350
St. Paul, MN 55101-2147

Dear Members of the Commission

I am writing about the Docket # TL-10-86

I own property that is listed for the new 115kv power line. It is dishearting to think Great River Energy would destroy a section of my forest and hobby farm. I wish you would reconsider and proceed with the new proposed route traveling down CR 40 it is a shorter and less forest would need to be destroyed.

Please help us preserve our health, land and way of life.

Sincerely,

Dean Kimball
14705 CR18
Park Rapids MN 56470

10-86

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
121 7th Place E. Suite 350
St. Paul, MN 55101-2147

RECEIVED
MAY 03 2010
MINNESOTA PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION

Docket # TL-10-86

Dear Members of the Commission,

As a concerned property owner on CR18 where the new 115kv power line is proposed. I feel this will have a very negative effect and eyesore on my property. There are many homes on this route that are close to the right away where the line would be going through the front of their yards. I feel the new proposed route that travels down CR 40 is less distance. There would be less devastation and fewer homes in its path.

Please take this in consideration when making your dissection on this matter.

Sincerely,

William Kimball
21827 County 1
Park Rapids MN 56470

(Your name) William Kimball
(Your address) 21827 County 1

(Date) 5-12-10

RECEIVED
MAY 17
MAILROOM

Office of Energy Security
Scott Ek, State Permit Manager
85 7th Place East, Suite 500
St. Paul, MN 55101-2198

Re: Docket TL-10-86

Dear Mr. Ek:

I am in favor of locating Great River Energy's 115 kV transmission line along the northern alternative route located west of Emmaville from CSAH 4 to Highway 71. If the substation were to also be located at this vicinity, it would be a preferred site for future growth needs.

This route is made up of primarily county and state land, affecting as few private properties as possible while preserving the aesthetics of our lake sensitive region and tourism industry.

Thank you for your consideration.

(Name/signature)
William Kimball

Holly Krautkremer
15003 County 18
Park Rapids, MN 56470

March 3, 2010
Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
121 7th Place E. Suite 350
St. Paul, MN 55101-2147
Re: Case 53884-TS, Docket TL-10-86

Attention Commission Members:

We are writing to you in regards of the Great River Energy's/Itasca-Mantrap's Transmission Line Project and alternative route/Potato Lake 115 kV Substation and Transmission Line. We are concerned Todd Township residents in Hubbard County; we live at 15003 County 18 Park Rapids, MN. We are greatly opposed to this project; if this proposed transmission line is run down County Rd 18 it will cause immense harm to our family and our neighbors. Due to Great River Energy's proposal our home, our land, our future security and our health is being put in jeopardy. I implore you to hear our voices; your agency is our hope of having our concerns heard and our due process meet. Our family and neighborhood all express deep concern over this proposal.

The intent of this letter is:

1. To ask Public Utilities Commission to reject Great River Energy's proposed high-voltage transmission line, and to ask that you recommend running the line an alternative route other than down County Rd 18 where it would have less impact on the homes and the people living along the proposed route.

2. To outline the issues and hardships that would arise due to the proposed transmission line and how it would impact our home and neighbors' homes

directly.

3. The environmental impact it would have to the trees, animals and those of us who live on County Rd. 18.

4. If the proposed transmission route is going to be approved by the PUC, then considerations should be written into the permit for the property owners that will be impacted by this. We ask that we be treated with fairness and that extra measures be taken to have as little impact on our property as possible.

We have several real concerns about the transmission line being run by our property.

In 2003 we purchased our dream home, a little slice of heaven away from the all the car horns, people shouting, sirens blaring and all the chaos that comes from living in town. Our property is very unique, our home is an earth home; however that is not a selling point. The property itself is the selling point; it is secluded from road and our neighbors. The seclusion and the peacefulness was the major reason for purchasing this specific piece of property.

If this line is run on our side of the road it will clear out all of our trees between our home and county rd 18. It will take away the privacy and seclusion of our property. Who would want to purchase our home later on with the eye sore of the giant transmission poles, instead of the beautiful forest that we have now? We will be hearing road traffic noise, beeping horns, bikers and people who walk up and down the road. We will be able to see our neighbors and the road too; these are the very things that we moved from town to get away from. If we wanted to deal with all of this we would still be living in town.

It will also open up our yard to ATV's and snowmobiles, this scares us as our nieces, nephews, little cousins and our dog play out in our yard. Right now those trees offer a buffer area to protect them all from such hazards. What is to keep them safe? Unless we build a fence, if we wanted a fence we would have

purchased a home with one already. This would be expensive and financially cause us hardship; this is not an option for us and we should not have to build a fence just because Great River Energy thought this route was the best route for the new transmission line. I ask, if those people live here, or you, would you want to have to build a fence when there was already a natural barrier between your home and the road? We also don't wish to put up orange webbing who wants to look at that eye sore? Not us that's for sure!

Where the proposed line would be run would also take away the availability to build on this section. The land that would be taken for the proposed line is the majority of our buildable property. We would not be able to build any future buildings on this section as we have planned. Our property is surrounded by wet lands and we don't have much property available to build on. The proposed high-voltage transmission line will greatly damage and depreciate the value of our property; it will make it unsellable down the road. We will lose thousands and thousands of dollars from what our property would be valued at in the future. This is our life time investment for retirement. We spent the last 6 years each working 2 jobs to pay for our dream. The proposed high-voltage line will greatly impact our future and how we live.

The "fair market value" that Great River Energy will offer in no way compensate us for our loss and future losses. Please stop this process or find an alternative more suitable route for the transmission line to avoid or at least minimize the impact of the private properties along county rd 18.

Great Rivers Energy's easement request not only will take out all of our trees, it will put the transmission line 40 feet from our well. This concerns us above any other issue as the power poles are dipped and sealed with arsenic. Over time what will this do to our well? Who will pay for the regular water testing for this and the potential health complications that could arise? We finically can't take this responsibility on. Health wise this raises a lot of concerns for us, our family and our animals. If the well was to be moved, the water quality would most likely not be as high. To move the well would be extremely expensive, not only because

the cost of drilling a new well, but due to how our house was built the plumbing is run underground; our yard would have to be completely torn up, along with the supporting underground wall of our house. We could not afford to move our well; it would cause great finical hardship for us. Also, who would want to purchase a home with power poles that close to a well? Is this even legal? Are there no guidelines set for something like this? Can Great River Energy give us written proof that over time these poles will not contaminate our water source?

The proposed high-voltage line would also be 40 feet from our propane tank and wood stove. To move all of this would incur a great cost upon us which we cannot take on as we are young couple. The same procedures would have to be taken to move these as it would with the well.

If the proposed high-voltage transmission line is approved and run down county rd 18, it would be in Great River Energy's best interest to run it on the opposite side of the road when going by our property. The cost that would incur from moving our well, utilities and damage to our property would be significant.

The proposed high-voltage transmission line would be 90 feet from our home which then raises the issue of EMF radiation. There have been many studies done, and proven that power lines increase the risk of Leukemia, Alzheimer, Brain cancer and more for those living near power lines. The EPA states the impact of EMF radiation is inconclusive but yet there are numerous studies that have been done and proven otherwise. Great River Energy can't guarantee that the transmission lines are 100 percent safe against these illnesses. There is health risks posed by long-term exposure to magnetic fields of high-voltage power lines, should we not err on the side of caution? What would run through potential homebuyer's minds when looking at one of the homes along county rd 18, would they not wonder about the potential health hazards of having a high-voltage power line over their home as well? What about the animals what will it do to them?

Environmentally what impact will this have on our area? What about the wild life? We have deer, trumpeter swans, eagles, ducks, wild turkeys and etc. How will this impact their habitat? What harm will come to them by taking existing trees away from them? How will this affect the fish in the river and potato lake over long term? What damage will be done that will be irreversible? What harm will be done to livestock and pets over the long term? What about the big beautiful trees that have been here for a very long time? It takes hundreds of years for them to grow back like that. The beauty of county rd 18 would be destroyed. What is most convenient to Great River Energy is also will be the most devastating to the homeowners and our natural resources.

Until this project we had never heard of Eminent Domain, providing for the common good. What a joke, seizure of private property is a form of socialism in our eyes. What and who gives the right for someone to come onto our property and take it away when we purchased it, we pay the taxes on it, we take care of the maintenance and upkeep. Our sweat and blood have gone into our property not Great River Energy's. Last time we checked we have the right to own and protect our property and we shouldn't have to worry about someone coming and taking it without consequence. Why should we have to pay for a lawyer to defend what is already ours.

We have been hard working, and good tax-paying citizens and we are shocked to learn that our land may be seized and we may have to be in a legal battle to protect ourselves and what is rightful ours. I highly request the Public Utilities Commission to intensely weigh the issues and "need" for this transmission line proposed route and to find an alternative that does not disrupt our values for this place we call home.

Through Representative Brita Sailer it is my understanding that the House Energy and Civil Justice committees are interested in reviewing how power companies have been treating private property owners and how eminent domain is exercised on the private property owners. What right do big businesses have, to walk all over law abiding citizens such as those living along county rd 18? Eminent domain

should not be loosely used to increase one company's investment, by stealing from other more vulnerable people's investments. A power line for the public good should use public lands, and not steal from private lands.

Great River Energy claim there is a growing demand for power to the north of us for new customers and growth, which is why they want to run a transmission line down county rd 18. They want to keep their new customers happy, but yet what about current customers who are very unhappy with this proposed transmission line route? The ironic part of all this is we pay for this line, not Great River Energy so shouldn't we the rate payers have a say were this is placed?

Great River Energy has alternative routes and other options available to them. Why could they not run the transmission line north to county rd 40? This route would give them a near straight shot from substation to substation. We were told by Great River Energy that if they went down county rd 40 they would have to use too many guide wires on the power poles, however how is this any different than if they ran down county rd 18 and had to jump across the road several times due to the close homes. This cannot be an acceptable excuse. My father does work for a power company and I have researched this entire issue.

Further north of county rd 40 there is public land, if they went this route it would impact less private property owners. In the long run wouldn't this be a cheaper route for them to take?

Great River Energy could run the lines underground but they won't even consider that stating it is too cost prohibitive. Why should our property be damaged to save them a dollar, when in the long run we will be paying for it anyway? Since this is an investment that will be paid back by the rate payers over the next 50 years, why not invest a little more up front to improve the long term out come?

Great River Energy can do better than what they are proposing, but we feel they are doing what is best for them and not the "common good".

Many homeowners will face financial hardship from this transmission line route, regardless of what side of the road the line is run down. We plead with the members of the PUC to hear our voices, and do what is right for the "common good" not what is right for big business. Please make Great River Energy use an alternative option. We don't want to see the beauty that is county rd 18 destroyed for an unjust reason.

Regardless of where Great River Energy runs there high-voltage transmission line we ask that they treat the property owners with fairness. If these projects are for the "common good" then the "common person" should have a say in it.

Thank you for your work on behalf of the home owners of county rd 18.

Sincerely,
Holly Krautkremer
(218) 237-1980
Catrules97@yahoo.com

cc. Rep. Brita Sailer

March 19, 2010

Jamie Krautkremer
15003 County 18
Park Rapids, MN 56470

CASE # 5384-TS
DOCKET # TL-10-86

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
121-7th Place E. Suite 350
St. Paul, MN 55101-2147

Dear Commission Members,

My wife and I are unable to attend the meeting scheduled for March 25, 2010 with Great River Energy in regards to the high-voltage transmission line. We are opposed to the proposed route as stated before in our previous letters to the Public Utilities Commission.

Do to our inability to attended, I ask the Public Utilities Commission to set up an Advisory Task Force so there can be input from the ones that are directly affected by this project. There are a lot of unresolved issues that need be addressed. This need is further compounded by the fact that the meetings are being held several hours of commute away from the ones that this directly affects. Not everyone involved is able to travel that distance, therefore again, I am requesting that the Public Utilities Commission set up an Advisory Task Force; our interests and those of our neighbor's need to be taken into consideration as well.

Thank you,

Jamie Krautkremer
Property Owner
(218) 237-1980
Jamez_k@hotmail.com

Jamie Krautkremer
15003 County 18
Park Rapids, MN 56470

March 3, 2010
Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
121 7th Place E. Suite 350
St. Paul, MN 55101-2147
Re: Case 53884-TS, Docket TL-10-86

Attention Commission Members:

We are writing to you in regards of the Great River Energy's/Itasca-Mantrap's Transmission Line Project and alternative route/Potato Lake 115 kV Substation and Transmission Line. We are concerned Todd Township residents in Hubbard County; we live at 15003 County 18 Park Rapids, MN. We are greatly opposed to this project; if this proposed transmission line is run down County Rd 18 it will cause immense harm to our family and our neighbors. Due to Great River Energy's proposal our home, our land, our future security and our health is being put in jeopardy. I implore you to hear our voices; your agency is our hope of having our concerns heard and our due process meet. Our family and neighborhood all express deep concern over this proposal.

The intent of this letter is:

1. To ask Public Utilities Commission to reject Great River Energy's proposed high-voltage transmission line, and to ask that you recommend running the line an alternative route other than down County Rd 18 where it would have less impact on the homes and the people living along the proposed route.

2. To outline the issues and hardships that would arise due to the proposed transmission line and how it would impact our home and neighbors' homes

directly.

3. The environmental impact it would have to the trees, animals and those of us who live on County Rd. 18.

4. If the proposed transmission route is going to be approved by the PUC, then considerations should be written into the permit for the property owners that will be impacted by this. We ask that we be treated with fairness and that extra measures be taken to have as little impact on our property as possible.

We have several real concerns about the transmission line being run by our property.

In 2003 we purchased our dream home, a little slice of heaven away from the all the car horns, people shouting, sirens blaring and all the chaos that comes from living in town. Our property is very unique, our home is an earth home; however that is not a selling point. The property itself is the selling point; it is secluded from road and our neighbors. The seclusion and the peacefulness was the major reason for purchasing this specific piece of property.

If this line is run on our side of the road it will clear out all of our trees between our home and county rd 18. It will take away the privacy and seclusion of our property. Who would want to purchase our home later on with the eye sore of the giant transmission poles, instead of the beautiful forest that we have now? We will be hearing road traffic noise, beeping horns, bikers and people who walk up and down the road. We will be able to see our neighbors and the road too; these are the very things that we moved from town to get away from. If we wanted to deal with all of this we would still be living in town.

It will also open up our yard to ATV's and snowmobiles, this scares us as our nieces, nephews, little cousins and our dog play out in our yard. Right now those trees offer a buffer area to protect them all from such hazards. What is to keep them safe? Unless we build a fence, if we wanted a fence we would have

purchased a home with one already. This would be expensive and financially cause us hardship; this is not an option for us and we should not have to build a fence just because Great River Energy thought this route was the best route for the new transmission line. I ask, if those people live here, or you, would you want to have to build a fence when there was already a natural barrier between your home and the road? We also don't wish to put up orange webbing who wants to look at that eye sore? Not us that's for sure!

Where the proposed line would be run would also take away the availability to build on this section. The land that would be taken for the proposed line is the majority of our buildable property. We would not be able to build any future buildings on this section as we have planned. Our property is surrounded by wet lands and we don't have much property available to build on. The proposed high-voltage transmission line will greatly damage and depreciate the value of our property; it will make it unsellable down the road. We will lose thousands and thousands of dollars from what our property would be valued at in the future. This is our life time investment for retirement. We spent the last 6 years each working 2 jobs to pay for our dream. The proposed high-voltage line will greatly impact our future and how we live.

The "fair market value" that Great River Energy will offer in no way compensate us for our loss and future losses. Please stop this process or find an alternative more suitable route for the transmission line to avoid or at least minimize the impact of the private properties along county rd 18.

Great Rivers Energy's easement request not only will take out all of our trees, it will put the transmission line 40 feet from our well. This concerns us above any other issue as the power poles are dipped and sealed with arsenic. Over time what will this do to our well? Who will pay for the regular water testing for this and the potential health complications that could arise? We finically can't take this responsibility on. Health wise this raises a lot of concerns for us, our family and our animals. If the well was to be moved, the water quality would most likely not be as high. To move the well would be extremely expensive, not only because

the cost of drilling a new well, but due to how our house was built the plumbing is run underground; our yard would have to be completely torn up, along with the supporting underground wall of our house. We could not afford to move our well; it would cause great finical hardship for us. Also, who would want to purchase a home with power poles that close to a well? Is this even legal? Are there no guidelines set for something like this? Can Great River Energy give us written proof that over time these poles will not contaminate our water source?

The proposed high-voltage line would also be 40 feet from our propane tank and wood stove. To move all of this would incur a great cost upon us which we cannot take on as we are young couple. The same procedures would have to be taken to move these as it would with the well.

If the proposed high-voltage transmission line is approved and run down county rd 18, it would be in Great River Energy's best interest to run it on the opposite side of the road when going by our property. The cost that would incur from moving our well, utilities and damage to our property would be significant.

The proposed high-voltage transmission line would be 90 feet from our home which then raises the issue of EMF radiation. There have been many studies done, and proven that power lines increase the risk of Leukemia, Alzheimer, Brain cancer and more for those living near power lines. The EPA states the impact of EMF radiation is inconclusive but yet there are numerous studies that have been done and proven otherwise. Great River Energy can't guarantee that the transmission lines are 100 percent safe against these illnesses. There is health risks posed by long-term exposure to magnetic fields of high-voltage power lines, should we not err on the side of caution? What would run through potential homebuyer's minds when looking at one of the homes along county rd 18, would they not wonder about the potential health hazards of having a high-voltage power line over their home as well? What about the animals what will it do to them?

Environmentally what impact will this have on our area? What about the wild life? We have deer, trumpeter swans, eagles, ducks, wild turkeys and etc. How will this impact their habitat? What harm will come to them by taking existing trees away from them? How will this affect the fish in the river and potato lake over long term? What damage will be done that will be irreversible? What harm will be done to livestock and pets over the long term? What about the big beautiful trees that have been here for a very long time? It takes hundreds of years for them to grow back like that. The beauty of county rd 18 would be destroyed. What is most convenient to Great River Energy is also will be the most devastating to the homeowners and our natural resources.

Until this project we had never heard of Eminent Domain, providing for the common good. What a joke, seizure of private property is a form of socialism in our eyes. What and who gives the right for someone to come onto our property and take it away when we purchased it, we pay the taxes on it, we take care of the maintenance and upkeep. Our sweat and blood have gone into our property not Great River Energy's. Last time we checked we have the right to own and protect our property and we shouldn't have to worry about someone coming and taking it without consequence. Why should we have to pay for a lawyer to defend what is already ours.

We have been hard working, and good tax-paying citizens and we are shocked to learn that our land may be seized and we may have to be in a legal battle to protect ourselves and what is rightful ours. I highly request the Public Utilities Commission to intensely weigh the issues and "need" for this transmission line proposed route and to find an alternative that does not disrupt our values for this place we call home.

Through Representative Brita Sailer it is my understanding that the House Energy and Civil Justice committees are interested in reviewing how power companies have been treating private property owners and how eminent domain is exercised on the private property owners. What right do big businesses have, to walk all over law abiding citizens such as those living along county rd 18? Eminent domain

should not be loosely used to increase one company's investment, by stealing from other more vulnerable people's investments. A power line for the public good should use public lands, and not steal from private lands.

Great River Energy claim there is a growing demand for power to the north of us for new customers and growth, which is why they want to run a transmission line down county rd 18. They want to keep their new customers happy, but yet what about current customers who are very unhappy with this proposed transmission line route? The ironic part of all this is we pay for this line, not Great River Energy so shouldn't we the rate payers have a say were this is placed?

Great River Energy has alternative routes and other options available to them. Why could they not run the transmission line north to county rd 40? This route would give them a near straight shot from substation to substation. We were told by Great River Energy that if they went down county rd 40 they would have to use too many guide wires on the power poles, however how is this any different than if they ran down county rd 18 and had to jump across the road several times due to the close homes. This cannot be an acceptable excuse. My father in law does work for a power company and I have researched this entire issue.

Further north of county rd 40 there is public land, if they went this route it would impact less private property owners. In the long run wouldn't this be a cheaper route for them to take?

Great River Energy could run the lines underground but they won't even consider that stating it is too cost prohibitive. Why should our property be damaged to save them a dollar, when in the long run we will be paying for it anyway? Since this is an investment that will be paid back by the rate payers over the next 50 years, why not invest a little more up front to improve the long term out come?

Great River Energy can do better than what they are proposing, but we feel they are doing what is best for them and not the "common good".

Many homeowners will face financial hardship from this transmission line route, regardless of what side of the road the line is run down. We plead with the members of the PUC to hear our voices, and do what is right for the "common good" not what is right for big business. Please make Great River Energy use an alternative option. We don't want to see the beauty that is county rd 18 destroyed for an unjust reason.

Regardless of where Great River Energy runs there high-voltage transmission line we ask that they treat the property owners with fairness. If these projects are for the "common good" then the "common person" should have a say in it.

Thank you for your work on behalf of the home owners of county rd 18.

Sincerely,
Jamie Krautkremer
(218) 237-1980
Jamez_k@hotmail.com

cc. Rep. Brita Sailer

March 19, 2010

Holly Krautkremer
15003 County 18
Park Rapids, MN 56470

CASE # 5384-TS
DOCKET # TL-10-86

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
121-7th Place E. Suite 350
St. Paul, MN 55101-2147

Dear Commission Members,

My husband and I are unable to attend the meeting scheduled for March 25, 2010 with Great River Energy in regards to the high-voltage transmission line. We are opposed to the proposed route as stated before in our previous letters to the Public Utilities Commission.

Do to our inability to attended, I ask the Public Utilities Commission to set up an Advisory Task Force so there can be input from the ones that are directly affected by this project. There are a lot of unresolved issues that need be addressed. This need is further compounded by the fact that the meetings are being held several hours of commute away from the ones that this directly affects. Not everyone involved is able to travel that distance, therefore again, I am requesting that the Public Utilities Commission set up an Advisory Task Force; our interests and those of our neighbor's need to be taken into consideration as well.

Thank you,

Holly Krautkremer
Property Owner
(218) 237-1980
Catrules97@yahoo.com

Ek, Scott (COMM)

From: holly krautkremer [catrules97@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 11, 2010 12:32 PM
To: Ek, Scott (COMM)
Subject: Great River Enegy project Docket #ET2/TL-10-86
Attachments: Fact%20Sheet%20Revised%20Treated%20Wood%202-21-03.pdf

Jamie and Holly Krautkremer
15003 County 18
Park Rapids, MN 56470

May 11, 2010

Scott E. Eke, Project Manager
Minnesota Department of Commerce
Office of Energy Security
85 7th Place East, Suite 500
St. Paul, MN 55101-2198

I am sending this in regards to the Docket #ET2/TL-10-86 Transmission Line.

We are against the route coming down county rd 18. We are in favor for an alternative route "Northern Route" which would run from Emmaville straight west to Highway 71. This route is made up of predominately undeveloped property with no homes in its path. A majority of this land is owned by the county and state. We are asking the OES to reject Counties 18 and 40 as GRE route options and consider the northern route that was discussed at the Advisory Task Force Meeting on May 4th 2010.

By rejecting county 18 and 40 route; homes that are close to these roads would be spared of future health problems and concerns. We've attached a fact sheet on the chemicals used to treat the Wood Power Poles. Homes and the resident's lives would not be destroyed by this project.

Residents of county 18,
Jamie and Holly Krautkremer

Fact Sheet on Chemically Treated Wood Utility Poles

- Wood preservatives used to chemically treat wood utility poles contain dangerous chemicals, including dioxins, which harm human health and the environment. The last legal remaining use of pentachlorophenol (penta) is as a wood preservative in utility poles.

- There are approximately 135 million chemically treated wood utility poles in the U.S. Three percent of these poles are replaced annually.

- Wood preservatives account for nearly one-third of the 2.4 billion pounds of pesticides annually used in the U.S. Nearly 600 million cubic feet of wood poles (approx. four million poles) are treated with these chemicals each year.

- The three major chemical wood preservatives are pentachlorophenol (penta), creosote, and arsenicals (copper chromium arsenate, or CCA). A fourth, copper naphthenate, is considered an alternative.

- Chemical treating of wood poles is one of the last remaining uses of penta and creosote – 43% of all poles are treated with penta; 42% of all poles are treated with arsenic; and 13% are still treated with creosote.

- The use of penta is prohibited in 26 countries around the world, but not in the United States.

- Penta and its contaminants, dioxin, furans, and hexochlorobenzene are considered the United Nations Environmental Program to be persistent organic pollutants (POPs). These contaminants are restricted under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants signed by the United States in 2001.

- Wood preservatives are ranked among the most potent cancer agents. They are also promoters of birth defects, reproductive problems and nervous system toxicants. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) assigned a cancer risk 3.4 million times higher than acceptable for people that apply penta to poles in the field, according to EPA's draft science chapter on penta that was released in 1999.

- There are at least 795 wood preserving plants in the U.S. whose operations and waste products are not adequately regulated.

- In 1984, EPA issued a standard to limit dioxin contamination in penta to 1 part per million (ppm). In 1986, under pressure from the chemical industry, lead by the sole producer of penta in the U.S., Vulcan Chemical Co., EPA agreed to raise the dioxin levels by 4 times to 4 ppm. in some cases. This issue has not been revisited since 1986.

- The wood preserving industries strive to deny and avoid the cost and potential liability of the disposal of treated poles. A Beyond Pesticides/NCAMP study found that more than 60% of utilities regularly give away poles taken out of service. Given EPA's concern for residential exposure this practice may have to stop.

- Poles made of alternative materials, such as recycled steel, concrete, composite, or the burying of lines, are all alternatives to wood poles that currently are used. The salvage value of steel poles contrasts sharply with the disposal costs of treated wood utility poles.

- In 2001, the European Union severely restricted the sales and use of creosote after an EU scientific committee concluded from a recent study that creosote has a greater potential to cause cancer than previously thought.

- In February 2002, EPA released for comment a preliminary agreement with the three major manufactures of CCA to end manufacturing of wood preserved with CCA for residential use by the end of December 2003. As of February 2003 the final agreement had not been released.

- January 2003, the European Union announced a ban on all but a restricted number of industrial uses of CCA.

- In February 2003, the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission announced that it found that that some children may face an increased risk of developing lung or bladder cancer over their lifetime from playing on playground equipment made from CCA pressure-treated wood. This risk is in addition to the risk of getting cancer due to other factors over one's lifetime.

Beyond Pesticides/National Coalition Against the Misuse of Pesticides
701 E Street, SE, Suite 200, Washington, DC 20003
www.beyondpesticides.org

Jamie and Holly Krautkremer
15003 County 18
Park Rapids, MN 56470

May 11, 2010
Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
121 7th Place E. Suite 350
St. Paul, MN 55101-2147
Re: Case 53884-TS, Docket TL-10-86

Attention Commission Members:

We are writing to you in regards of the Great River Energy's/Itasca-Mantrap's proposed Transmission Line Project and alternative route/Potato Lake 115 kV Substation and Transmission Line. We are concerned Todd Township residents in Hubbard County; we live at 15003 County 18 Park Rapids, MN. We are greatly opposed to this project; if this proposed transmission line is run down County Rd 18 it will cause immense harm to our family and our neighbors. Due to Great River Energy's proposal our home, our land, our future security and our health is being put in jeopardy. The power lines will be placed dangerously close to our drinking water well; these poles are coated in a solution containing arsenic. I implore you to hear our voices; your agency is our hope of having our concerns heard and our due process meet. Our family and neighborhood all express deep concern over this proposal.

Great Rivers Energy's easement request will not only take out all of our trees between us and the road, and most of our buildable property, it will put the transmission line 40 feet from our drinking water well. This concerns us above any other issues as the power poles are dipped and sealed with arsenic. The proposed high-voltage line would also be 40 feet from our propane tank and wood stove. To move all of this would incur a great cost upon us which we cannot take on as we are young couple. Another health concern of ours is the EMF radiation that is

emitted from the high voltage lines. The poles would be 90 feet from our home and this could cause future health problems.

This proposed project raises the issue of Eminent Domain. What gives the big power companies the right to take our land, which we paid for, we pay taxes on, we maintain, not them. How is this for the common good if it negatively affects the people involved? If this is for the common good, then it should be on state land, not private land.

We are greatly opposed to this project and Eminent Domain. We cannot afford to lose our land which we invested so much into. We have attached a picture of our home and how it looks now, as well as one that we have digitally altered removing our trees to show you what damage would be done to our property and our life.

I recently attended the first Advisory Task Force meeting that was held on May 4, 2010. At that time there was an alternative route discussed, at this time there is not a name for it other than the "Northern Route" which would run from Emmaville straight west to Highway 71. This route is made up of mostly county and state land that is not been developed, there little private property and homes would be affected by this.

By rejecting county 18 and 40 route; homes that are close to these roads would be spared of future health problems and concerns. We've also attached a fact sheet on the chemicals used to treat the Wood Power Poles. Homes and the resident's lives would not be destroyed by this project.

Thank you for your work on behalf of the home owners of county rd 18.

Sincerely,
Jamie and Holly Krautkremer
(218) 237-1980

Fact Sheet on Chemically Treated Wood Utility Poles

- Wood preservatives used to chemically treat wood utility poles contain dangerous chemicals, including dioxins, which harm human health and the environment. The last legal remaining use of pentachlorophenol (penta) is as a wood preservative in utility poles.

- There are approximately 135 million chemically treated wood utility poles in the U.S. Three percent of these poles are replaced annually.

- Wood preservatives account for nearly one-third of the 2.4 billion pounds of pesticides annually used in the U.S. Nearly 600 million cubic feet of wood poles (approx. four million poles) are treated with these chemicals each year.

- The three major chemical wood preservatives are pentachlorophenol (penta), creosote, and arsenicals (copper chromium arsenate, or CCA). A fourth, copper naphthenate, is considered an alternative.

- Chemical treating of wood poles is one of the last remaining uses of penta and creosote – 43% of all poles are treated with penta; 42% of all poles are treated with arsenic; and 13% are still treated with creosote.

- The use of penta is prohibited in 26 countries around the world, but not in the United States.

- Penta and its contaminants, dioxin, furans, and hexochlorobenzene are considered the United Nations Environmental Program to be persistent organic pollutants (POPs). These contaminants are restricted under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants signed by the United States in 2001.

- Wood preservatives are ranked among the most potent cancer agents. They are also promoters of birth defects, reproductive problems and nervous system toxicants. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) assigned a cancer risk 3.4 million times higher than acceptable for people that apply penta to poles in the field, according to EPA's draft science chapter on penta that was released in 1999.

- There are at least 795 wood preserving plants in the U.S. whose operations and waste products are not adequately regulated.

- In 1984, EPA issued a standard to limit dioxin contamination in penta to 1 part per million (ppm). In 1986, under pressure from the chemical industry, lead by the sole producer of penta in the U.S., Vulcan Chemical Co., EPA agreed to raise the dioxin levels by 4 times to 4 ppm. in some cases. This issue has not been revisited since 1986.

- The wood preserving industries strive to deny and avoid the cost and potential liability of the disposal of treated poles. A Beyond Pesticides/NCAMP study found that more than 60% of utilities regularly give away poles taken out of service. Given EPA's concern for residential exposure this practice may have to stop.

- Poles made of alternative materials, such as recycled steel, concrete, composite, or the burying of lines, are all alternatives to wood poles that currently are used. The salvage value of steel poles contrasts sharply with the disposal costs of treated wood utility poles.

- In 2001, the European Union severely restricted the sales and use of creosote after an EU scientific committee concluded from a recent study that creosote has a greater potential to cause cancer than previously thought.

- In February 2002, EPA released for comment a preliminary agreement with the three major manufactures of CCA to end manufacturing of wood preserved with CCA for residential use by the end of December 2003. As of February 2003 the final agreement had not been released.

- January 2003, the European Union announced a ban on all but a restricted number of industrial uses of CCA.

- In February 2003, the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission announced that it found that that some children may face an increased risk of developing lung or bladder cancer over their lifetime from playing on playground equipment made from CCA pressure-treated wood. This risk is in addition to the risk of getting cancer due to other factors over one's lifetime.

Beyond Pesticides/National Coalition Against the Misuse of Pesticides
701 E Street, SE, Suite 200, Washington, DC 20003
www.beyondpesticides.org