

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF MINNESOTA

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

FOR THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Route Permit Application for the
Hollydale 115 kV Transmission Line Project in the Cities
of Plymouth and Medina, Hennepin County

OAH 8-2500-22806-2
MPUC E-002/TL-11-152

Wayzata High School
4955 Peony Lane North
Plymouth, MN 55446

Met, pursuant to notice at 6:00 in the
evening on June 7, 2012.

BEFORE:

Eric Lipman, ALJ

REPORTER:

Angie D. Threlkeld

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I N D E X - V O L U M E 1		PAGE
SPEAKERS		
DONALD THOMAS WRIGHT	14	
PATTI O'DONNELL	20	
LOWELL TURNER	24	
DEB STAGE	30	
SHARON TARAGOS	38	
ALAN NAPIER	40	
TOM KUBINSKI	45	
JUDY JOHNSON	52	
PAUL ABLACK	56	
TAMI CARPENTER	58	
RON ROBERTS	64	
AMIN KADER	69	
DAYNA MURRAY	70	
JIM ZOOK	73	
YAN KRAVCHENKO	85	
DR. LAURIE AZINE	88	
JEFF MINEA	95	
ILAN ZERONI	96	
KRISTINE ERICKSON	109	
RON HANSON	111	
DIANE BRIDGE	115	
CAROLYN ANDERSON	118	
ALEKSANDR ANDZELEVICH	122	
MAKSIM BELOV	123	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TRACY CROCKER	126
MATT KNUTSON	129
JOANIE MEEHAN	131
STEVE THOMPSON	135

EXHIBITS:	Mrk'd
A Ms. O'Donnell's submission	24
B Mr. Roberts' submission	67
C Mr. Zeroni's submission	101

1 Wright, and then following him will be Patti
2 O'Donnell.

3 Mr. Wright, if you wouldn't mind joining
4 us down here. And, again, brevity is the soul of
5 wit so we can hear from your neighbor.

6 With that, Mr. Wright, would you mind
7 stating and spelling your name?

8 MR. WRIGHT: My legal name, Donald Thomas
9 Wright, W-R-I-G-H-T.

10 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you so much,
11 Mr. Wright. What do we need to know?

12 MR. WRIGHT: Not so much what you need to
13 know, I had a question while I was doing some
14 research. I was reviewing a document file on this
15 document, read something that I would like to know.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: Can't hear.

17 JUDGE LIPMAN: Oh, can you -- is that on?

18 MR. WRIGHT: Sorry.

19 JUDGE LIPMAN: There we go.

20 MR. WRIGHT: Is that better?

21 JUDGE LIPMAN: So you were reviewing, and
22 you had a question from the document.

23 MR. WRIGHT: Okay. I was reviewing a
24 document filed in this docket. I read something
25 that I would like to know a little bit more about --

1 JUDGE LIPMAN: Okay.

2 MR. WRIGHT: -- a document from the
3 Department of Commerce and read as follows: The
4 Department -- excuse me. The Department knows that
5 Xcel currently has several ongoing proceedings
6 regarding new and/or upgraded 115 kV transmission in
7 the west metro area. There may be a single, more
8 efficient, higher-voltage solution to these issues
9 in the west metro. Development of such an
10 alternative in multiple dockets may be facilitated
11 by a contested case. That document then refers to
12 the Hollydale project.

13 Can the Department or Xcel speak to what
14 is meant by a higher-voltage solution?

15 JUDGE LIPMAN: I think the Department
16 staff is still out in the foyer. But why don't we
17 turn it over to the Applicant first? Either
18 Ms. Asah or Ms. Herring, did you want to address a
19 higher-voltage solution?

20 MS. HERRING: Yes, I can address your
21 question. The higher-voltage solution is not a
22 solution that is currently proposed by the
23 Applicants for this project. That was an
24 alternative that the Department of Commerce put
25 forth for another project. If there is a higher

1 voltage or alternative put forth, that would be put
2 forth as part of the certificate of need process,
3 which right now we're in the route portion of the
4 proceeding process where we're determining where the
5 proposed facilities will go. The certificate of
6 need process will determine size, type, and planning
7 for a different voltage solution, and that would be
8 a different process. Does that answer your
9 question?

10 MR. WRIGHT: Sort of. I'm just curious,
11 though, is there any way that we can research this
12 or do you have anything out here that we as a
13 community can learn a little bit more about that?

14 MS. HERRING: The Company does not.
15 That's not an alternative that the Company has put
16 forward. It's an alternative that the Department of
17 Commerce has suggested. So, I'm sorry, I can't
18 provide any additional information.

19 JUDGE LIPMAN: Mr. Ek.

20 MS. HERRING: Perhaps somebody from the
21 Department of Commerce can.

22 JUDGE LIPMAN: Yes, Mr. Ek, if you
23 wouldn't mind. If you could introduce yourself
24 first.

25 MR. EK: Good evening. My name is Scott

1 Ek. I'm with the Minnesota Department of Commerce
2 Energy Facility Permitting Unit. And the question
3 was -- Mr. Wright?

4 MR. WRIGHT: Right.

5 MR. EK: -- Mr. Wright had was an
6 alternative, higher-voltage alternative. Now, we're
7 here tonight for -- that was -- that was something
8 that was mentioned by another division in Commerce,
9 which is the Division of Energy Resources, and that
10 was a comment that was made specifically to the
11 certificate of need process. And it -- and we're
12 here for the routing and the siting, the actual
13 location where a transmission line would go and, you
14 know, whether they should have a permit or receive a
15 permit for that exact location. So that's what this
16 proceeding is for.

17 The Applicants do, I believe, intend to
18 submit the certificate of need doc -- or application
19 in this docket, which would be run as a separate
20 process. And in that certificate of need, that's
21 where that question would be answered.

22 I can't speak for the other division.
23 They're not here. They're not part of the routing
24 process. But what happens for a certificate of need
25 is alternatives to what's been proposed by an

1 applicant are suggested by either the Department,
2 folks like you when the certificate of need process
3 begins, and they need to look at alternatives to, in
4 this case, a single 115 kilovolt line. So I can't
5 speak for why they said it or the reasoning behind
6 it, but it is a normal part of the certificate of
7 need process to suggest alternatives to what the
8 applicant has proposed. And that -- I believe the
9 Applicant would know or have an idea what they're
10 going to submit or if they're going to be submitting
11 a certificate of need application in this docket.

12 So as this process goes on, once they
13 submit that certificate of need docket, then the
14 process starts with that. And that's where the
15 question that you asked would be answered. It's not
16 part of the routing process for which we're here
17 tonight. But once the CN, certificate of need,
18 process starts, that's when your question would
19 likely be answered.

20 MR. WRIGHT: Is there a time frame
21 probably when that would happen? I just --

22 MR. EK: I'll give it over to the
23 Applicants. They would have a better idea.

24 MS. ASAH: We're proposing to submit the
25 certificate of need by the end of this month.

1 If I may add one other piece?

2 JUDGE LIPMAN: Please, Ms. Asah.

3 MS. ASAH: As Gene and I have just been
4 noting here, this project, and I mentioned it in my
5 presentation, is a local-load-serving project. And
6 so for the Applicant, a local-load-serving project
7 would mean that we would propose a 115 kilovolt
8 solution or lower-voltage solution rather than a
9 higher voltage. So for us it's not something we
10 would propose or be using to serve the
11 local-load-serving issue.

12 MR. WRIGHT: But it could still be
13 viable?

14 MS. ASAH: I can't speak to what the
15 Department of Commerce would look into in terms of
16 what would be viable for them. But it's not
17 something we would pursue or use as a
18 local-load-serving issue.

19 JUDGE LIPMAN: Mr. Eknes.

20 MR. EKNES: Thank you, Your Honor. Maybe
21 a couple of things that I can shed some light on.
22 Number one, when we're talking about alternatives in
23 the certificate of need, we're talking about system
24 alternatives, not route alternatives. The route
25 alternatives are something that is being discussed

1 in this proceeding.

2 The other thing is whether there is a
3 larger line, higher voltage line that will address
4 the local needs, you know, that's something that
5 will be developed within the certificate of need
6 process. And by law if the project has both a
7 certificate of need and a route proceeding, the
8 certificate of need has to be decided first before
9 you can then designate where those lines are going
10 to go. So first we have to make the choice if
11 they're needed or not; and if they're needed, then
12 we decide where they go. So no shovels will go into
13 the dirt until the bigger system -- or bigger line
14 option has been fully explored.

15 JUDGE LIPMAN: Mr. Wright, can we go on
16 to Ms. O'Donnell?

17 MS. ASAH: Thank you.

18 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you so much for your
19 time and your contribution.

20 Ms. O'Donnell.

21 And then following her will be Lowell
22 Turner.

23 Ms. O'Donnell, if you'd state and spell
24 your name for our record.

25 MS. O'DONNELL: Sure. My name is Patti

1 O'Donnell. P-A-T-T-I, O-D-O-N-N-E-L-L. And I am
2 the director of buildings and grounds for Providence
3 Academy. I want to begin by thanking the Minnesota
4 Department of Commerce for hosting tonight's meeting
5 regarding the Hollydale project.

6 As many of you know, Providence Academy
7 is located on Schmidt Lake Road in Plymouth's first
8 ward. Providence is a K-12 college prep school with
9 over 900 students, founded in 2001. Our interest in
10 the Hollydale project stems from the fact that the
11 current transmission line, which is proposed to be
12 upgraded, runs directly through the east side of our
13 41-acre campus. In fact, there are currently five
14 poles located on our campus. It's our understanding
15 that the current structures would be replaced with
16 taller, wider poles. Even more concerning is the
17 fact that the lines would be upgraded from
18 69 kilovolts to 115 kilovolts. The lines are very
19 near our heavily-traveled areas which serve as play
20 fields for our elementary students.

21 Since we opened our doors in 2001, we
22 continue to build new buildings and improve our
23 infrastructure in order to attract new families not
24 only to our school, but to our community. In fact,
25 our future expansion includes a chapel located

1 directly next to the proposed line. This expansion
2 is difficult with current structures in place, let
3 alone the proposed upgrade. Providence Academy
4 parents, families, and faculty are concerned about
5 the impact the expansion will have on our community
6 of students. Because of our concern, Providence has
7 been actively working with the City of Plymouth,
8 Xcel Energy Company, and the Department of Commerce
9 to facilitate a compromise that would lessen the
10 potential impact on the 900-plus students who attend
11 our school.

12 With that said, Providence encourages and
13 supports the following alternative considerations
14 included in the environmental impact statement draft
15 scoping document dated June 5th, 2012:

16 One, if the rebuild is granted along the
17 route preferred by Xcel, we encourage the
18 transmission line that runs north and south on
19 Providence's campus between Schmidt Lake Road and
20 the railroad tracks to be moved to the east of the
21 conservation easement located on our campus. In the
22 environmental impact statement draft scoping
23 document, this is identified in Figure 1-4, the
24 Providence Academy alternative route;

25 Number two, if an alternate route is

1 considered, we support the new line being
2 constructed from substation A, moving south down
3 494, and then west along Highway 55, connecting with
4 the existing Xcel Hollydale substation and then
5 moving west along the proposed route. In the
6 environmental impact statement draft scoping
7 document, this is identified in Figure 1-4, the ATF
8 alternative route E.

9 In the end our goal is to protect our
10 students, protect our families, and protect our
11 city. The considerations we propose take into
12 account the following factors: Cultural values, the
13 proximity to homes, property values, health and
14 safety, right-of-way, and the impact on the
15 environment.

16 We hope you consider all of these when
17 making a final decision. Thank you for your time
18 and consideration. We look forward to working with
19 all interested parties to achieve a commonly-desired
20 outcome. And I will leave a letter with you as well
21 as exhibits that address our concerns.

22 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you so much,
23 Ms. O'Donnell. Do you have a spare that we could
24 mark as an exhibit in addition to the letter?

25 MS. O'DONNELL: Sure.

1 JUDGE LIPMAN: I guess I would like to
2 mark those materials as Exhibit A, and we're
3 grateful for your time and testimony.

4 (Exhibit A marked.)

5 JUDGE LIPMAN: So, Mr. Turner, if you
6 wouldn't mind stating and spelling your name for our
7 record.

8 MR. TURNER: Lowell Turner. L-O-W-E-L-L,
9 T-U-R-N-E-R.

10 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you so much,
11 Mr. Turner. Please.

12 MR. TURNER: Okay. We're at 21 units in
13 our townhome association, Walnut Grove Pond
14 Association. And my main concern myself is this 115
15 K transmission line that's going through here, how
16 that would affect my pacemaker.

17 JUDGE LIPMAN: Okay.

18 MR. TURNER: And which I have -- I would
19 like a report from an independent source, as our
20 home is only 20 feet from the center line of this
21 transmission line and it's right in the area where I
22 watch TV for about four hours a day. Anyhow, I'm
23 very concerned about the health and welfare of all
24 the units in there. They're all subject to this,
25 but I am -- our home is the closest of any.

1 Imagine -- they're asking for a 75-foot
2 easement. Imagine them going through these homes
3 and taking out trees, shrubbery, and stuff that's
4 going to be damaged and taking out trees for these
5 lines if they're going to stick to the 75-foot way
6 that they need. And this is really going to be
7 tough on resale of any home, especially if the line
8 goes in.

9 JUDGE LIPMAN: So, Ms. Asah, did you want
10 to try and address that, or is that Mr. Kotz? Is
11 that you?

12 Mr. Kotz, if you'd introduce yourself and
13 talk to EMF or pacemakers, if you can.

14 MR. KOTZ: Good evening, Mr. Turner.
15 Thanks for your comment. My name is Gene Kotz. I'm
16 the project manager for this effort for Xcel Energy.
17 I understand your question about your pacemaker
18 concerns. Xcel Energy has no concerns that it will
19 affect your pacemaker. We've built 69 and 115
20 conversions all over the state. We've never had
21 issues with your concern.

22 As far as your question about the
23 right-of-way, what we have now is right-of-way
24 exists on your property. We're not looking at
25 taking any more or creating any more; we're looking

1 at rebuilding the same center line that exists now.
2 So essentially if we were to go on that route where
3 you are, that pole would be replaced in kind with a
4 structure adjacent to it, and then the old one would
5 be removed. So there's no asking of any more
6 property. We would probably have to clear some --
7 the trees and stuff that are in that easement just
8 because it's an issue with operability and safety
9 and reliability. But I hope that answers your
10 question.

11 But as far as your major concern about
12 your pacemaker and EMF concerns, there aren't any
13 issues that we find at Xcel Energy.

14 JUDGE LIPMAN: Okay. And Mr. Ek.

15 MR. EK: I just wanted to let you know,
16 in the draft scoping document that you found out
17 front, both to pacemakers, implantable devices in
18 general, and property values, resale values as
19 they -- as they're concerned with transmission lines
20 and magnetic fields and so forth, those will be
21 evaluated in the environmental impact statement that
22 we will be preparing. And that's one of the reasons
23 for the meeting tonight is to find out those issues
24 that people find most important to them and ensure
25 that we study those in the environmental impact

1 statement. And that should be -- that should give
2 you -- the schedule for that to be released is the
3 end of the summer or early fall, and that will
4 provide all the information on questions you have
5 with regard to pacemakers and property values.

6 JUDGE LIPMAN: So, Mr. Turner, other
7 items that Mr. Ek and the folks at Commerce should
8 look into?

9 MR. TURNER: Well, Medtronics is where
10 the pacemaker comes from. They could not give me an
11 answer. And none of the doctors at Methodist
12 Hospital could give me an answer, and they couldn't
13 find any. That's why I would like a report from an
14 independent source --

15 JUDGE LIPMAN: Okay.

16 MR. TURNER: -- that would do that. It's
17 funny, but if they know more about it than
18 Medtronics, got that on file.

19 The thing -- and as far as -- I don't
20 know how -- they state 75 feet that they want.
21 Well, that's -- on both sides, that's going to clear
22 out many trees and stuff that have to come down.
23 And I understand that these poles are so far apart
24 that in a heavy wind they sway, and they could get
25 tangled up with these trees is my understanding from

1 what I've learned from there.

2 And as far as the value of our home, we
3 have been talking to realtors; and they tell us it
4 depends on where the line is, how high it is, and
5 how close it is to your place. The value alone
6 could drop from 10 to 30 percent. This is from
7 realtors who have had this problem.

8 Another thing, which was -- our home now,
9 which is this close, would they use this eminent
10 domain, which -- or would it be possible that they
11 could work around the home without -- or would they
12 force us -- and this was with a realtor, would they
13 force us, buy us out, or what's going to happen?

14 The wife and I are in our middle 80s, and
15 we can't -- you know, it's kind of tough on us old
16 folks here to do a lot of moving.

17 JUDGE LIPMAN: Well, given the closeness
18 of the easement to your TV room, Mr. Turner, would
19 you mind sharing your address, and maybe the
20 Department of Commerce staff could look at your
21 particular parcel?

22 MR. TURNER: 18130 39th Avenue North.

23 JUDGE LIPMAN: Okay. And so that's
24 something that the Department can look into.

25 Anything else that you'd like to have

1 them look into?

2 MR. TURNER: No. No.

3 JUDGE LIPMAN: Okay.

4 MR. TURNER: This is all I got. And I
5 want to thank you for letting me --

6 JUDGE LIPMAN: Oh, we're grateful for the
7 help.

8 Yes, Ms. Asah.

9 Actually, Mr. Turner, Ms. Asah has a
10 remark.

11 MS. ASAH: Would you mind if we address
12 the easement concern?

13 JUDGE LIPMAN: Oh, sure. Yes.

14 MS. ASAH: I believe Mr. Turner asked if
15 we would be clearing -- if we're proposing to clear
16 75 feet on either side of the transmission line, and
17 I wanted to make sure -- I wasn't very clear
18 earlier, I don't think. It's actually 70 feet that
19 we'll need, which --

20 MR. TURNER: It would be 37-and-a-half
21 feet from the line.

22 MS. ASAH: Correct. So if it's 70 --
23 75 feet would be 37.5 feet on either side of the
24 pole that would be maintained for a transmission
25 structure. And that would be for vegetation that

1 would happen and trees would be trimmed.

2 You had a question about what we call
3 blowout. That's when vegetation management comes
4 into play, where trees are trimmed. And so if the
5 winds do blow and the transmission lines sway, they
6 don't sway into the trees.

7 JUDGE LIPMAN: Great. Thank you so much.

8 Next with us is Deb Stage, and following
9 here will be Sharon Taragos.

10 Good evening, Ms. State. If you wouldn't
11 mind introducing and stating and spelling your name
12 for our record.

13 MS. STAGE: It's Deb, D-E-B, Stage,
14 S-T-A-G-E.

15 JUDGE LIPMAN: Ms. Stage, what would you
16 like the Department to look into?

17 MS. STAGE: Well, while we're here, I'm
18 wondering if I can ask a question about the capacity
19 need? Just because I was one of the earlier
20 homeowners; and what we observed is several times as
21 the homes were built, Xcel had to come in, shut
22 down. And I'm not sure if I'm messing up the
23 terminology. I'm not sure -- the boxes that are
24 actually in the subdivision that feed us, they're
25 transformers or transfusers?

1 MR. KOTZ: Transformers.

2 MS. STAGE: Okay. Twice we all got shut
3 down, our programmable heating died because we had
4 so many surges, and they dealt with a capacity issue
5 now that there are more homes. It was always
6 planned for X amount of homes, and they were all
7 roughly the same size. So my concern is -- one of
8 them is, okay, 115, yes, we need it now. But are
9 you budgeting for capacity based on the homes that
10 aren't built yet so that this doesn't keep
11 happening? Because let's do it once.

12 I mean, if you need -- I'm going to open
13 a can of worm with underground buried lines, because
14 I haven't heard that addressed anywhere. If you
15 need to bury them, there are a lot of advantages.
16 And I'm a misplaced East Coast gal who was out there
17 last fall when they had the storm, and the weight of
18 it took down trees everywhere. It was a disaster.
19 And it took a week to get power up and running.
20 Took two months with crews all over the East Coast
21 and Canada to clean up trees and down lines.

22 So I am an advocate for buried lines
23 because, to bullet point, everyone says it costs too
24 much. They've been doing it in Europe; and state by
25 state now in California, I know Chicago is doing it,

1 Connecticut just passed a law, every new line must
2 be buried. And the advantages are you don't have
3 the EMFs, the electric fields. They're gone.
4 They're underground. The health risks are removed.
5 You don't have the downtime from wind, hurricane,
6 lightning, a semi running into a pole. You aren't
7 knocking down trees. You aren't worrying about
8 swaying the trees. You don't have the transmission
9 loss, which they did a study in Canada. And I
10 figure Canada is pretty comparable to our climate.
11 Just what you lose in an over ground -- overhead
12 line, they say it could range from 50 to 67 percent.
13 And in one year that's \$220 million, whereas they're
14 saying it's 10 cents for every 100 million a single
15 line. Why would we not bury the lines? You can use
16 the land above. You aren't infringing on anyone's
17 home, trees. You aren't exposing anyone to health
18 risks from EMF. I guess I'm just confused why this
19 hasn't come up. And you aren't doing intentional
20 harm. When power lines came up in the past, nobody
21 knew about health risks. Now we do know, and state
22 by state they're ordering them to be buried.
23 Minnesota has been ahead in health and quality of
24 life and education. I don't understand why we're
25 kind of behind on this.

1 JUDGE LIPMAN: Ms. Asah, you or Mr. Kotz
2 want to address undergrounding or EMF?

3 MS. ASAH: I was going to address her --

4 JUDGE LIPMAN: Oh, great. Please.

5 MS. ASAH: -- capacity question first, if
6 that's okay.

7 JUDGE LIPMAN: Please.

8 MS. ASAH: I believe you were asking if
9 we need 115 kilovolts now to upgrade 69 line, will
10 we come back in a couple of years, oh, we need a
11 larger line. What we -- what our planners do -- we
12 have one here that can give you more details, Justin
13 Michlig -- our distribution system folks come and
14 say, we need additional capacity, we've got a lot of
15 distribution -- which may have been what you
16 experienced as an outage has happened -- they try to
17 fix the distribution first to handle additional
18 capacity; and once they've max'd out, they come and
19 say, please, we need help with that additional
20 capacity.

21 Our transmission planners then take a
22 look at the system and say, here's what we see now
23 we need, here's what we project in the 10, 20,
24 additional years future. So what happened about
25 45 years ago you saw the system upgraded,

1 34.5 kilovolts. Now it went up to 69 kilovolts.
2 And this voltage should last well into the future.
3 That's how we plan our system.

4 In terms of burying the line, I'm not
5 sure I quite understood your question. I understand
6 a lot of your concern about burying, why it would be
7 a good idea, but I wasn't quite sure I understand
8 what question you had for us.

9 MS. STAGE: Well, I guess as I'm
10 understanding what I'm looking at, every single
11 route is aboveground on existing poles or new poles,
12 as opposed to following 494 highway where there are
13 no homes. Take it underground, as opposed to using
14 poles. Why are we not burying cables?

15 MS. ASAH: I -- Mr. Ek would like to
16 answer that.

17 MR. EK: Hello. My name is Scott Ek,
18 again, with the Department of Commerce. I just
19 wanted to let you know that's already an issue,
20 undergrounding. That's been brought up in the past
21 during the past scoping; and we will be looking and
22 evaluating undergrounding this transmission line,
23 the feasibility, the pros, the cons, so forth. So
24 that is an item that we will be looking at in the
25 environmental impact statement. And once that comes

1 out, I know I'm going to be repeating myself, saying
2 we're going to look that over, look that over. So
3 that's the whole reason we're going through this
4 process is to fill that environmental impact
5 statement with all the facts and information, and
6 undergrounding will be one of them. And once that
7 comes out, people will be able to comment again on
8 that underground option on what they saw, what they
9 liked about it, what they don't like about it, and
10 so forth. So that is something we are going to be
11 taking a look at and evaluating.

12 MS. STAGE: So as we are looking at this
13 and stating our preference or making our comments,
14 how do we indicate that?

15 JUDGE LIPMAN: Oh, well, you just did.
16 And he says that it was on the list before and that
17 you'll get an opportunity to make a comment on their
18 assessment.

19 MS. STAGE: Okay.

20 JUDGE LIPMAN: And so right now we're
21 making a checklist, a laundry list of items, or
22 maybe it's better to say as a table of contents for
23 their assessment. And I guess Mr. Ek is saying for
24 sure undergrounding is going to be an area of
25 inquiry. And then you'll get to read that and say,

1 oh, you left out X or you should have thought of Y.

2 MS. STAGE: Okay. I don't know if it's
3 possible as you look into expenses, but what they
4 had found in, you know, Canada and several of the
5 other states is that it's only like 10 cents per
6 hundred million of cost to bury a line, and it
7 amounted to somewhere between 10 and 15 cents a
8 month for residents. I mean, I'd happily write you
9 a check for \$30 a year to bury it and take away all
10 the risk and over the long haul to have it cost less
11 in terms of the environment, the health issue,
12 maintenance, not going down. It's much more
13 reliable because you don't have all that. I just
14 want to know it is under consideration.

15 MR. EK: It is. And all the things you
16 just brought up are. We go through the pros and the
17 cons of undergrounding a transmission line in the
18 environmental impact statement. And so of course
19 cost would be, health impacts, reliability,
20 everything I just named off would go into that list
21 of, you know, can it be done, is this going to help,
22 is this going to mitigate a problem, and so forth.
23 So, yeah, all the items you just brought up.

24 JUDGE LIPMAN: And, Ms. Stage, if you
25 have items for the Canada study or other studies

1 that you thought were worth reading, that's a good
2 thing to put on the comment form and send it in so
3 we can make sure it's part of the record. You can
4 forward it on to the Department of Commerce. If
5 you've got a study, you've got a bibliography you
6 want to share, that's a great thing to do before
7 June 22nd.

8 MS. STAGE: Sure. Okay. I appreciate
9 that. Like I said, I guess I didn't thoroughly
10 understand that it was even an option. I just
11 thought the only option was where you want the
12 poles.

13 JUDGE LIPMAN: Oh, no, no, no. We're
14 here tonight to get suggestions on what they should
15 look into.

16 MS. STAGE: Okay.

17 JUDGE LIPMAN: So is it okay if we go on
18 to Ms. Taragos?

19 MS. STAGE: Yes. Thank you.

20 JUDGE LIPMAN: Great. Thank you so much
21 for your --

22 MS. STAGE: And I'll drop this off before
23 the end of the evening.

24 JUDGE LIPMAN: Oh, yes, or before
25 June 22nd.

1 Sharon Taragos. And following her will
2 be Tim Anderson.

3 JUDGE LIPMAN: Ms. Taragos, if you
4 wouldn't mind stating and spelling your name for our
5 record.

6 MS. TARAGOS: My first name is Sharon,
7 S-H-A-R-O-N.

8 JUDGE LIPMAN: Oh, please.

9 MS. TARAGOS: And the last name is
10 Taragos, T-A-R-A-G-O-S.

11 JUDGE LIPMAN: Ms. Taragos.

12 MS. TARAGOS: We are among the very first
13 in Bridlewood Farms, and we chose our lot because it
14 was a wonderful location in a cul-de-sac backing up
15 to the woods. And now we find that -- right now
16 where the house is located, we're directly impact by
17 this decision. We have a deck on the back of the
18 house made with the permission of Plymouth to do
19 that. And we are 45 feet from the deck to the rail
20 to the west side of the house, and that was all --
21 that was all okay. But it's really not going to be
22 very okay anymore, which is all -- because the power
23 line is located -- what we have now is 45 feet from
24 our deck to the edge of the property to overhead in
25 our backyard, and now it's going to be even

1 stronger. And we've heard that there's a lot of
2 noise, there's humming, there's perhaps a safety
3 issue. We've been told by another CenterPoint guy
4 that it is really a noise problem for people.

5 JUDGE LIPMAN: So you want the Department
6 to look into noise and safety?

7 MS. TARAGOS: Indeed.

8 JUDGE LIPMAN: Okay. Other topics for
9 inquiry?

10 MS. TARAGOS: That is it.

11 JUDGE LIPMAN: Okay. Ms. Asah, do you
12 have a comment?

13 MS. ASAH: We do not.

14 JUDGE LIPMAN: Okay. Great. Thank you
15 so much, Ms. Taragos. We're grateful for your time
16 and contributions.

17 Mr. Anderson. And then followed by him
18 will be Alan Napier.

19 MR. ANDERSON: Your Honor, I'll pass.

20 JUDGE LIPMAN: Okay.

21 MR. ANDERSON: My concern was
22 undergrounding.

23 JUDGE LIPMAN: Okay. Great.

24 Mr. Anderson passes.

25 Mr. Napier. And followed by him would be

1 Tom Kubinski.

2 Mr. Napier, if you wouldn't mind stating
3 and spelling your name for our record.

4 MR. NAPIER: Alan, A-L-A-N. Napier is
5 N-A-P-I-E-R.

6 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you so much.
7 Mr. Napier.

8 MR. NAPIER: I'd like to -- I'd like to
9 accent a couple of points, and that's with the
10 health issues.

11 JUDGE LIPMAN: Sure.

12 MR. NAPIER: Mr. Turner brought up the
13 fact that he would like to have an independent
14 survey of health issues as well as an independent
15 survey of home values. I've heard Xcel say that
16 there's no issue with pacemakers, there's no issue
17 with any kind of EMF, et cetera.

18 Frankly, they wouldn't put these wires
19 150 feet in the air if they were beneficial. They
20 put them up there for a reason, and it's not because
21 they -- you know, they're good for you. So if there
22 is going to be a health study, I'd like that to be
23 an independent health study.

24 Mr. Turner also stated independent home
25 values, 10 to 30 percent he quoted. I've heard even

1 more than that, especially in a buyer's market, that
2 people just flat won't buy a home that backs up to a
3 wire. And if this study shows within Xcel that
4 there's no impact on home values, then it might be
5 nice if they would make us whole, if somebody
6 wouldn't buy our home because it backed up to a
7 power line.

8 So, again, an independent study, not --
9 not an Xcel cherry-picked study, but independent.

10 And, third and very important, it's my
11 understanding when we bought the house it was given
12 to us as -- I couldn't find the documentation, but
13 that GRE line that goes through the back of our
14 house isn't a main line. It's used sparingly. It's
15 a standby case. It's not up all the time. So if
16 we're going to do a study between upgrading between
17 a zero voltage line that's not in use and 115 volt
18 line, that would be the comparison. The 69 volt is
19 kind of a -- to me it's a red herring. It's not a
20 69-volt line all the time; it's only a 69-volt line
21 when GRE needs a standby for it.

22 And I don't know, and this is all okay, I
23 don't know if this is scientific at all; but when
24 that line is active, we can hear it hum. When it's
25 not active, which is the vast majority of the time,

1 we can't. Now, if that is indeed a caliber on
2 whether or not that line is actually in use, it's
3 not in use very much at all.

4 So when we do the study on the impact of
5 it, somebody also has to study how it's used,
6 because it's being proposed as a constant-use line,
7 and I don't believe right now it is a constant-use
8 line. At least it wasn't when we moved into the
9 house in '95. So you could add that to the list of
10 things that you're looking into.

11 The final item that I'd like to bring out
12 and highlight is that during the public hearings
13 that we had months ago now, we had all of these
14 proposals put forward, and the groups -- the
15 group -- at least one of the groups that I went to
16 asked -- one of the speakers asked who in here
17 objects to the line as proposed. Universally
18 everybody in the room raised their hands. But the
19 other question that he asked was who in here would
20 have any objections to the route alternative, which
21 is E, which Providence Academy had at least one of
22 the preferred routes for them to see if Plymouth
23 identified a preferred route to them, who in here
24 objects to that. Nobody raised their hand.

25 So there is agreement in the community as

1 to a route for this line, should it become necessary
2 or should it be certified as necessary, should it be
3 put in, should it go through this alternative.

4 There is a route that's universally acceptable.
5 That's route 55/494 alternative. It's route E on
6 your alternatives. The fact that it's route --
7 effectively number 1 out of 17 or number 80 out of
8 17 kind of belies the fact that it's an agreed-upon
9 or at least a universally-acceptable community
10 alternative. So if there is to be a study, there
11 should be some impact in there that says that E is,
12 from the community, a very acceptable alternative.

13 JUDGE LIPMAN: Okay. Thank you so much,
14 Mr. Napier.

15 Ms. Asah?

16 MS. ASAH: We were just going to clarify
17 the 69-kilovolt line use and where it is active and
18 where it's not active. From the Medina substation
19 to the Hollydale substation is active all the time.
20 In 2006, from the Hollydale substation to the new
21 115 connection on 494, it was taken out of service
22 and used as a backup. I can't speak to where your
23 home is. The Hollydale substation on the map is
24 going to be where the 55 route comes in up to 494
25 has been inactive since 2006.

1 MR. NAPIER: Okay. Point. Most of the
2 homes we're talking about and most of the impact of
3 people who are here tonight is on the north side of
4 Route 55, which you just said is inactive?

5 MS. ASAH: I believe we're talking about
6 the same location. And it hasn't been active since
7 2006.

8 MR. NAPIER: Then the upgrade is now from
9 zero to 115, not from 69. For the vast majority of
10 these people, I would ask -- well, I'm not going to
11 ask for it, because it's already in concrete. But
12 the vast majority of the impact of people is from 55
13 north.

14 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you, Mr. Napier.
15 Very grateful.

16 Mr. Kubinski. And as Mr. Kubinski is
17 making his way, I'll ask, Councilwoman Johnson, did
18 you want to make remarks or did you want to be
19 progressed forward to later in the list?

20 MS. JOHNSON: I'm right here and I'll
21 make remarks.

22 JUDGE LIPMAN: Okay. Great. Thank you.

23 So, Mr. Kubinski, if you wouldn't mind
24 joining us. If you could state and spell your name
25 for our record.

1 MR. KUBINSKI: Absolutely. My name is
2 Tom Kubinski. K-U-B, as in boy, I-N-S-K-I. And,
3 Your Honor, I just wanted to thank you for having
4 this opportunity, and there's been a lot of great
5 comments. And I want to talk to the health issue
6 first and foremost.

7 We've talked about center lines to our
8 homes, and I did do a measurement. My home dead
9 center to the fence is 1 foot, dead center to the
10 backyard deck is 57 feet, dead center back to my
11 kids' room is 69 feet. And that's a second story
12 level. That's where they sleep every night for
13 eight hours or more. And looking at all the
14 studies, which the bell curve that we've been
15 showing, there's a 200-foot diminishing return of
16 harm. Well, if my kids' floor is the second floor,
17 that's pretty much close to that wire, which is
18 probably at the top of the bunker.

19 Now, there's been studies done, and I can
20 submit them, on links to international organizations
21 that study EMF. So I'll put that in comments, which
22 you can look them up. So they have been done about
23 the health risk hazards, the cancer that comes from
24 it. Me personally I have more personal concern with
25 cancer. I am now in my two-and-a-half years

1 pro-cancer survival mode, and I am not considered
2 cancer free until five years. If I'm going to have
3 a power line in my backyard that's going to work
4 7/24/365 and my backyard is where I spend time with
5 my kids in all kinds of activity, that's going to be
6 a threat to my survivor -- survival.

7 Had I known that this power line, which I
8 already knew was inactive when I bought my home, was
9 going to be upgraded, I would have never bought the
10 home.

11 Real estate agents, which has been stated
12 and talked to already, have confirmed my findings
13 are 10 to 40 percent decrease in home value. And
14 that percentage sways by the closeness of the home.
15 And I'm very, very close to that wire. So the
16 depreciation value of my home, which is my biggest
17 investment, my biggest cost, in the future is going
18 to be greatly affected.

19 The bottom line is we are talking about
20 costs and Xcel wanting to do this. We can't purely
21 look at costs. We have to look at standard of
22 living, lifestyle, health issues. And cost has to
23 be the bottom line or the way bottom of the totem
24 pole for consideration. If it costs an extra
25 300,000 or a million dollars to produce it, the

1 health that's going to be affected is more
2 important, I think. It should be their loss.

3 The alternative routes that were listed
4 originally are a joke. They're established to make
5 sure that the main plan or route made the most sense
6 cost wise. After all these meetings, as we all
7 agree, alternative E does not threaten very many
8 homes. It's already an existing path that can be
9 easily upgraded, and it may cost more. That just
10 makes the most sense.

11 The other thing that I'm concerned with
12 is this process is new to all of us as homeowners.
13 We don't deal with this. We are being forced to be
14 experts in something that we know nothing about.
15 We've got nobody holding our hand. We've got all
16 kinds of people banding together, but really running
17 around with their heads cut off. How do we as a
18 community look out for our best interests? Who's
19 fighting for us? Do we need to band together and
20 get an attorney? To fight who? Because we've all
21 had these goals, we've all had these discussions,
22 we've all had these open forums, and we all think
23 we're making headway; but what happens at the end of
24 the day when we walk away? Who's really there
25 looking out for the best interests of the people?

1 The next question I have is, when a
2 proposed route has been made, what are the chances
3 of a community fighting and having it changed? What
4 is the percentage of success of that? I have no
5 idea.

6 The other points I'd like to make is at
7 the very first meeting, Your Honor, was a divide and
8 conquer. We've been set up to fight each other for
9 the least resistant path that's going to affect us.
10 I don't want it to affect my neighbor, so it's going
11 to go into yours. If you look at all of those
12 alternative paths, it's one neighbor picked against
13 another. E makes the most sense. We've banded
14 together as a community. It makes the most sense to
15 the community. It should be the only option for the
16 community. It doesn't affect the wetlands,
17 snowmobile trail that may or maybe may not be used,
18 and all kinds of other stuff.

19 The other thing that I really like about
20 this process and I just want to bring it up is that
21 in the very first meeting we were made to believe
22 that Xcel did own the line that's inactive. There
23 were several discussions with several different
24 people that, no, they did not. I was also made to
25 believe that it was a currently working line, which

1 I found out was not.

2 And I also asked about the alternative,
3 and I went from table to table for three hours and
4 talked to various people that were there, and I
5 proposed the alternative E to somebody, and he said
6 to me, you know, I actually put this together, I put
7 the lines together, that makes the most sense to me,
8 would be the easiest for me to put up; why wasn't
9 that alternative submitted? That's his question.
10 He was excused from the meeting or I didn't see him
11 after that.

12 Then I talked about what is the sense of
13 need, another gentleman from Xcel. And there's
14 really no need for the line right now. It's for the
15 outer edges. It's for the further-out city areas.
16 So why don't you just -- or purposely shaping, from
17 what I was told, where we are now, the need is for
18 the future.

19 It's -- he also -- I asked about the 494
20 and 55 path; and I asked why can't you just beef
21 that up? And what I was told in the very first
22 meeting is that those lines have already been spoken
23 for for other needs. The community hasn't been told
24 this. And is it really true?

25 JUDGE LIPMAN: So you'd have the

1 Department look into those other alternatives,
2 beefing up other lines?

3 MR. KUBINSKI: Well, again, 55/494 makes
4 the most sense. It's an already-existing line. It
5 can be beefed up. But what I was told at one
6 meeting is that it's not available because it's
7 already spoken for. And I don't know if that's true
8 or not. But even if it is true, it can be beefed up
9 even more.

10 I was also told that burying the lines,
11 in that first meeting with another individual, was
12 not an option because it costs too much. So it
13 wasn't presented.

14 I guess what I'm saying is this is really
15 a nice opportunity for the public to be informed,
16 but from the beginning it's been kind of a cat and
17 mouse game. It's been I'm going to be notified a
18 hundred feet away from the line, which is basically
19 very limited homes, and then we'll see where it goes
20 from there. And I feel that the public really
21 doesn't know what to do, and we need some guidance.
22 And we've come together really well with a lot of
23 really good work from a few individuals, but there
24 are health concerns. They're proven. I don't care
25 what's been told. And my home, my close proximity

1 and others, with any cancer risk really concerns me,
2 and that we need an advocate for us.

3 JUDGE LIPMAN: I guess I'll just share a
4 personal comment to you, Mr. Kubinski, and maybe a
5 partial answer -- maybe not a complete answer, but a
6 partial answer. As I followed this case, and I've
7 only just recently been appointed by the Public
8 Utilities Commission to take some of these
9 processes, as I've seen the dockets, it seems to me
10 that the Commission has put greater rigor and
11 greater processes on this proceeding, a contested
12 case hearing, on new -- a new meeting like this
13 following the Best Western meeting to get us some
14 additional rigor and input into the scoping. And so
15 I think that from my perspective, I'll give you, is
16 I think the Commission is interested keenly in what
17 the community thinks and that the community has been
18 very helpful in shaping that dialogue with the
19 Commission.

20 Now, I think there's still work to do,
21 and that's why we're here tonight. We're going to
22 be here tomorrow. There are going to be open
23 proceedings throughout the summer and the fall. And
24 we're eager for folks to stay tuned. So I think
25 that's a partial answer, and I hope that you'll have

1 confidence that folks in St. Paul care deeply about
2 what's on the mind of folks here in Plymouth.

3 MR. KUBINSKI: Okay.

4 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you kindly.

5 Councilwoman Johnson. Councilwoman, if
6 you wouldn't mind stating and spelling your name for
7 our record.

8 MS. JOHNSON: Thank you. Judy Johnson.
9 J-U-D-Y, J-O-H-N-S-O-N. Thank you, Judge. I
10 appreciate the opportunity to be here tonight. I
11 serve as a City of Plymouth council member for Ward
12 1. I represent all these people. I also happen to
13 live on one of the alternate routes. And I served
14 on the advisory task force as part of this process
15 representing the City of Plymouth.

16 So I was first contacted about this issue
17 coming up on about two years ago. So people are
18 very invested in this, and I am too from many
19 different points of view.

20 Just to be specific and not to repeat too
21 much tonight -- I know we've made our comments
22 official as the City of Plymouth -- as this process
23 unfolded and I participated in the advisory task
24 force and working with many people here tonight, as
25 we looked at all the items that would be considered

1 under the EIS and are already a part of the scoping
2 process, we came up with a lot of the concerns that
3 we're hearing tonight. And they are already part of
4 the record, so I wouldn't repeat that. But they do
5 address in great degree the point about human
6 settlement, noise, proximity to homes, existing
7 utilities, property values is a big concern -- I've
8 heard a lot of that from people, everybody -- safety
9 and health.

10 One of the things that I did just go back
11 to the city council and said, listen, the task force
12 has come to some sort of agreement that we think
13 this route E should be strongly considered, and the
14 city council did vote and support that, and that
15 would be the 494/55 route.

16 On behalf of the people that live to the
17 west of 101, they've got a little bit different
18 problem because they're trying to come up with
19 alternate routes that would avoid their
20 neighborhoods as well; and as their councilmen, the
21 City of Plymouth stopped short of voting past that.
22 And as the advisory task force, I'd like to step up
23 and show my support that this process needs a route
24 too that would also move it out of the neighborhoods
25 and be least impactful to them so that they have the

1 same consideration that the rest of the city is
2 putting forward tonight.

3 I also do want to just mention that we do
4 appreciate this additional process, and I appreciate
5 the neighbors that brought this process forward, and
6 I support that as the City. But this rigorous
7 process was brought forward by the community and not
8 by the Applicants, and so we appreciate the
9 willingness to go through this because we hope it
10 will further vet the issues that are being brought
11 forward tonight and that will be brought forward
12 through the additional public comment.

13 I do believe it's important again that --
14 and I would say the City of Plymouth recognizes that
15 stability of power is important for our community
16 for not just residential, but the business
17 community, and reliability and stability is
18 important. And we know we're growing, as other
19 communities around us. But there will be a cost
20 involved in this one way or another, and it will
21 either fall on the ratepayers or it will fall on the
22 citizens of Plymouth. And what I really hope that,
23 as this process is considered and cost is
24 considered -- and we're all worried about costs
25 these days, but it really -- that we look at any

1 kind of process that can get it out of negatively
2 impacting the residents of the City, since it is
3 mostly ratepayers, whether that's undergrounding,
4 whether that's moving it off to a different corridor
5 that follows commercial/industrial routes rather
6 than residential routes. I know that that's not fun
7 when rates have to go up, and I know that the energy
8 companies go through a lot through the PUC to get
9 rate increases. I'm very aware of that. But
10 somebody's going to bear a cost, and I just don't
11 believe the residents of Plymouth should have to do
12 that, as we try to be a good partner in the spirit
13 of getting reliable energy to our community and
14 those around us.

15 The City of Plymouth also has a stake in
16 this because one of the sites, the preferred site
17 for the Pomerleau station, is really City of
18 Plymouth owned, and that was in our comprehensive
19 plan for play fields, and we will continue to work
20 with the power lines on that. But if the City of
21 Plymouth is to come forward and be a good partner to
22 provide land for a substation, I for one as an
23 elected official would like consideration for my
24 residents, then, who are also being brought into
25 this process, unfortunately for many of them.

1 And I think for the most part that would
2 conclude my comments tonight. Again, thank you for
3 giving me the opportunity. There's great consensus
4 in this community and support by the City of
5 Plymouth, and we have come together. We are all
6 going to solve the problem here tonight. The power
7 companies have a problem to solve, and now the
8 people of Plymouth have a problem to solve; and
9 we've come together with a solution, and we do hope
10 that will be taken very, very seriously. And
11 thank you for the opportunity tonight.

12 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you, Councilwoman
13 Johnson. I guess I would just ask that you prompt
14 your constituency and also other members of the
15 council, remember the comment form and to write to
16 me before 4:30 p.m. on June 22.

17 MS. JOHNSON: Thank you. I appreciate
18 your consideration.

19 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you kindly.

20 MS. JOHNSON: Thank you.

21 JUDGE LIPMAN: And so next up is Mr. Paul
22 Ablack, and following him will be Tami Carpenter.

23 Mr. Ablack, if you wouldn't mind stating
24 and spelling your name.

25 MR. ABLACK: Yes, Paul Ablack,

1 A-B-L-A-C-K. We got through 25 pretty fast. Wasn't
2 there 25 of us?

3 JUDGE LIPMAN: Well, the first list only
4 has one comment. But we are making progress, and if
5 you can keep --

6 MR. ABLACK: I'll keep it brief.

7 JUDGE LIPMAN: -- it as concise as the
8 others --

9 MR. ABLACK: Yeah. You know, I've done a
10 lot of research on EMF, and it's addressed a couple
11 of times tonight, and I guess it falls under the
12 human settlement section of the EIS. And my concern
13 is this: You know, we saw arsonic water in Erin
14 Brockovich. We saw smoking, which is now banned
15 everywhere. What happened -- and I know I've read
16 the application; and every time I read about EMF,
17 it's inconclusive, which to me means it can't be
18 disproven. So -- and then I see the activities in
19 Europe and some of the eastern states that are, you
20 know, making changes.

21 My question is this: Who owns the
22 liability if next year or a year after a line is put
23 in, all the sudden we find out that EMF is, in fact,
24 harmful and it is cancer causing? Is that addressed
25 somewhere in the EIS who actually has that

1 responsibility? Because that's what I would like to
2 understand, is who to go back to.

3 And one thing I'll say, too, I'd rather
4 pay a little bit more money to get the line rerouted
5 than pay for the cost of cancer for a whole bunch of
6 people. And I wonder if that's considered.

7 That's my comment.

8 JUDGE LIPMAN: Okay.

9 MR. ABLACK: Thanks.

10 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you so much,
11 Mr. Ablack. Grateful for your time and
12 contributions.

13 Ms. Carpenter. And following her, as she
14 makes her way down, is Ron Roberts.

15 Ms. Carpenter, if you would state and
16 spell your name for our record.

17 MS. CARPENTER: Sure. It's Tami
18 Carpenter. It's T-A-M-I. And then Carpenter is
19 just like the worker, C-A-R-P-E-N-T-E-R.

20 JUDGE LIPMAN: Okay. And what should the
21 Department look into?

22 MS. CARPENTER: Several things. So,
23 first of all, as a former executive of a company
24 that builds pacemakers, the whole reason that we
25 don't hear anything about them in terms of EMF and

1 things like that is people wouldn't die from it.
2 What will actually happen and the way they are
3 designed, is that they interfere with the ability to
4 sense normal electrical signals, and so it will
5 actually fire inappropriately. In other words, it
6 will deliver the life-saving device activity versus
7 not function at all. So we probably wouldn't hear
8 any reports of anyone dying from EMF, because that's
9 not the way the devices are designed to work.

10 So I just have a couple of questions with
11 regard to the material that I've seen that I would
12 like to see more detail and data on. And the first
13 one is is that there was a recent letter published
14 on May 31st with some answers back to a particular
15 consumer or people, and it indicated that the
16 maximum EF for this particular line at 3.28 feet
17 above the ground is going to be 1.34 kilovolts per
18 unit. And the way that the devices are designed for
19 this particular realm is the recommendation that you
20 never want to exceed 1 kilovolt per meter on a
21 regular basis. So if we've got 1.34 kilovolts per
22 meter directly underneath that line, my great
23 concern is if you take a 70-foot pole and you
24 subtract off, you know, 10 feet down from where the
25 line is, that's basically saying within a 50-foot

1 distance, you're at 1.34 kilovolts. And we've got
2 homes, as one person mentioned, that are 18 feet
3 from that line. And we know that the energy
4 dissipates from that line at a distance. And that
5 particular room might be two stories high. They
6 could be less than 10 feet from that power line,
7 which means they're certainly over 1.34 kilovolts
8 per meter. There's no doubt about it. Which is
9 .34-kilovolt over whatever the recommended level for
10 continued exposure.

11 So I guess I would like to actually see
12 actual measurements and distribution of those
13 measurements based on distance not only at the
14 ground level, but also at second stories, given the
15 proximity to several homes in this area.

16 The second thing is is that one of the
17 great issues we have in the western suburbs is
18 affordable housing. And if you look at where the
19 proposed route goes, the vast majority of those
20 homes impacted and those within a 25-foot distance
21 of that line are homes that are typically townhomes
22 and, therefore, the most affordable housing in the
23 entire state.

24 Most people who will go to purchase those
25 homes are looking for an FHA loan. And if you go

1 into the FHA website and take a look right now
2 today -- and, actually, I had my husband, who is a
3 realtor, check into this -- they state, No dwelling
4 or related property improvement may be located
5 within the engineering design fall field -- so, in
6 other words, where the pole falls -- distance of any
7 pole, tower, or support structure of high voltage
8 transmission line, radio/TV transmission power,
9 microwave, so on and so forth. The bottom line is
10 that these homes would be excluded from FHA
11 financing. So on top of the economic impact of the
12 property loss values and as a spouse of a realtor
13 who sells a ton of homes in Plymouth, ironically the
14 top two reasons people don't purchase homes is
15 proximity to the street and its traffic pattern and
16 power lines. So it will have a definite impact.
17 And he goes to homes everyday -- as a matter of
18 fact, he's showing homes tonight -- and hears the
19 comments every single time.

20 So for us to say that there is no issue
21 with pacemakers and things like that because there's
22 no reports, it's designed not to kill people should
23 they be in an EMF situation.

24 I'd also like to address some of the
25 comments that were made in the original routing

1 application. I asked some questions, and I never
2 did get an answer to them. And I was specifically
3 looking at the portion of route C, and one of the
4 comments that was made is that no new impacts to
5 these residents would occur from using the proposed
6 route segment C. And I guess I take issue with that
7 in that, A, it's a visual impact; B, we know that
8 there are health risks, even though no one can prove
9 it definitively. And, frankly, who's going to cough
10 up funding to actually study this? No one. And the
11 fact that route -- that particular route means that
12 there are 68 homes versus 19 that are impacted, and
13 50 percent of those homes are within just 100 feet,
14 and 27 -- excuse me, 14 of those homes are within 35
15 to 50 feet, and two of those homes -- and I'm only
16 talking about the smallest segment of their proposed
17 route -- are within 0 to 35 feet; one of them being
18 as close as 18 feet to the closest line, and they
19 have a second story. So that power line is less
20 than ten feet from the second story bedroom.

21 The second thing that they noted in the
22 particular example was -- is one of the reasons that
23 they indicated that that was the preferred route is
24 it would impact snowmobile trails. I would like to
25 know what snowmobile trails these might be, because

1 the alternate route C was basically down the
2 freeway, and the last time I checked -- I've lived
3 there ten years -- I have never seen a snowmobile.
4 Why is that? It's probably still on a route, but
5 that was back in the day where I lived it was a farm
6 and you could actually pull your snowmobile out of
7 your garage and start snowmobiling. There's no
8 accessibility to those trails whatsoever. Unless
9 you drive across property, snowmobiles are not
10 allowed. So, frankly, given that it's still on a
11 map is kind of comical because there's no accuracy
12 to them. And I'm an avid snowmobiler. So if I
13 could snowmobile out in the backyard, I'd be doing
14 it right now today. Well, maybe not today.

15 Okay. So I guess I would like an answer
16 to the questions that I had previously asked, and I
17 won't -- I won't bore everyone with all those today.
18 And I would also like to address the fact that when
19 they talk about eminent domain and we're not going
20 to make any changes to properties, how do you
21 possibly do that? And as a group of citizens in
22 this room today, ironically everyone in this room
23 can sit down and agree that proposed route E is the
24 one that doesn't pit neighbor against neighbor and
25 we all agree upon. So I'm struggling to understand

1 what the differential is.

2 So when I asked Xcel Energy to please
3 outline the cost of things, I would like to see in
4 their proposal for all the various routes the actual
5 costing. Because when they replied to me with cost
6 information, the reason I determined that they came
7 to the proposed route is the fact that it was
8 \$800,000 cheaper than any other route listed on
9 their alternative plans. So as far as I can tell,
10 the reasonable business reason they have for doing
11 this is the fact that there's an \$800,000 savings
12 and, thus, a greater management incentive bonus, I'm
13 sure. I can't see any other reason, given their
14 proposal, as to why the alternate route E would not
15 be accepted.

16 That's all I have.

17 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you kindly,
18 Ms. Carpenter.

19 Mr. Roberts. And depending upon time, we
20 might speak to Amin Kader.

21 Mr. Roberts, if you wouldn't mind stating
22 and spelling your name for our record.

23 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Your Honor. My
24 name is Ron Roberts. R-O-B-E-R-T-S. Ron is R-O-N.

25 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you. What should

1 the Department inquire into?

2 MR. ROBERTS: I have two comments and a
3 question.

4 JUDGE LIPMAN: Great.

5 MR. ROBERTS: I represent the homeowners
6 association Courtyard Plymouth Oaks along Rockford
7 Road, just to clarify some of my points. It was --
8 since we have -- obviously have community coalesced
9 around route E -- and that's pretty clear from what
10 Ms. Johnson said as well as others -- the
11 observation that we would make is that if we -- if
12 route E is selected, as we would hope that it is,
13 the poles and the lines that are in our community on
14 other routes should be removed and no longer even be
15 an issue for the community to face. And we would
16 recommend that to the Department of Commerce and
17 Public Utilities Commission.

18 Secondly, I have a study that I would
19 like -- essentially an article from the Southwestern
20 Legal Foundation in Dallas. It is not a current
21 article, but it raises some principles that I think
22 are very important, and I would like to submit it
23 for the record.

24 JUDGE LIPMAN: Yes, if you have a copy
25 that we can mark --

1 MR. ROBERTS: I will give it to you.

2 JUDGE LIPMAN: Great.

3 MR. ROBERTS: I'll give it to you.

4 JUDGE LIPMAN: So you're Exhibit B.

5 MR. ROBERTS: And I would like to make an
6 observation about it.

7 JUDGE LIPMAN: Please.

8 MR. ROBERTS: This is for people writing
9 the environmental study and evaluating an
10 environmental study. This article makes the point
11 that issues like health issues are very often
12 superficially dealt with in environmental studies.
13 And I looked at two or three of our environmental
14 studies on the record in the website, and I agree
15 with that; while it's an admission that there are
16 health issues, very often they were not dealt with
17 to any extent that would give you any confidence.

18 Secondly, as far as homeowner values are
19 concerned, this article talks about the perception
20 of homeowner values as a result of potential health
21 risks, and very often environmental studies don't
22 deal with that at all. And I would submit that
23 that's an important factor, because it's not so much
24 of what the value of the land really is, but what
25 somebody thinks it is. And so I would hope that

1 those evaluating the environmental studies for this
2 particular project would take that into
3 consideration. And I will give you this article for
4 whatever it's worth.

5 JUDGE LIPMAN: Great. Thank you,
6 Mr. Roberts.

7 (Exhibit B marked.)

8 MR. ROBERTS: My procedural question that
9 I'd like an answer to is in our homeowners'
10 association we have a sound berm and a wall or a
11 fence -- wall and a fence that have been erected for
12 the purpose of keeping the noise away from our homes
13 off of Rockford Road. And I'm wondering, if those
14 are within the right-of-way of a power line, do
15 those have to be modified? Can they stay where they
16 are? The right-of-way would fall within halfway in
17 our backyard. Does it have to be changed?

18 JUDGE LIPMAN: Ms. Asah, do you or your
19 team members -- are you familiar with the Plymouth
20 Oaks development and --

21 MR. ROBERTS: It's along Rockford Road
22 before you get to Fernbrook and 494.

23 JUDGE LIPMAN: Mr. Rogers.

24 MR. ROGERS: Yes, Chris Rogers with Xcel
25 Energy. I guess I need to know specifically where

1 your property is and where it falls within the --
2 or, more specifically, are you on the proposed
3 route?

4 MR. ROBERTS: Alternative route A.

5 MR. ROGERS: Okay. So there's no power
6 there today?

7 MR. ROBERTS: No power.

8 MR. ROGERS: Okay. Engineering would
9 need to take a look at that at the height of the
10 berm to determine whether clearances would be able
11 to be met, the process. The higher off the ground
12 it is, the higher the clearance would need to be.
13 So if you would be willing to provide your address,
14 when we're in that specific area, we could
15 certainly take a look at it.

16 MR. ROBERTS: 41st Avenue North. All of
17 the units in the association are along 41st Avenue
18 North.

19 MR. ROGERS: And the name of the
20 association again was?

21 MR. ROBERTS: Courtyard Plymouth Oaks.
22 And just an observation, if that berm along that
23 route is too high, we have a real value problem with
24 that, with those -- with our units.

25 MS. ASAH: If you could, if you could

1 please provide me your mailing address or your
2 e-mail or --

3 MR. ROBERTS: Sure.

4 MS. ASAH: -- so we can get back to you
5 with this information.

6 MR. ROBERTS: Okay. Thank you.

7 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you so much,
8 Mr. Roberts.

9 And Mr. Amin Kader will be our last
10 witness right before the break. Okay. So we're
11 going to take a standing break after Mr. Kader.

12 If you wouldn't mind, Mr. Kader, stating
13 and spelling your name for our record.

14 MR. KADER: Amin Kader. A-M-I-N.
15 K-A-D-E-R.

16 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you so much,
17 Mr. Kader. What should the Department look into?

18 MR. KADER: Well, the people before me
19 made very good observations. What I would like to
20 emphasize is burying the cable is something that has
21 been done by most communities, including third-world
22 countries. That's not something that should be
23 overlooked. But if Xcel -- if Xcel wants to do it
24 up kind of on towers, well, we have alternative E.
25 Everybody accepts it. It is good. \$800,000 cost is

1 not worth what we're going to go through in terms of
2 quality of life, health, and property values.

3 As we get older -- as we get older, our
4 house makes the highest investment we're looking for
5 to retire on. So what's going to happen now? I
6 hope Xcel, if you decide to do this, then add to
7 their project the 30 percent or 40 percent increase
8 in home values so we can still be comfortable. And
9 thank you very much.

10 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you very much,
11 Mr. Kader.

12 With that, I have 9:23 (sic) so that we
13 can keep on pace and use our time wisely. Folks can
14 synchronize their watches -- sorry, 7:23 is what I
15 have on my watch, and inaccurate as it may well be.
16 But we're going to start precisely in ten minutes,
17 at 7:33. We are in recess. Thank you very much.

18 (Break from 7:25 to 7:35.)

19 JUDGE LIPMAN: Our next commentator is
20 Dayna Murray.

21 Ms. Murray, if you wouldn't mind stating
22 and spelling your name for our record.

23 MS. MURRAY: My name is Dayna, D-A-Y-N-A,
24 Murray, M-U-R-R-A-Y. And for the record, I am a
25 real estate agent with Keller Williams. A very

1 large push of my business is in the western suburb,
2 primarily Plymouth.

3 JUDGE LIPMAN: Okay.

4 MS. MURRAY: I don't do it casually. I
5 do it full time.

6 JUDGE LIPMAN: Excellent.

7 MS. MURRAY: So homes -- as
8 Ms. Carpenter's husband also. I just want to
9 address specifically the house value issue. I think
10 it's come up a couple of times, hearsay within
11 hearsay. I do this firsthand everyday. I do know
12 that this will make a significant impact on our
13 property values. I personally live in Bridlewood,
14 for the record. And as I was just talking to this
15 woman here, a lot of proposals are talking about the
16 E alternative. There doesn't seem to be a whole lot
17 of alternative other than going straight through
18 Bridlewood, and I would ask for them to look at the
19 impact on that. It doesn't look good for those
20 living within Bridlewood.

21 We do know that progress means money, and
22 Plymouth was ranked the number one place to live a
23 couple years ago because it is a wonderful place to
24 live. We moved here purposely because of the
25 beautiful area it is and lack of impact of all this

1 exterior stuff that would happen to our homes.

2 I recently sold a home up in St. Michael,
3 though that's a different market; but that house
4 would still be on the market because of high power
5 lines behind it if it weren't for the little lady
6 that bought it because it's directly across the
7 street from her grandchildren. And that was the
8 only reason she purchased that house. Everyone that
9 walked into the house -- we kind of lowered the
10 blinds halfway so they couldn't see the big power
11 lines, but walking out on the deck you could see
12 them. It was on the market for a very long time for
13 that specific reason, and we had to lower the price,
14 lower the price, lower the price. Every comment
15 said beautiful home, wonderful neighborhood, whoo,
16 don't need the power lines. A gentleman with the
17 throat cancer said it precisely: I would not have
18 bought this house. This is going to make a
19 significant impact on our property values. I would
20 really like some alternative to the Bridlewood
21 thing, if you can avoid. It's a beautiful
22 neighborhood that ranges in price from 300- to 8- or
23 \$900,000. I could easily see a 30 to 40 percent
24 drop in that.

25 Thank you for your time.

1 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you so much,
2 Ms. Murray, for your time and contribution.

3 Next we have Mr. Jim Zook. And Yan
4 Eurochenko (phonetic) -- I hope I've done justice to
5 that -- after Mr. Zook.

6 Mr. Zook, if you wouldn't mind stating
7 and spelling your name for our record.

8 MR. ZOOK: My name is Jim Zook. It's
9 J-I-M. Z, as in zebra, O-O-K.

10 JUDGE LIPMAN: Okay. And what should the
11 Department inquire into?

12 MR. ZOOK: I guess I would qualify that I
13 live also along the proposed route. I have several
14 things I guess I want to address and requests I want
15 to make, some of which have been made before. I'm
16 going to bring them up again.

17 One of them is historical, I guess. I
18 feel like the original route of the existing lines
19 when they were put in were through a bunch of
20 farmers' fields. And clearly at that time it was
21 put in straight, I assume, because of cost. I don't
22 know why we didn't put them along the major highways
23 like at least Highway 55, which was there at the
24 time. But we didn't. So I feel like that was a
25 mistake. Obviously that's long past. But my

1 request would be that we not perpetuate that mistake
2 because we don't feel it's cost effective anymore to
3 make a different decision. I think it's still time
4 to do the right thing.

5 We've heard a lot of people support
6 alternative E. I support that as well. And I -- my
7 question is that that be thoroughly studied, I
8 guess. What I'm really looking for is the reasons
9 why that would not be accepted if everybody in
10 Plymouth is asking for it. If we can bury it, so
11 much the better.

12 I also do hear sometimes a sentiment from
13 folks, a question of, you know, those of us who have
14 houses that are on the existing lines knew that when
15 we bought the houses. And I want to say two things
16 about that, some of which have been brought up
17 before. One is the lines have been seldom used.
18 I'm on a Great River Energy line, which is seldom
19 used and currently not used. So as it was pointed
20 out before, it's going from 0 to 115 kV from my end.

21 Secondly is that I talked with Great
22 River Energy when we bought it. I asked a lot of
23 questions about those lines. I was told they still
24 fall in the category of low voltage lines.
25 Apparently the question they were asked was could

1 they ever become high voltage lines, and obviously
2 the answer to that is yes. If it can happen once,
3 it can happen again. So I want -- I'm concerned
4 that after we go to 115, we'll go to wherever is
5 next up the line.

6 My question there -- I heard the answer
7 before saying this should be good capacity for a
8 number of years. I'd like to know how many years.

9 I also just want to say on that topic
10 that to me it just feels more like wrong to take a
11 right-of-way that I'm sure people gave for low
12 voltage class lines and suddenly slip a high voltage
13 on.

14 JUDGE LIPMAN: Ms. Asah, do you want to
15 take the year question? Please.

16 MS. ASAH: I'm going to actually refer to
17 our transmission planner, Mr. Michlig. I will say
18 that our plan, we can't predict the whole future,
19 but he'll address it.

20 JUDGE LIPMAN: And if you could state and
21 spell your name for our record.

22 MR. MICHLIG: Thank you, Your Honor. My
23 name is Justin Michlig. It's J-U-S-T-I-N,
24 M-I-C-H-L-I-G.

25 And, Mr. Zook, to the longevity of the

1 lines, in our transmission planning our normal look
2 to the future is about 10 to 15 years. That's the
3 clarity that we run on. For that -- sorry about my
4 throat. The goal of anything that we put in the
5 field is that it lasts as long as it's designed.
6 These structures that we're putting in, we're
7 proposing steel at the moment. The steel structures
8 should last about 40 years, and I see no reason why
9 this 115 kV structure will not last for the area.

10 JUDGE LIPMAN: Mr. Zook.

11 MR. ZOOK: I guess I'm not worried about
12 how long the poles are going to last. My question
13 is are we going to have all these same discussions
14 in another ten years, and it sounds like the answer
15 is yes.

16 MR. MICHLIG: No. I'm sorry to be
17 direct, but we will not be coming back within the
18 next ten years --

19 MR. ZOOK: If you're planning capacity
20 for 10 or 15 years, why will we not be having these
21 discussions again in 10 years?

22 MS. ASAH: I think Mr. Michlig was
23 addressing the fact that when they do planning, they
24 plan the infrastructure, not only, you know, the
25 hard poles, et cetera, they plan our capacity to

1 last as long as the infrastructure lasts. That's
2 what he was talking about. So about 40 years is
3 what their goal is in capacity planning as well as
4 the infrastructure.

5 MR. ZOOK: Okay. And so what was the 10
6 to 15 years?

7 MR. MICHLIG: 10 to 15 years is a typical
8 planning process from -- the model itself was
9 designed to well survive that period and are
10 projected to last 40 years of the design project.

11 MS. ASAH: And I may add a little bit.
12 They're required to plan for 10 to 15 years. They
13 do additional investigation that project into the
14 future beyond their requirement.

15 MR. ZOOK: Okay.

16 JUDGE LIPMAN: So, Mr. Zook, what should
17 the Department look into? Other --

18 MR. ZOOK: I guess my -- okay. Other
19 issues moving from -- how long is the GRE lines been
20 there? When was -- when did we do our last planning
21 that we're doing it over again now?

22 JUDGE LIPMAN: Ms. Parlow, are you able
23 to help? And if you could introduce yourself for
24 our record as well.

25 And maybe you could just keep that on.

1 Ms. Parlow.

2 MS. PARLOW: I'm Marsha Parlow with Great
3 River Energy. M-A-R-S-H-A, P-A-R-L-O-W. This
4 transmission line was put in service in 1971.
5 That's when electricity was running through it the
6 first time. And my understanding is easement
7 acquisitions started in 1969.

8 MR. ZOOK: Prior to -- before any of our
9 homes were built. Okay. Another question I guess I
10 have, in the application I noticed that in the areas
11 where they propose to build new lines, the
12 right-of-way that is proposed is much wider than the
13 right-of-way where the existing homes are. And my
14 question is why is it okay for existing homes to be
15 somewhat closer than any future homes?

16 JUDGE LIPMAN: Ms. Asah.

17 MS. ASAH: I believe the difference is
18 approximately five feet. So the existing
19 right-of-way is 70 feet, and we're asking for
20 75 feet on the new right-of-way. And the 75 feet is
21 our standard -- it's standard to get -- generally
22 get for 115-kilovolt line, but GRE required 70 feet.
23 We tend to safely -- we meet all national safety
24 code -- we exceed national safety code of 70.

25 MR. ZOOK: Okay. I didn't bring it with

1 me, but what I remember from the application is that
2 it was much wider -- the reference to the fact that
3 it's looking -- you normally would get much wider,
4 that you could work within the existing. I don't
5 think it was a 70- to 75-foot distance. I guess I'd
6 request that we look at that.

7 MS. ASAH: Your Honor, if I may.

8 JUDGE LIPMAN: Sure.

9 MS. ASAH: I believe maybe --

10 JUDGE LIPMAN: Well, why don't you
11 finish your answer, and then we'll get to Mr. Ek.

12 MS. ASAH: I believe what you may be
13 remembering is the route width distance. And I
14 mentioned it briefly in our presentation, but is
15 that we're requesting a route width -- a route width
16 is an area that we ask for from -- yeah, from the
17 Public Utilities Commission, as what Mr. Kotz just
18 said, consideration. What we do with the route
19 width is look at the best place to put the structure
20 and line in that route width. In the existing
21 corridor we've asked for 200 feet as just a
22 standard. We are going to be dealing within the
23 existing corridor, with a few minor alterations
24 around substations. Very minor. Those have yet to
25 be fleshed out totally, but very minor area. As I

1 said, within 70 feet. And the 400-foot route width
2 we're looking at is for the new portion that we'll
3 be acquiring. So the route width is 400 feet where
4 we can put the line, and right-of-way will be 75.
5 So that's the difference.

6 MR. ZOOK: Okay. Thank you. It's been
7 brought up a couple different times. I also want to
8 express by the argument to say that there is little
9 to no impact to property values and there's little
10 to no impact on health from the EMS. And the
11 request has been made to study those. I would ask
12 for that same thing. Again, I would ask that those
13 be independent studies.

14 I think numerically I struggle with the
15 fact that we're doing an environmental impact
16 statement where the Applicants are doing their own
17 study work. It feels from the original application
18 they had already considered the original alternative
19 routes, turned them all down. It feels a lot to me
20 like their agenda is clear to stay with their
21 proposed route. And so it feels like we have a
22 study that's being done by a fox on the hen house.

23 JUDGE LIPMAN: Mr. Ek.

24 MR. EK: Mr. Zook, just to clarify, the
25 Applicants will not be creating the environmental

1 impact statement. That's the job of the Minnesota
2 Department of Commerce. We take their application
3 that they submitted back last fall, and we do
4 take -- we do take their information. At the same
5 time we look that over and we vet that information
6 to make sure it's correct. And we use that -- some
7 of it in the information. And we of course add to
8 the information, the information we're receiving
9 here from the citizens. But the applicants for a
10 transmission line do not have any part in creating
11 the environmental document, in this case the
12 environmental impact statement. That's done by the
13 State of Minnesota Department of Commerce.

14 MR. ZOOK: Okay. I think some of the
15 angst in this room, certainly for me, is in the
16 original application it was very clear what their
17 objective was, because they proposed alternative
18 routes and analyzed each of them, saying, well, they
19 didn't meet the project's objectives. And when you
20 look up the project objectives, it was primarily
21 cost. And I want to make sure that this
22 environmental impact statement does not go down the
23 same path.

24 A couple of questions I have. What is
25 the decibel of the noises that are heard by 115 kV

1 lines? Because I know they hum. I've heard them
2 hum.

3 JUDGE LIPMAN: Ms. Asah.

4 MS. ASAH: The trans -- 115-kilovolt
5 transmission line and other transmission lines will
6 hum in humid conditions. That's when you hear them
7 hum. What is the dB? It depends on humidity, how
8 loaded they are, how loaded the lines are. So I
9 can't give you the exact dB, you know, today or two
10 weeks from now if it's raining.

11 MR. ZOOK: Can you give us a range?

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: High and low.

13 MS. ASAH: I can get back to you with
14 that. I don't have it right now.

15 MR. ZOOK: That would be great.

16 JUDGE LIPMAN: And you can certainly --

17 MS. ASAH: It's in the application
18 apparently. Again, I moved to this project -- I
19 just got to it a little late. It is in the
20 application. I cannot tell you what page it is. I
21 apologize.

22 JUDGE LIPMAN: Mr. Ek has a comment, and
23 I think it could be obviously an area of deep
24 inquiry for the Department.

25 Mr. Ek.

1 MR. EK: Yeah, and that subject of noise
2 has been brought up a few times tonight. I know it
3 was brought up in the past with regard to the
4 transmission lines themselves or the substation or
5 even actually when they're doing the construction,
6 you're going to have noise. So in the environmental
7 impact statement we will be looking at that. We
8 will be providing those actual numbers, distances
9 and standards, and providing that information in the
10 environmental document. Unfortunately, you know,
11 it's hard to give you information now. But that's
12 our job is to evaluate all this stuff as we move on.

13 I know folks are anxious to find out
14 about all of these issues that are important to you;
15 but it's my job, after we put out the scoping
16 decision, to get to work and provide those facts in
17 that environmental document. And, then again, you
18 will have a chance to comment on those at another
19 meeting down the line, and we can respond even
20 further to those inquiries and so forth.

21 So, yes, it's always a very important
22 issue is noise when it comes to transmission lines,
23 as well as health and safety as well as proximity to
24 homes. Very standard for people to be concerned
25 about those issues, and we will evaluate them for

1 all of the routes.

2 JUDGE LIPMAN: Mr. Zook, concluding
3 thoughts?

4 MR. ZOOK: I have one other question, and
5 I know it was one that came up earlier, apparently
6 there was another department raised the question
7 about needing higher capacity lines, and that was
8 deferred, we should -- you know, because they
9 weren't some part of this conversation, I guess.
10 But it left me wondering why are we having this
11 conversation now if really we might be talking about
12 200-kilovolt lines instead of 115?

13 JUDGE LIPMAN: Well, I think what I
14 understood the answer to be is that we're focused on
15 route. And I guess the capacity will be what is
16 actually needed, and that will be a function of a
17 later proceeding. If the application comes in June,
18 that will start on a parallel track. They may well
19 meet up; they might go separately. But that's what
20 I understand the answer.

21 If you have a suggestion about some --

22 MR. ZOOK: Well --

23 JUDGE LIPMAN: -- no, no, some inquiry
24 for the Department on those issues, you know, we'd
25 be grateful to hear.

1 MR. ZOOK: I guess only that if we are --
2 it just only further amplifies the concerns and
3 questions we have about running this line right next
4 to our homes.

5 JUDGE LIPMAN: Indeed. Thank you so much
6 for your contributions, Mr. Zook. Very grateful.

7 Mr. Kravchenko. And following him will
8 be Laurie Azone.

9 Mr. Uravchenko (phonetic), if you
10 wouldn't mind taking a seat and stating and spelling
11 your name for our record.

12 MR. KRAVCHENKO: Yan Kravchenko. Y-A-N.
13 Last name K-R-A-V-C-H --

14 JUDGE LIPMAN: It was a K. Forgive me.
15 I'm sorry. K-R-A-V --

16 MR. KRAVCHENKO: -- C-H-E-N-K-O.

17 JUDGE LIPMAN: Kravchenko. Oh, forgive
18 me, I thought it was a U.

19 MR. KRAVCHENKO: No problem, you're the
20 law judge.

21 JUDGE LIPMAN: Mr. Kravchenko, what
22 should the Department look into?

23 MR. KRAVCHENKO: So I would like to add a
24 little bit more details to the subjects that have
25 already been brought up.

1 First I want to talk about an issue of
2 health. I realize there will be a study for the
3 human health impacts. I would like the study to
4 emphasize health impacts in people with immune
5 diseases. So if your immune system is no longer
6 able to defend it, which happens in half of the
7 people, whether there's any difference or not in the
8 way the energy waves are affected by. This is one
9 thing that I'm personally afflicted with, my health,
10 and the power lines are going to be basically in my
11 backyard. I'm very concerned about that.

12 The second thing I would like to offer
13 are in terms of research and value. A realtor
14 helped me purchase this house about four years ago.
15 A couple of things that I want to make sure that the
16 study focuses on. So as part of bringing in these
17 power lines, there will be a process for clearing
18 trees, there will be a process for clearing
19 right-of-way. We already know the wetland where the
20 power line currently sits has a very vibrant
21 wildlife. There are many trees. There are owls.
22 There are, you know, deer, all kinds of wildlife.
23 And it adds tremendous overall value to the
24 property.

25 So what I want the study to focus on is

1 not just the reduction of property values with
2 proximity, but what happens when you take a premium
3 loss where backyard used to be a wild area with
4 trees and wildlife and turn it into basically a
5 barren land where a power pole is taken up. There
6 is a lot -- there are a lot more factors to
7 determine the value of a home than simple proximity
8 to the power line. So I just want to make sure when
9 this thing does happen, they take into consideration
10 not only the power lines but change in landscape and
11 the effect on the wild life and the ultimate value
12 it adds to the land.

13 In terms of route E, this is something
14 that was brought up before. One of the things that
15 is very upsetting is Xcel Energy two weeks ago -- or
16 less than two weeks ago requested an approval for a
17 6.7 percent rate increase in energy costs. So
18 clearly they're going to try to get more money for
19 various reasons, and they are entitled to that.
20 They are also a \$842 million company, according to
21 their net income reported for last year.

22 I recognize that putting power lines into
23 the ground is going to cost more, and probably
24 considerably more. I can already anticipate the
25 comments and, you know, come out showing the

1 capacity issues, that there are existing power lines
2 there. So I think it's undisputable that route E
3 will be more expensive. However, in consideration
4 for what led to -- what has led to this to look at
5 this as not most expensive or least expensive, but
6 if Xcel Energy is profitable enough to be able to
7 afford the route that affects the fewest people, I
8 do believe the cost should be the absolute last
9 factor, unless it's truly cost prohibitive. But as
10 a company they're not shy about increasing the
11 rates. They're not shy about taking our money for
12 the services they provide. And for the most part of
13 the relationship, it would be nice to get some
14 better treatment from them.

15 JUDGE LIPMAN: Mr. Kravchenko, thank you
16 so much.

17 As Dr. Azine makes her way up to the
18 podium, our next commentator is Jeff Minea after
19 her.

20 Dr. Azine, if you wouldn't mind stating
21 and spelling your name.

22 DR. AZINE: It's Dr. Laurie, L-A-U-R-I-E,
23 A-Z-I-N-E.

24 JUDGE LIPMAN: Dr. Azine, what should the
25 Department look into?

1 DR. AZINE: I look at it as three basic
2 issues that we talked about from the get-go. It's
3 power, health, and finance.

4 Power. In the last two years my power's
5 gone out five times on sunny, nice days. And it's
6 annoying, but you put up with it. This year alone
7 already my power's gone out three times on sunny
8 days. There's a power problem in Plymouth since
9 they started building west by the high school here
10 and in Medina. I get we have a power issue, and my
11 home has been one of the ones that's been affected
12 from the get-go. But you cannot sacrifice people's
13 health for power. And that's what you guys are
14 wanting to do by when you put up from the get-go
15 where all the alternative routes were.

16 I am on one of the alternate routes. I
17 am not on the proposed route, yet I have been at
18 every meeting to say and stand up for the fact that
19 EMF does cause cancer. And when you guys are saying
20 that you're going to go back and study the health
21 risks, who's studying it? It's not physicians. You
22 guys, not one of you are physicians, are you? Is
23 there a physician who's going to study the EMF
24 and -- on your panel who's going to study it?

25 MS. ASAH: Are you asking --

1 DR. AZINE: I've asked the question every
2 time, and I've yet to get a response from you. So
3 this is why I'm doing it in front of the judge now.

4 MS. ASAH: Okay. Are you asking Xcel
5 Energy?

6 DR. AZINE: I'm asking in the scoping,
7 Xcel, who's studying it and saying that there's not?
8 Because back in 2007 physicians said there was.

9 JUDGE LIPMAN: Mr. Eknes.

10 DR. AZINE: It causes cancer. And I want
11 an answer from you guys there's something showing
12 that it's not.

13 MR. EK: Well, I can't give you an answer
14 today, because we need to look at it again. And,
15 no, we don't have doctors or physicians at the
16 Department of Commerce that are studying this.
17 However, we do look to the Minnesota Department of
18 Health to get information on this. We do look to
19 the World Health Organization and large
20 organizations like that that have done exhaustive
21 studies like that. So it is -- we're not going to
22 come out and do our own brand-new studies. It's
23 more a literature review of what's been done, what's
24 been performed since the 1970s. And we don't just
25 pick and choose on which -- which study comes out to

1 be better than the next. We take all the studies
2 that have been peer reviewed and have been used by
3 these recognized organizations throughout the world.
4 At the same time we look to guidelines that have
5 been set up in the United States, in Canada and
6 other countries with regard to magnetic fields,
7 electric fields, when it comes to extremely low
8 frequency or power frequency. So it is -- it is a
9 literature review. But we -- no, we don't have the
10 capacity to go out and start our own new study like
11 some of these organizations have.

12 DR. AZINE: And the greatest
13 recommendation WHO always puts out is bury the lines
14 first and foremost. And that is still the best
15 option in this case is to bury the lines. To bury
16 the lines is the best thing. And as a cancer
17 survivor myself, I see from not only patient's
18 perspective but as a physician on this line. And
19 this line, you can't really argue about patients'
20 lives, because I asked at the very first meeting and
21 I want it all on the record again, how many of you
22 live with power lines in your backyards and how many
23 of you have poles in your backyard? I want it on
24 record in front of the judge how many of you
25 actually have lines and poles in your yards? Each

1 one of you to respond.

2 MR. ROGERS: This is Chris Rogers, Xcel.
3 I live less than 200 feet from a double 115 line in
4 my backyard, less than 200 feet.

5 JUDGE LIPMAN: Well, like I say, Doctor,
6 we're here to set the agenda for -- the line of
7 inquiry for Commerce today.

8 But I appreciate your testimony,
9 Mr. Rogers.

10 Are there other things that they should
11 look into?

12 DR. AZINE: Yep. And the last one,
13 again, as I said, is finance.

14 JUDGE LIPMAN: Oh, please.

15 DR. AZINE: I paid a lot premium to live
16 where I do. And is everybody who has a lot premium
17 where they live if the route goes where it is -- can
18 I get paid back the money if the poles go in their
19 yards for the lot evaluation that they're going to
20 have if that happens? Does Xcel -- that 800,000
21 difference is going to come back to all of us that
22 we all paid in lot premiums? I'd like to know that
23 answer too, since it was never actually provided to
24 me when I asked it last time.

25 JUDGE LIPMAN: Mr. Rogers, you wanted to

1 talk about --

2 MR. ROGERS: I don't believe I have
3 enough information to answer that question at this
4 time.

5 DR. AZINE: Yeah, that's the same answer
6 I got the first time around.

7 JUDGE LIPMAN: Well, but --

8 DR. AZINE: And I expected I would get a
9 response at some point if that happens.

10 JUDGE LIPMAN: And, Doctor, what we're
11 doing tonight, apart from whether you like
12 Mr. Rogers' answer or not, is that you want the
13 Department to deeply look into --

14 DR. AZINE: Yeah.

15 JUDGE LIPMAN: -- whether the way that
16 landowners are compensated is fair and appropriate,
17 and you want that to be part of their -- their
18 assessment of on the overall impacts. And you've
19 identified the impact of property values and who
20 those costs are visited on as opposed to the
21 ratepayers as an item for inquiry. And we're
22 grateful for focusing the Department that way.

23 Ms. Asah.

24 MS. ASAH: I think Mr. Rogers would like
25 to add --

1 JUDGE LIPMAN: Oh, Mr. Rogers, please.

2 MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, I would just
3 like to say, if new acquisition is involved -- it
4 sounds like you're on an alternative route.

5 DR. AZINE: Yes.

6 MR. ROGERS: There are no rights there.
7 Should that situation come into that, route chosen,
8 Xcel Energy, like any utility, would analyze your
9 property, look at the impacts, what the impact will
10 be for that pole being on your lot, and look at the
11 impacts to value and come up with fair compensation
12 to compensate you for the easement area of taking
13 over your property, should that be the case.

14 MS. ASAH: And if you would like
15 additional information on how those things take
16 place, Mr. Rogers will be available afterward for a
17 short while to talk about that.

18 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you so much, Doctor.
19 Grateful for your time and your contributions to the
20 record. Really appreciate it.

21 DR. AZINE: I appreciate your time.

22 JUDGE LIPMAN: Mr. Jeff Minea. And as
23 Mr. Minea is making his way, Mr. Zeroni is next
24 after Mr. Minea.

25 Mr. Minea, if you wouldn't mind stating

1 and spelling your name for our record.

2 MR. MINEA: Sure. It's Jeff Minea.

3 JUDGE LIPMAN: Minea. Forgive me.

4 MR. MINEA: J-E-F-F, M-I-N-E-A.

5 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you so much,
6 Mr. Minea. What should the Department look into?

7 MR. MINEA: We -- we support route E in
8 the sense that it's a good route to the east of 101.
9 However, it doesn't support everyone here tonight.
10 And we want to make sure that the utmost
11 consideration be given to those people. And there's
12 a significant number of people that live west of 101
13 and when siting these lines that should be given.
14 We support routes F and G west of 101.

15 And I also have one concern about this
16 process, and that would be I'm concerned as to the
17 weighting of the priority of each of the criteria
18 that will be used in the EIS.

19 JUDGE LIPMAN: Okay.

20 MR. MINEA: And I want the report to
21 address what the weighting is for each item. And I
22 also want to receive a copy of how this evaluation
23 will be, I guess, evaluated. If there is a set of
24 standards that goes into it -- because there should
25 be, I would think -- it would be nice to be able to

1 see what those background criteria are.

2 JUDGE LIPMAN: How they got to it?

3 MR. MINEA: Right.

4 JUDGE LIPMAN: And, I'm sorry, F and G
5 you support west of 101. Have I got that right?

6 MR. MINEA: That's correct.

7 JUDGE LIPMAN: Anything else for the good
8 of our record?

9 MR. MINEA: No.

10 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you so much. I
11 appreciate your contributions.

12 Mr. Zeroni. And as he makes his way,
13 Kristine Erickson will follow him.

14 Mr. Zeroni, welcome. And if you wouldn't
15 mind stating and spelling your name for our record.

16 MR. ZERONI: First name is Ilan, I-L-A-N.
17 Last name is Zeroni, Z-E-R-O-N-I.

18 JUDGE LIPMAN: Great. Mr. Zeroni, what
19 should the Department look into?

20 MR. ZERONI: I live in Bridlewood Farm
21 west of the Ferndale substation. The first thing
22 I'd like to say is thank you to the Applicants for
23 being willing to convert the alternative process in
24 accordance with the petition signed of 763 of the
25 residents of Plymouth and Medina. This is a very

1 bold move, and thank you for that.

2 Having said that, I'd like to say a
3 person's residence -- a family's residence is a
4 significant financial resource over a decade.
5 Typically mortgages are 30 years, 15 to 30 years.
6 Significant financial resource over a decade. And
7 as I said previously, we picked the location where
8 our school district is.

9 Ms. Asah, could you please do me a favor
10 and move us to the slide that shows the proposed
11 route?

12 MS. ASAH: I apologize.

13 MR. ZERONI: There you go. Thank you.

14 Your Honor, I would just like you to, if
15 you could, please indulge me and just look at this
16 for just a moment and see what characterizes this
17 proposed route. And I'm pausing for effect here.
18 Because when I look at this, what I see is straight
19 lines and right angles, and this thing cuts directly
20 through the land. Now this has all been said. This
21 has been erected for 1971. There was hardly
22 anything there at that time. Nowadays, you can see
23 from the posters hanging over there behind you
24 there, this line that is showing right now, is
25 cutting directly through densely-populated areas, as

1 you see, straight lines and right angles.

2 So that is the first thing that I would
3 like to say. And, as has been said before, this is
4 the proposed line because this is the current line
5 since 1971. There was nothing there. Now this
6 whole land is full of densely-populated residential.
7 We should not perpetuate this issue. Definitely
8 move along major thoroughfares, and we should
9 definitely try to minimize impact. That is -- those
10 are the two guiding principles that I absolutely
11 wish would guide you when you prepare your report
12 and when you consider this project, is just look at
13 the proposed route and you'll see that the last
14 thing it does is it does not minimize impact, it
15 does not run along major thoroughfares. There are
16 some other considerations in proposing this route.

17 I would like to further state that, and I
18 may be in error, the EMF requirements from the
19 application is that alternate routes be proposed by
20 the Applicants. So the Applicants should have
21 proposed a proposed route, but then they should also
22 propose proposed alternate routes. The first
23 question is, am I right about this or am I wrong?

24 MS. ASAH: I believe I understand your
25 question to be when we -- when an applicant comes

1 forward with a proposed route for a -- for
2 consideration as a Public Utilities Commission, do
3 we need to propose more than one route. And it
4 depends on the process. But for the full process,
5 we do only propose one route, so a route and an
6 alternative route.

7 MR. ZERONI: Okay. So that was the
8 understanding. I would like to please highlight for
9 you that west of 101 there were alternate routes
10 considered. The only thing is that they follow the
11 exact same geographic path. So there is no
12 distinct -- distinct geographic path that the
13 Applicant -- the Applicant's never proposed in their
14 application a geographically-distinct alternate
15 route west of Hollydale. There is only one proposed
16 route. There are alternates. They run on the exact
17 same path. So that is one thing that I would like
18 you to consider, whether or not that is in
19 accordance with statutes. I believe it is not, but
20 definitely something to bring up.

21 The easement in our neck of the woods
22 limits the Applicants to single wooden poles, which
23 means that it -- if the proposed route is actually
24 permitted, in addition to everything that has been
25 said, we would also be, in my understanding, exposed

1 to cresols and pentachlorophenol, which are the
2 materials, the chemicals that the wood is
3 impermeated with to prevent insect attacks and
4 for preservation. These are known carcinogens.

5 JUDGE LIPMAN: Those are on the wood
6 poles?

7 MR. ZERONI: The wooden poles, yes. The
8 wooden poles are pressure treated with either
9 cresols or pentachlorophenol, which I think is the
10 material to be used, which will actually -- and I'd
11 like definitely Mr. Ek to consider in his
12 environmental impact statement the environmental
13 effects of this on the residents. Cresols and
14 pentachlorophenol have not been approved for
15 residential use. And when this thing runs in my
16 backyard, it is residential use. These materials
17 are not -- are not allowed for residential use.

18 What is the impact? For me the impact is
19 number of properties, number of properties submitted
20 to the line. If we look at what has been handed out
21 today by the Applicants and you look at the proposed
22 routes and you look at -- do you have that with you
23 or should I give it to you, Your Honor?

24 JUDGE LIPMAN: The map?

25 MR. ZERONI: Yes, please.

1 JUDGE LIPMAN: Not with me, but I can
2 certainly follow along.

3 MR. ZERONI: No, these maps you should --
4 I'm talking about the route width, which is not on
5 there.

6 JUDGE LIPMAN: Okay.

7 MR. ZERONI: Do you have that there,
8 route width?

9 MS. ASAH: I gave mine to a member of the
10 public.

11 MR. ZERONI: I would like to give mine.

12 JUDGE LIPMAN: We can mark it as an
13 exhibit. I would be delighted to have it. This is
14 C.

15 MS. ASAH: Mr. Zeroni, you can keep yours
16 if you want. We just got one from the GRE folks.

17 MR. ZERONI: Oh, thank you.

18 (Exhibit C marked.)

19 JUDGE LIPMAN: So on Exhibit C, which is
20 the -- are you working off of Figure 2?

21 MR. ZERONI: I'm working -- I think the
22 most -- the most telling is Figure 2, yes, please.

23 JUDGE LIPMAN: Okay.

24 MR. ZERONI: Now, if you look at the
25 shaded area around the various routes, the

1 understanding is the proposed route width -- this is
2 not easement, this is not right-of-way; it is just
3 the area that -- and please correct me if I misstate
4 this -- that the Applicants are requesting permit
5 for because then they can clear a route with the
6 exact location of the poles. The thing that really
7 strikes you is if that if you look at the width of
8 the proposed route and you compare that to the width
9 of any of these alternate routes that go north of
10 it, which stay along 55, you can see that the
11 proposed route width is much wider there. If I
12 understand it, it's not the easement necessarily
13 would be wider there in the route. But one question
14 I ask myself, why is it wider up there? And to me
15 the answer is pretty clear. There's less property
16 over there, so they can have that way, whereas along
17 the proposed route, they just do not have that way
18 to move the poles around.

19 So it is -- I think it's a very visual
20 way to see how limited the proposed route, in the
21 sense that there's so much population among it, and
22 the fact that the width there is so much thinner or
23 it is so much thinner than the route width for the
24 other alternatives. I hope that -- this is, for me,
25 visual proof of how much better the alternate routes

1 are then the proposed route in terms of number of
2 houses, proximity to my house. So that is something
3 that certainly I wish to propose.

4 I would also like to say that initially
5 the Applicants, or Northern States, did have a route
6 that follows the current route, F1, which is going
7 north along 55 all the way to the railway and then
8 crossing along the routes and then going south.
9 Along that route the analysis -- the impact analysis
10 that was done actually again was to double the
11 width. So if I remember correctly, along the
12 proposed route they analyzed 400 feet distance away
13 from center line, whereas along this alternate
14 route -- and I can produce the impact table that was
15 there; it was awhile back -- whereas along that
16 initial proposed route, which was not -- was not
17 filed in the application, it was 200 feet.

18 So what I would like to say -- I think
19 I'm correct; I have spoken with Mr. Ek about this --
20 I would like to absolutely make sure that when
21 analyzing impact in terms of number of properties
22 affected proximity to line, the same yardstick is
23 applied to the proposed route as to the alternate
24 routes; that is, the number of houses are counted by
25 distance from center line, regardless of where the

1 line runs, regardless of where the proposed or the
2 alternate line. Because the alternate, you cannot
3 count all the way to 400 versus all the way to 100
4 poles. It has to be apples to apples.

5 I'm sure -- Mr. Ek and I had a
6 conversation. And I hope I'm not mistaken. If I
7 am, I apologize, and please correct me. But that is
8 the way it will be. I just want it on the record
9 that this is a grave concern on the number of houses
10 in the EIS have been counted apples to apples,
11 meaning same number of houses, it is done from
12 distance from 0 to 200, from 200 to 300, regardless
13 of whether the proposed route will be on...

14 JUDGE LIPMAN: Okay. Mr. Ek.

15 MR. EK: I think I can answer that. This
16 is always a point of confusion with all transmission
17 line projects is route versus right-of-way. And
18 this came up earlier. Mr. Zook brought this up.
19 The Public Utilities Commission, when they give --
20 when they issue a route permit to a utility, it's
21 for a route width. And so on the maps you will see,
22 as Mr. Zeroni pointed out, the proposed route does
23 have a smaller route width of 200 feet. In areas
24 where there is no right-of-way, they can make a
25 little bigger, 400 feet. Now within that 200 feet,

1 400 feet, whatever it may be for a project, the
2 Applicant will situate that right-of-way, whatever
3 is needed, if it's a 75-foot right-of-way or
4 150-foot right-of-way, in this case it's 75-foot
5 right-of-way, they will situate it within that route
6 width that they are permitted in the best place
7 possible to avoid as best they can any issues that
8 are in that specific area.

9 The reason that the route width -- and
10 the Applicants can maybe speak to this if I'm wrong.
11 But the reason the route width along the proposed
12 route by the Applicants why it's 200 feet is because
13 there is an existing right-of-way there. So they do
14 have a line and an alignment to follow. So it's not
15 necessary to have a bigger route width, because they
16 already have that center line that they're going to
17 be following. They do give themselves extra wiggle
18 room because there probably will be areas along that
19 proposed route that the line could be moved north,
20 south, east or west, depending on where you are, to
21 make it in a better location than they are now.
22 We're still way before that's going to happen.

23 The reason why the route width in areas
24 where there's not a transmission line or a
25 distribution line or some type of right-of-way they

1 follow is larger is because there's never been a
2 line there, so it would -- it makes more sense to
3 have a larger route width that they can play with to
4 make sure to put that line in the best place in that
5 route width. So that's why they make it bigger
6 where there is not an existing right-of-way as there
7 is in the proposed route.

8 Now for the environmental impact
9 statement, we do -- we take our measurements when it
10 comes to proximity to homes or proximity to wetlands
11 or whatever the topic or issue is, we go from that
12 center line out, and it is apples to apples. We'll
13 go past that route width, the 200 feet. If we're
14 going to 500 feet on other routes, well, then we're
15 going to go to 500 feet on that proposal, because we
16 want it to be apples and apples so there can be a
17 comparison. People can look at the information and
18 compare each of the routes to those specific
19 categories -- such as proximity to homes is what
20 we're talking about now. So we go from the center
21 line out, not just to the edge of the requested
22 route.

23 JUDGE LIPMAN: Mr. Zeroni, do you have
24 some concluding thoughts or --

25 MR. ZERONI: Yes. Thank you for that.

1 Having established that, I will tell you, Your
2 Honor, we have done some analysis on our own
3 regarding minimizing the impacts. And I can
4 definitely tell you, for example -- and this is
5 according to our own analysis, which I want
6 Mr. Ek -- the proposed route versus, say, alternate
7 route G reduces impact by 75 percent, down from 134
8 properties affected to 33. That's a 75 percent
9 reduction. It is significant. So --

10 JUDGE LIPMAN: Alternate G?

11 MR. ZERONI: Alternate G, yes. And this
12 is according to our analysis of Google maps and
13 going by residential property lines. Not by the
14 exact location of the house, but by the property
15 lines.

16 I would like to ask you, Mr. -- Your
17 Honor, once we establish with Mr. Ek that the
18 comparison is going to be apples to apples, I am
19 absolutely certain that some of the existing or --
20 plus some of the additional alternate routes that I
21 plan to submit during the public comment period, I
22 ask you to please consider two guiding principles:
23 Minimization for overall impacts and running along
24 major thoroughfares. Those are the only two guiding
25 principles that I feel, and I absolutely beg you to

1 please consider these two the most prominent ones --
2 cost being absolutely the last -- minimization of
3 overall impact and running along major thoroughfares
4 as much as possible. Because if you do apply these
5 principles, then I feel that this entire population
6 that lives west of Hollydale and west of 101 will
7 also -- will also have the fairest, because
8 alternate route E does not apply to us. So just
9 knowing if you follow these two, really I think the
10 most applicable guidelines, I would feel would give
11 us the best solution overall as well.

12 I will conclude and say, as Mr. Yan (sic)
13 I believe said before me, Xcel is a for-profit
14 corporation. They're stakeholders and they have
15 regulators. The money spent on this will either go
16 to the ratepayers or to the shareholders. And as
17 Mr. Yan has indicated, it doesn't go all to the
18 ratepayers; it can also go to the bottom line and to
19 the shareholders. And as I said before, cost should
20 definitely -- as I said, cost should be the least of
21 the concern. It should be minimization of impact,
22 of overall impact, minimization of overall impact,
23 and running along major thoroughfares.

24 Thank you very much.

25 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you kindly.

1 Ms. Kristine Erickson. And as she makes
2 her way to the podium, Mr. Ron Hanson is next.

3 Ms. Erickson, if you wouldn't mind
4 stating and spelling your name for our record.

5 MS. ERICKSON: Yes, Kristine,
6 K-R-I-S-T-I-N-E, Erickson, E-R-I-C-K-S-O-N.

7 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you so much,
8 Ms. Erickson. What should the Department inquire
9 into?

10 MS. ERICKSON: I first wanted to say what
11 my address is. I live at 4815 Cheshire Lane North.
12 I live very close to the proposed route and to the
13 substation site A. 17 years ago my husband and I
14 built our home. And like most people who are out
15 looking for a place to build their home, you take a
16 lot of things into consideration. One of the things
17 we did take into consideration was the fact that we
18 live very close to 494. There are already large
19 power lines. We also looked into -- we live near an
20 airline. There's an annoyance issue there. And we
21 decided those are two things that the risks were
22 somewhat minimized and we could live with that.
23 However, we are not happy with the proposed route,
24 specifically with the pole at the corner of Cheshire
25 Lane and Schmidt Lake Road. And the easement --

1 JUDGE LIPMAN: Could you give me that --
2 I know Cheshire.

3 MS. ERICKSON: Schmidt Lake Road.

4 JUDGE LIPMAN: Oh, Schmidt Lake Road.
5 Thank you.

6 MS. ERICKSON: There's a three-way stop
7 there, and it appears as though there will be a pole
8 in that corner to take it to the substation A, which
9 will be very close to our home. We would prefer to
10 not have any new poles near our home, because we're
11 already dealing with the substation A being very
12 close.

13 I had not looked much at the alternative
14 routes until this evening. And route E has come up
15 now. And I looked at route E now in-depth, and that
16 would be very favorable to where our home is. And
17 what I wanted to mention was that substation site
18 A -- when we did build our home, we looked into what
19 could possibly be developed there. Site A was
20 originally planned to be ball fields. And so ball
21 fields and a substation, power station, is a little
22 different.

23 So mainly I just wanted to view my
24 opposition to the proposed route as it is near --
25 where it is near my home. And I'm also curious

1 about what are the additional health effects that
2 can happen when you live near a substation? When
3 you're taking in that much power and redistributing
4 it, what does the substation itself, not just the
5 power lines, do?

6 Something I've also not read, but I've
7 heard a lot about tonight, is burying the lines. It
8 sounds good. It would look good. What I'm curious
9 about is how much does that reduce or does it
10 eliminate EMF, and does it also reduce or eliminate
11 the noise with the hum to it?

12 And, finally, my big concern of course is
13 for any medical issues and the values of our homes
14 that are all going to be affected by this line and
15 by the substation. So I'm also looking at it from
16 the substation -- substation A point of view.

17 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you so much,
18 Ms. Erickson. Very grateful for your contributions
19 to our record. Thank you.

20 And next is Mr. Ron Hanson. And after
21 him is Diane Bridge.

22 Mr. Hanson, if you wouldn't mind stating
23 and spelling your name for our record.

24 MR. HANSON: It's Ron, R-O-N. Hanson,
25 H-A-N-S-O-N.

1 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you so much,
2 Mr. Hanson. What should the Department inquire
3 into?

4 MR. HANSON: Well, I'd like to have a
5 little inquiry first, if that would be okay. On
6 proposed -- or on alternative route H that goes down
7 101, I notice that there's two turns in it that push
8 the lines on the east side of 101 instead of
9 remaining on the west side, And I'm curious as to
10 why is that.

11 MS. ASAH: What page?

12 JUDGE LIPMAN: I think we're working off
13 of figure 2. Is that what you're working off of,
14 Mr. Hanson?

15 MR. HANSON: Figure 2.

16 JUDGE LIPMAN: Do you have figure 2
17 handy? Do you want to borrow mine, Mr. Rogers?

18 MR. ROGERS: Did you say proposed route H
19 as in Henry?

20 MR. HANSON: H, that's correct.

21 JUDGE LIPMAN: Yes.

22 MR. HANSON: I also -- as an introductory
23 comment, I'm the president of Heather Run
24 Homeowners' Association, and I think it would be
25 fair to say we're the southeastern part of Plymouth

1 here on this map.

2 JUDGE LIPMAN: Okay.

3 MR. ROGERS: I guess I can go ahead and
4 comment on proposed -- or alternate route H.
5 Alternate route H was not an alternate selected by
6 the Applicant. So as far as crossing the roads and
7 whatnot the way they show, we really had no input on
8 that. That was not a route proposed by the
9 Applicant.

10 MR. HANSON: So that's not being
11 considered at this time?

12 JUDGE LIPMAN: Mr. Ek.

13 MR. EK: I guess I can answer. All the
14 routes -- I believe there's a total of 13 of them
15 now, total routes, alternate routes to the proposed.
16 Alternate H is one of them. The lines you see on
17 the map are arbitrary right now. They just --
18 because they look like they may be on one side of
19 the road or the other side of the road is just to
20 give the citizens and government agency an idea of
21 where the lines would go within that route.

22 However, that being said, this is a
23 really good opportunity for folks to suggest those
24 ideas, such as you have for alternative route H.
25 And we call them alignment alternatives, and it's

1 something we can look at in the environmental impact
2 statement. And it -- and it's valuable information.
3 And folks can say, well, for this stretch of road
4 between intersection A and intersection B, it would
5 be best -- if that line was chosen, it would be best
6 if that line was on the north side of the road
7 versus the south side of the road or the east side
8 or the west side. So people can get into really
9 great detail in their comments, and that great
10 detail is helpful, and it will follow through the
11 process in the environmental review document, in the
12 public hearings, in the public meetings. It's very
13 good information.

14 So I want folks to know that they can get
15 very detailed when it comes down to these alternate
16 routes going to which side of the road they're on or
17 keep away from this tree break or, you know, items
18 such as that, or I have a shed that's very close, is
19 that going to be a problem? So the more detail I
20 get, the better I can convey that information to
21 you, the public, in the environmental impact
22 statement.

23 MR. HANSON: Thank you. We're, as a
24 general rule, more favorable towards the
25 northwestern siting of the route. We believe that

1 that impacts the fewest residents. Thank you.

2 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you so much,
3 Mr. Hanson. Grateful for your time and
4 contribution.

5 Ms. Bridge, thank you. If you wouldn't
6 mind stating and spelling your name for our record.

7 MS. BRIDGE: I'm Diane Bridge.
8 D-I-A-N-E, B-R-I-D-G-E.

9 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you so much,
10 Ms. Bridge. What should the Department look into?

11 MS. BRIDGE: I signed up to speak at the
12 last minute because I had heard a lot of talk about
13 how everyone is in favor of alternate route E. I
14 also live on the western side of the proposed route,
15 and I want to just go on the record that I would
16 like alternate F and G to be considered.

17 I'd also like to go on record that I'm --
18 I'm grateful for Providence Academy to have the
19 nerve to come up here and speak on behalf of their
20 students; and I'm appalled that School District 284,
21 since Greenwood Elementary School is significantly
22 impacted, that they are absent here tonight.

23 My property runs along the Greenwood
24 Elementary. I'm on Urbandale Lane North. I'm right
25 behind the ball fields on the proposed route. Now,

1 before those ball fields were built, it was just
2 open space. There were thousands of yards of dirt
3 that were brought in to build up these ball fields
4 for the kids to play on. And since then in the
5 three years, four women on my street of ten houses
6 have had radical mastectomies. Now, if this
7 proposed line is going to cause further cancer risk,
8 I think we need significant independent studies to
9 figure out leukemia, breast cancer, the prostate
10 cancer, and everything that's involved here.

11 Bridlewood Farms, Churchill Down,
12 Saddlebrook were all farmland when this map and this
13 proposed line was made. Since then my -- I may be
14 off 10 percent here or there -- there are over 253
15 homes in these three subdivisions. Now, I am right
16 on the proposed line, and I believe the easement
17 goes right through my deck. But I want to appeal to
18 everyone here, whether you're on the proposed line
19 or not, for those of us who may dump our homes at
20 whatever price we can get at this point, it's going
21 to dramatically affect comparable prices of anyone
22 who's not on the line who's trying to sell their
23 home. So while it's going to diminish the price of
24 my home, it's going to significantly impact the
25 other 253 homes who are going to try to sell their

1 house with a comparable property size, and they're
2 not going to be able to get fair market value.

3 I'd also like to find out, if we do have
4 up to 30 percent decrease in the value of our homes,
5 are our taxes going to go down? I seriously don't
6 think so. But I would like to know if our taxes
7 will go down in -- to compare with the decreased
8 value of our homes, because they certainly haven't
9 yet.

10 So I -- I'm appealing to District 284 to
11 speak on behalf of the hundreds of children who go
12 to Greenwood Elementary School, and I'm appalled
13 they're not here. I'm certainly hoping there isn't
14 some kind of donation involved that would keep them
15 from being here to speak on behalf of the children.

16 I'm done.

17 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you kindly,
18 Ms. Bridge, for your contributions to our record
19 this evening.

20 Because everyone was so precise, so very
21 clear, so very helpful, we've exhausted the list of
22 folks who had originally signed up. We've gone
23 through -- Ms. Bridge was our 22nd witness. So,
24 again, a great testament to the clarity and brevity
25 with which people have offered comments and focused

1 the study for the Department.

2 So I'm able, quite happily, in the
3 25 minutes we have remaining before district
4 officials insist that we live, I would like to use
5 that productively. And what I'm going to do what I
6 used to do when I was seven and do an all-y all-y in
7 come free. And so anyone who hasn't yet had an
8 opportunity to make an inquiry or to share comments
9 or to focus the Department, if you just raise your
10 hand.

11 Please, ma'am, if you wouldn't mind
12 coming down. And if you could state and spell your
13 name for our record.

14 MS. ANDERSON: Sure. Good evening, Your
15 Honor. Carolyn Anderson. C-A-R-O-L-Y-N.

16 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you --

17 MS. ANDERSON: Anderson --

18 JUDGE LIPMAN: Oh, go ahead.

19 MS. ANDERSON: -- A-N-D-E-R-S-O-N.

20 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you so much,
21 Ms. Anderson. And what should the Department focus
22 on?

23 MS. ANDERSON: Well, there's two
24 principles I would like the Department to focus on.
25 And the first one is expectation of the parties, and

1 the second is quality city planning. And I think
2 one of these I look at, when you look at any
3 industrial corridor such as Highway 55, you know
4 that any property owners on that highway, the
5 expectation was it was going to be industrial. I
6 mean, it's zoned that way. And they understand
7 there could be power lines, there could be
8 billboards, whatever. That's the expectation. When
9 they purchase that property, they know that this is
10 going to be a consequence.

11 However, when you look at like -- and I'm
12 looking specifically west of 101. My property's
13 on -- I think it's alternate route I, and my
14 father-in-law's right on the proposed route. It
15 goes through his wetlands. When you look at the
16 owners on many of these properties, when we
17 purchased those properties, we had the expectation
18 that we had to pay a premium price in order to be in
19 the country, going to have private neighborhoods
20 that had a certain feel, and we were willing to pay
21 X percent more just to be able to get that.

22 And I think one of the things I would
23 really like the DOC to look at is specifically on
24 this -- is that a road? Is that all --

25 MR. ROGERS: Yeah, it is a road.

1 MS. ANDERSON: It's like there's 3.8
2 miles of road that they're looking at. It's one of
3 the alternatives.

4 MR. ROGERS: H.

5 MS. ANDERSON: H?

6 MS. ASAH: H.

7 MR. ROGERS: H.

8 MS. ASAH: I'm sorry, I don't have a map
9 on me.

10 MR. ROGERS: That would be I.

11 MS. ANDERSON: It's I. But I just wanted
12 to have the record -- I want to give a little bit of
13 history on Medina Road. About 15, maybe 20 years
14 ago, it was a dirt road. Traffic's flying now. But
15 the county came and said, hey, we're willing to
16 put -- pave this whole road, put in like a great
17 road, put paved shoulders and everything; we'll make
18 it County Road 116, and we'll do this for free;
19 otherwise, you're going to have to pay for it, each
20 homeowner is going to have to pay for it. And we
21 went before the Minneapolis Council and said we'll
22 pay for it ourselves; we don't need the county
23 money, because we know when we take county money
24 that something else goes with that. And you
25 have to -- and you realize that you're going to be

1 marked in district court. We said this is a private
2 road, wanted it to have a neighborhood feel as so
3 many residents here. And so when you look at what
4 the residents are looking at, so we paid for that.

5 And now I'm afraid that that's one of the
6 considerations, you know, poles out there, which we
7 understand that poles have to go somewhere. Putting
8 them underground is the safest way to do it, but
9 they have to go somewhere. But just even on a city
10 planning perspective, looking at the options that we
11 have, do we have to plan cities where we take
12 industrial corridors and we've got businesses here
13 and we've got these, you know, shops and everything,
14 we've got these small communities, instead of taking
15 these poles, which we all know are unsightly, taking
16 them down the industrial corridor. Why are we
17 crisscrossing neighborhoods and homes and rural
18 areas? So let's do some good city planning here and
19 let's honor that.

20 Thank you.

21 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you, Ms. Anderson.

22 Sir, if you wouldn't mind joining.

23 And if there's anyone other than this
24 gentleman that would like that hasn't had an
25 opportunity to speak, if you could join us down by

1 the woman right here in red and just sit in these
2 front seats here so we know who would like to come
3 and participate.

4 So, sir, if you wouldn't mind stating and
5 spelling your name or our record.

6 MR. ANDZELEVICH: Aleksandr Andzelevich.
7 A-L-E-K-S-A-N-D-R, A-N-D-Z-E-L-E-V-I-C-H.

8 JUDGE LIPMAN: Andzelevich.

9 MR. ANDZELEVICH: Yes. And so I am
10 concerned about ability for maintenance. So this
11 road -- this path goes in the neighborhood, and how
12 they gonna access the poles in the area? So -- and
13 also talking about easements that there now. If I
14 understand, the new poles would not stay in the same
15 place where current ones are.

16 JUDGE LIPMAN: Okay.

17 MR. ANDZELEVICH: Right? So basically
18 that means there will be new location for the poles,
19 and you cannot site the easements to be as far
20 as the -- and I actually wouldn't mind this proposed
21 route if it was buried. It could be a great trail
22 if it, I don't know, cement or asphalt.

23 JUDGE LIPMAN: Okay. Mr. Andzelevich, if
24 you would hold on.

25 Ms. Asah, did you want to talk about pole

1 location or maintenance practice?

2 MS. ASAH: Certainly. For access of the
3 proposed route, it would be accessed from the
4 existing right-of-way or existing roads. And the
5 pole location would be the same or not. In some
6 locations it could be almost the exact same. So we
7 would --

8 MR. ANDZELEVICH: I read that.

9 MS. ASAH: Yes. So it would be almost
10 pole for pole as far as poles go, except for
11 wetlands, to avoid impacts on wetlands. You put the
12 pole in basically where the current one is. Does
13 that help answer your question?

14 MR. ANDZELEVICH: Yes.

15 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you so much,
16 Mr. Andzelevich. We appreciate your contributions
17 to our record.

18 Sir, were you next? Sir, if you wouldn't
19 mind joining us and stating and spelling your name
20 for our record.

21 MR. BELOV: So it's Maksim Belov. It's
22 M-A-K-S-I-M, B-E-L-O-V.

23 JUDGE LIPMAN: Mr. Belov.

24 MR. BELOV: Yes.

25 JUDGE LIPMAN: So what should the

1 Department focus on.

2 MR. BELOV: I just wanted to make a
3 couple of comments on the alternate routes. I guess
4 the main reason that I make here is that most of the
5 alternate routes are proposed by people that is away
6 from their home. So people are not proposing routes
7 that are being seen on their property.

8 And the second question that I have is
9 one of the criteria I understand on treating the
10 routes is the impact on homeowners. So there's 200
11 people on this route, and 100 people on that route,
12 the score is better.

13 I just realized looking at the routes
14 that all of the 3F alternatives, and all the 2G
15 alternatives, basically everything but the route H
16 is for the western homeowner. And I'm the only who
17 gets affected by E.

18 JUDGE LIPMAN: And where is your
19 property, if you wouldn't --

20 MR. BELOV: It's 3950 Alvarado Lane. So
21 it's right on the corner of Brockton Lane and
22 Medina. So routes I, F1, F2, F3, G1, and G, they
23 will all be within 100 feet, 150 feet of the
24 property.

25 JUDGE LIPMAN: So Brockton,

1 B-R-O-C-K-T-O-N?

2 MR. BELOV: Yep.

3 JUDGE LIPMAN: And Medina, M-E-D-I-N-A.

4 MR. BELOV: So I guess it's an
5 observation or a question of if I'm the only guy
6 affected, what kind of options do I have?

7 JUDGE LIPMAN: Suggest an alignment
8 alternative. But, yes -- no, no, I think that's
9 helpful as to whether you angered somebody at the
10 Department of Commerce.

11 MR. BELOV: Or said something to my
12 neighbor that they proposed --

13 JUDGE LIPMAN: No, no, no. I think
14 that's a helpful point that you are particularly
15 affected by the convergence of various route
16 alternatives.

17 MR. BELOV: And, actually, a third
18 question that I have is what kind of input can
19 people from the Medina area have on this process? I
20 know they're not present here. Anything west in
21 kind of a general alignment of Brockton Lane or
22 these routes, what kind of input do they have on
23 that?

24 JUDGE LIPMAN: Well, same as everyone
25 else. And if you have folks that live in Medina,

1 they're part of your Christmas card list, they're
2 part of local communities, they're in Cub Scouts
3 with you, tell them, please, by Friday, June 22nd,
4 at 4:30 p.m. they should comment and drive the
5 inquiries to the Department of Commerce, who are
6 very eager to have them, regardless of where they
7 live, either along an alternate route or not, in
8 Medina or Mogadishu, we want to hear from them.

9 MR. BELOV: Very good. Thank you, Your
10 Honor.

11 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you.

12 If you wouldn't mind stating and spelling
13 your name for our record.

14 MR. CROCKER: Yes, my name is Tracy
15 Crocker. T-R-A-C-Y, C-R-O-C-K-E-R.

16 JUDGE LIPMAN: Mr. Crocker, what should
17 the Department look into?

18 MR. CROCKER: Well, my question is, after
19 listening to this all tonight, are we putting the
20 chicken before the egg? We're talking about route
21 before we're talking about environmental, medical,
22 and all the issues that seem to be very prominent
23 tonight. And why are we doing the route before we
24 know what the different impacts are?

25 JUDGE LIPMAN: Well, I think -- Mr. Ek

1 might have a response. But I think what they're
2 trying to do is at least scope some of the inquiries
3 on the route as the -- as the other pieces of the
4 process go on. And I certainly don't want to
5 suggest anything.

6 Mr. Ek.

7 MR. EK: I kind of understand what you're
8 saying, that the issues should be vetted. But
9 that's what this environmental impact statement is
10 for. We'll take all these issues and go into these
11 issues and vet them, provide the information to the
12 public in this document, apply those to all these
13 routes, the 14 routes, 15 routes that we have. And
14 we apply all those issues and concerns to each of
15 the routes. And people will then see -- at that
16 time you can look through the document; and
17 typically people will be able to say, well, this
18 route, you know, rises above this one, or this one
19 is not needed, or this one is worse than another.
20 And it is going to be subjective. These kinds of
21 things are subjective at times. However, a lot of
22 the times the information that's provided, like
23 magnetic field, proximity to homes, distances to
24 park, number of wetlands, lakes or waterways, number
25 of schools, they will -- there will show -- there

1 will be a balancing act for each of these routes.
2 And that's the whole reason for going through this
3 process, to provide the facts and information to
4 folks in that environmental impact statement.

5 The report will not claim which route is
6 better at that time. It just provides the facts for
7 people to look at. And as I said, we will have
8 public meetings where people can say, well, I think
9 by looking at the environmental impact statement and
10 the information on so and so route, this is a great
11 route and, you know -- or you're missing something
12 from this route that would make it better, you
13 forgot this part. So we have to come back in that
14 final EIS and address that comment, and that could
15 definitely make a route or another route better than
16 another route.

17 MR. CROCKER: So you are going to do this
18 simultaneously?

19 MR. EK: Pardon me?

20 MR. CROCKER: You are going to look the
21 it simultaneously?

22 MR. EK: Oh, certainly. Yes, yes, very
23 much so.

24 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you so much,
25 Mr. Crocker.

1 With Mr. Crocker's set of inquiries,
2 we've exhausted the list up front. Is there anybody
3 else who has a further suggestion -- oh, forgive me.
4 I didn't know you folks were down here.

5 Okay. Please, sir, if you wouldn't mind
6 joining us, and then we'll get these two folks.
7 Forgive me.

8 Could you state and spell your name for
9 our record?

10 MR. KNUTSON: Sure. Matt Knutson.
11 M-A-T-T, K-N-U-T-S-O-N.

12 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you so much.
13 Mr. Knutson, what should the Department look into?

14 MR. KNUTSON: I just have a couple --
15 couple of questions about alternative route E. In
16 the specification for it, it talks about running it
17 along Highway 55 and then north along 494. Kind of
18 a question for Xcel. Is there any particular reason
19 why the east side going north of 494 was not
20 considered, and it only mentions going north along
21 the west side?

22 JUDGE LIPMAN: Ms. Asah, is E one of
23 yours?

24 MS. ASAH: No, E was not proposed by the
25 Applicants. It was proposed by the task force --

1 MR. KNUTSON: Correct.

2 MS. ASAH: -- is my understanding. And
3 so we haven't supported -- we are support -- we've
4 gone through the analysis on the route width of that
5 whole route, but it's not on either side, from what
6 I understand.

7 MR. KNUTSON: Okay. So then just one
8 point for the record related to that. Could Xcel
9 answer the question can a single circuit line be
10 basically converted to a double circuit line without
11 having to replace the poles, realizing you might
12 have to replace the arms of the pole structure?

13 MS. ASAH: It would depend on how the
14 structures were originally designed. A single
15 circuit structure is going to be designed to support
16 a single circuit. And so if it were to be converted
17 to a double circuit route or line, it would most
18 likely, in all cases I'm aware of, need new
19 structures.

20 JUDGE LIPMAN: Please, Mr. Kotz.

21 MR. KOTZ: There's a change in weight
22 induced when we go from a single circuit structure
23 to a double circuit structure. So that pole
24 strength would probably fail in the modeling in the
25 new design. So it would change it. But we could

1 use a multiple stretch per double circuit if we were
2 to replace it.

3 MR. KNUTSON: Okay. So then just from a
4 process standpoint, do you suggest including the
5 east side of 494 for consideration? Is this comment
6 made publicly enough record for that or do you need
7 to --

8 JUDGE LIPMAN: Oh, no, no. Things that
9 you say here, lines of inquiry are all good. Thank
10 you so much, Mr. Knutson.

11 And if you wouldn't mind stating and
12 spelling your name for our record.

13 MS. MEEHAN: Hello. My name is Joanie
14 Meehan. J-O-A-N-I-E. Meehan is M, as in Mary,
15 double E, H, as in Henry, A, as in apple, N as in
16 Nancy.

17 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you so much,
18 Ms. Meehan. What should the Department look into?

19 MS. MEEHAN: I have two things I would
20 like to talk about.

21 JUDGE LIPMAN: Okay.

22 MS. MEEHAN: One is a comment and the
23 other is a question. First my comment is that I --
24 well, I do live west of E and close -- very close,
25 not right on the proposed line. Okay. So the E is

1 good, but I still have a problem with going west.

2 JUDGE LIPMAN: Sure.

3 MS. MEEHAN: I just want you to know,
4 Your Honor, that I just received notification by the
5 Department of Commerce as of 10:30 this morning
6 regarding this high voltage power line going through
7 my neighborhood. I talked to Mr. Lehman from Xcel,
8 and he called me back immediately and discussed that
9 Mr. Ek, E-K, was responsible for getting
10 notifications out to neighbors. I called Mr. Ek,
11 and he did return my call, and we figured out the
12 error and why I wasn't receiving notification. But
13 I am now receiving notification.

14 Okay. I just want the Court to know, the
15 record to know that I am 10 to 12 months behind
16 everyone else about this whole high voltage power
17 line, and it greatly affects me and my family.

18 The reason I didn't plan to talk today is
19 because I'm preparing for tomorrow. I need more
20 information. And, too, I'll be doing written for
21 your --

22 JUDGE LIPMAN: Great.

23 MS. MEEHAN: -- by the 22nd. Okay. My
24 question is -- I wanted you to know that. My
25 question is can anybody at Xcel give me information

1 or somebody here on information -- on where I would
2 obtain information on the easement on the proposed
3 line? This should be public record, and I should be
4 able to find it. But because of the situation, I
5 need help to locate that.

6 JUDGE LIPMAN: Okay. Mr. Rogers, can you
7 give them a suggestion to the link?

8 MR. ROGERS: Yes, we would be happy to
9 pull the easement on your property, if you can
10 provide the property --

11 MS. MEEHAN: I'm not asking for my
12 property. I understand my property. What I don't
13 understand is the proposed high voltage power line,
14 you know, where that is, west of E.

15 MR. ROGERS: Correct.

16 MS. MEEHAN: I want to know where I would
17 obtain information on the easement, that particular
18 easement that you're proposing you would put. I
19 would like to be able to review that. I believe
20 it's public --

21 MR. ROGERS: It is.

22 MS. MEEHAN: And where could I find it?

23 MR. ROGERS: The easements could be found
24 in the courthouse in the town. We have record of
25 those easements as well, too. The easements are

1 going to be in several segments. In other words,
2 they may cover half a section, quarter section, a
3 whole section, a lot. So we really need to nail
4 down the section of the township you're in, for that
5 specific area that you're looking for in that
6 easement, because there's a different easement for
7 every eighth of a mile, quarter of a mile.

8 MS. MEEHAN: Okay. Do you have some type
9 of reporting for that or numbers that I can use?

10 MR. ROGERS: Well, they would be reported
11 by document number.

12 MS. MEEHAN: By document number. Do you
13 have document numbers if I got the section for you?
14 Could I -- basically the proposed -- the whole --

15 MR. ROGERS: The easiest way would be to
16 give me a property address. And the property
17 address would check and have records, what section,
18 township range for the subdivision name.

19 MS. MEEHAN: It's Bridlewood. I mean,
20 it's that whole section.

21 MR. ROGERS: Could you give me a lot -- a
22 lot rather than --

23 MS. MEEHAN: Okay. Then how about I
24 obtain it from e-mail from you?

25 MR. ROGERS: Yes, I could e-mail that to

1 you.

2 MS. MEEHAN: Okay. Your name is?

3 MR. ROGERS: Chris Rogers.

4 MS. MEEHAN: Chris Rogers. And are you
5 on a list?

6 MR. ROGERS: Depending on what that is.
7 We'll get you that.

8 MS. MEEHAN: Okay. Is exactly why I
9 wanted to bring this point to you, how behind I am.
10 And I have not been able to view all records that I
11 should have been able to view. So I'm dropping
12 everything to try to get this information. I do
13 feel that my rights have been violated in this case.

14 Thank you, Your Honor.

15 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you, Ms. Meehan. We
16 look forward to seeing you, spending time with you
17 tomorrow.

18 MS. MEEHAN: Thank you.

19 JUDGE LIPMAN: Sir, if you would state
20 and spell and your name for our record.

21 MR. THOMPSON: Yes, sir. Yes, Your
22 Honor. My name is Steve Thompson. S-T-E-V-E,
23 T-H-O-M-P-S-O-N.

24 JUDGE LIPMAN: Okay. And we have just
25 about five minutes remaining, so what should the

1 Department look into?

2 MR. THOMPSON: Well, just two comments
3 here. Number one, I appreciate the process that we
4 have to be able to get out here and get all the
5 constituents here to be able to put their concerns.
6 I think that's a wonderful thing.

7 Number two, I have to say I'm very
8 pleased with the way I've been communicated with so
9 that I could maintain myself on what's going on here
10 to get to this meeting tonight. So I think there's
11 real good due diligence that way.

12 I live on alternate route H near Holy
13 Name Lake. That's where I live. And I think
14 probably most people don't want the poles going by
15 their home with all the different concerns that have
16 been voiced. But we have a need for electricity and
17 power, so we have to figure out the best solution.
18 So that's why we're here.

19 Listening to the commentary earlier this
20 evening about people being on alternative route E on
21 the east half of this, that makes sense to me.
22 We're impacting the least amount of people. And it
23 is -- from an expectation standpoint, that's an
24 industrial highway, so people are -- are getting
25 what would be expected. That makes sense to me. I

1 don't think that same logic extends to all the
2 roads. Of course in my own self-interest, I think
3 about County Road 24 where I live. But that's where
4 I'm coming from.

5 Here's the things that we need to be
6 concerned of: First, we want to try to impact the
7 least amount of people we can without -- however we
8 put this in. The health issues should be number
9 one. That really needs to be authenticated by what
10 the risks are and how that's mitigated by the
11 highest -- highest authority, however that process
12 works.

13 Number two, the money part. The money
14 part should be second, and put the people's
15 interests and long-term health first. Those should
16 be guiding principles. So the point was made
17 straight lines, 90-degree turns, least amount of
18 wires strung. So let's get straight on that. This
19 century we get our priorities right on taking care
20 of our people. So that's the health part.

21 The next one is probably I'll be trying
22 to sell our home within the next five to ten years.
23 I don't want this hurting my home or anyone's home,
24 but probably the property values are going to be
25 hit. They're going to take a 20 or 30 percent hit.

1 So I would ask whatever the final route is, approved
2 route, there ought to be a baseline taken, however
3 the real estate industry does that, to determine
4 what the value of that property is before and then
5 do a time value assessment for what the impact would
6 be later on to buy this land, and those people ought
7 to be compensated for that, whatever it is. So get
8 that baseline piece put in there.

9 As far as alternative H goes, County Road
10 24, my expectation is I moved here from west Texas
11 17 years ago. We like kind of country peace. We're
12 on the edge of town. So I like that. I hate to see
13 those big power poles go underneath there. The
14 defects of them on the high plain of Texas, I know
15 what it feels like walking underneath those high
16 power lines.

17 I would say this, as far as alternative
18 H, I'd hate to see that line run on Highway 101 by
19 the school with a bunch of young kids. I'd hate to
20 see that. So I think that ought to be weighted in
21 there.

22 So what am I for? I'm for alternative
23 route E that's on the east side. And then where
24 might be the least impact coming on west 101, coming
25 from the far west, proceeding east proposed route,

1 and then maybe taking route F3 or F2, and then again
2 coming across to route G, and then again on Highway
3 55 and come down. That might be the best way to go
4 at it. But I'm new to this, looking at this tonight
5 and trying to listen with an open mind.

6 Let's compensate the people wherever this
7 is going to go on their property. Let's do the best
8 job to take care of our kids and the health of all
9 our citizens. Put the money there. Okay?

10 JUDGE LIPMAN: Thank you so much,
11 Mr. Thompson.

12 With regret, we're at time. So I just
13 want to make two announcements before we recess --
14 we're not adjourning; we're recessing -- is that we
15 start back up tomorrow precisely at 1:00 in the same
16 location for another three hours, if there are folks
17 who can break away to join us or folks who weren't
18 here this evening can join us.

19 Also I want to make another advertisement
20 for folks who are here or who are not here, please
21 feel free and you're strongly encouraged to write
22 detailed comments by Friday, June 22nd, by 4:30 p.m.
23 They're sent to me at my office. It can be by fax,
24 by e-mail, by first-class mail, by smoke signal, by
25 hand delivery, Fed Ex, whatever way you'd like to

1 get them in whatever format. The key is they need
2 to arrive by 4:30 at our office, or they're late and
3 they'll be excluded from the summary and from the
4 instruction given to the Commerce Department at this
5 stage of the game. So 4:30 p.m. on Friday, the 22nd
6 of June.

7 With that, you have my very, very
8 grateful thanks. We were able to get to nearly 30
9 folks tonight. You were very helpful, and I look
10 forward to seeing you tomorrow afternoon.

11 We're in recess.

12 (Proceedings concluded at 9:03 p.m.)
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25