PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

FAIRMONT - 1:00 P.M. & 6:00 P.M. - APRIL 22, 2014

FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

In the Matter of the Applications of ITC Midwest, LLC for a Certificate of Need and a Route Permit for the Minnesota-Iowa 345 kV Transmission Line Project in Jackson, Martin, and Faribault Counties, Minnesota

PUC DOCKET NOs. ET-6675/CN-12-1053
ET-6675/TL-12-1337

Knights of Columbus Hall
920 East 10th Street
Fairmont, Minnesota

1 I N D E X

SPEAKER	PAGE
1:00 SESSION	4
Ray Kirsch	4
Amy Ashbacker	5
Unidentified	14
Ray Kirsch	15
Carol Overland	33
Ron Mixer	39
Sarah Jagodzinske Rohman	43
Derald Harris	48
Michael Johnson	48
Ryan Gustafson	50
Dorothy Behne	52
Allison Schmidt	53
Carroll Behne	56
Beverly Schafer	58
Douglas Hilgendorf	58
Eugene Lehman	61
Jonathan Schafer	62
Helen Lee Murphy	64
Karan Worthley	73
	75

6:00 SESSION

Helen Lee Murphy	100
Carol Overland	102
Dawn Hartung	103
Bob Posivio	109
Carol Overland	112
Helen Lee Murphy	113
Donald Moritz	134
Amy Ashbacker	136
Tim Schafer	136
Maynard Jagodzinske	137
Amy Ashbacker	141
Maynard Jagodzinske	142
Donald Moritz	144
Jim Oltman	145
Dave Grover	148
Joanna Lange	150
Ben Cuba	151
Helen Lee Murphy	152
Dawn Hartung	154

(1:00 SESSION.)

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Well, good afternoon. I think we'll get started with today's afternoon meeting.

My name is Ray Kirsch, I'm with the Minnesota Department of Commerce. We're here for public information meetings on the draft environmental impact statement, which has been prepared for a proposed transmission line project in this area.

Here's how I'm proposing we spend our time here today. I'd like to do some introductions briefly and walk over the materials in the back of the room; talk about the proposed project; the state permitting process; a little bit about the draft environmental impact statement, using it, how to use the draft environmental impact statement, how it might be of use to you; and then we're going to open it up for your comments today and questions.

And I anticipate maybe taking 20 minutes to do the first five things on that slide, or 25 minutes. And let me say that it'll take longer if you ask questions. And if you have questions, I encourage them. So let's spend our time wisely, so if you have a question about something, let me know,

any time during the program.

Again, my name is Ray Kirsch, I'm with the Minnesota Department of Commerce Energy Environmental Review and Analysis. Our group is charged by Minnesota statute and rule to do environmental review for large energy facilities in the state of Minnesota, and that's why I'm working on the draft environmental impact statement for this project.

I also want to introduce Amy Ashbacker, who is here with ITC Midwest. And, Amy, could you introduce the ITC staff who are here today?

MS. AMY ASHBACKER: Sure. Thanks, Ray.

I am the project manager for this project with ITC, and there are several representatives from our company here and we hope you take advantage of their knowledge and expertise and chat with us following the meeting.

But there are a few that I want to introduce. Right here up front with me we have Joe Berry from our planning group, Jack Middleton with Burns & McDonnell, who assisted with the routing of this project. Dick Coeur with MBN Engineering, who is a design engineer and also assisted with routing. And Dave Grover of our regulatory department.

We also have JCG Land Services in the back and some of you have met with them already and they can print maps for you and are more than willing to do that for specific property locations following the meeting.

Thanks.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Thank you.

I'd like to just touch on the materials at the back of the room on the table. There is a presentation which we're going to go through here in the next 15 to 20 minutes. I gave you a paper copy of it, very similar to what I'll be showing up here. I think it's helpful, though, to sometimes have a paper copy, especially for some maps we'll be looking at.

There's a comment form on the back table. We'll be taking comments here today, but you can comment through May 9th. You can pick up a comment form if you haven't already at the table.

There's a meeting notice for today's meeting. Likely you have received this in the mail or otherwise know about the meeting. You're here today, but I brought it just in case because it has good information in it.

And there's a mailing list sign-up card

also on the back table. Again, likely many of you are on the mailing list but if you're not sure or you want to make sure, please complete a card and return it to us today. And also you can mail it to the Public Utilities Commission, also.

So the proposed project. ITC Midwest is proposing to build a 345 kilovolt transmission line about 73 miles long in southern Minnesota. It also includes expanding the Lakefield Junction Substation, creating a new Huntley Substation, and relocating several lines to connect to the Huntley Substation and removing the Winnebago Junction Substation. That's best probably depicted on the map.

Lakefield Junction Substation over here in Jackson County. This shows you a number of the routing options that proceed east. Here's the Fox Lake area. Here's where we are today in the Fairmont area and Lake Charlotte up here. The proposed Huntley Substation or an alternative substation down here, and then proceeding south into Iowa crossing the Iowa border down in this area right here.

There are a number of pictures in the draft environmental impact statement. This is just

one of them. This is a typical 345 kV - 161 kV structure. And by that, it has different voltage lines on each side, so it has maybe 345 on one side and 161 on the other. They are 130 to 190 feet tall, a span of 700 to 1,000 feet. And the right-of-way needed for this transmission line were it to cross your property is 200 feet, so that's the area needed to place the project.

In order to construct this project in Minnesota, ITC needs two approvals from the Public Utilities Commission. One, a certificate of need, which is to the question of whether the project is needed; and a route permit, which is if the project is needed where should it be located.

There are statutes and rules in Minnesota that guide this process. I've put them up here for you. The certificate of need is Minnesota Rule 7849 and the route permit is 7850.

Now, making a decision like this by the Public Utilities Commission is a big undertaking. And the Commission gets help from a number of state agencies, including the Department of Natural Resources, the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, any number of agencies. But two are particularly called into action. One is the Minnesota Department

of Commerce, which is where I'm located, and the other is the Minnesota Office of Administrative Hearings. And we'll see how we work in this process as we go forward.

So the certificate of need question is, is this project needed or is a different project more appropriate for the State of Minnesota. And out of that drop three other sort of subquestions: Is this the right size project? Are they connecting the right end points here? Is it the right voltage? Is it the right kind of project? Is transmission what is needed, transmission of energy rather than generation of energy? And is the timing right? Is this project needed now or is this something needed five years from now or 10 years from now? And that's something the Public Utilities Commission has to decide.

If it's needed, then where should it be located and how should it be constructed? The Commission has to make that decision also. And it's guided by the routing factors in Minnesota Rule 7850. And I believe in your handout in the presentation I gave you all of the factors that the Commission has to consider in 7850.

Let me pull that page so you can see it.

1 It sort of looks like this. It's a textual page.
2 And it has letters A through N, including effects on
3 human settlements and public health and safety and
4 land-based economies. That would mean mining and
5 forestry, agriculture, and maybe even tourism.
6 Impacts on the natural environment and impacts on
7 other factors, including archaeological and
8 historical resources. And also whether or not the
9 project uses existing rights-of-way.
10 The Commission is charged with making
11 sure that it does not, when issuing a permit,
12 proceed piecemeal or somehow divide up the
13 countryside when there are already existing highways
14 or roads or transmission lines in the area.
15 I've also included a small picture here
16 to show you the two things the Commission will --
17 two of the things the Commission will decide. One
18 is the route width, how wide the width is. And also
19 the anticipated alignment, which is more where are
20 the poles and the line going to be placed. And when
21 it decides that, and also where it's going to be
22 located, it has to decide a number of things about
23 the project.
24 UNIDENTIFIED: Excuse me. You're talking
25 about width. What do you mean width? It's 200 feet

1 wide, you can't farm any closer than that or what?
2 MR. RAY KIRSCH: Good question. The
3 gentleman's question is what do you mean by the
4 route width. Let me back up.
5 The Commission, when it issues a permit,
6 is trying to balance predictability and flexibility.
7 So it may issue, and in this case ITC has asked for
8 a route width of 1,000 feet, it may be that if the
9 Commission issues a route width of 1,000 feet that
10 the line could be going along there and anywhere
11 within that 1,000 feet the line could be placed. It
12 only needs to take up 200 feet, so you could move it
13 slightly higher or slightly lower. You could move
14 it within the route width. That's to give some
15 predictability as to where it's going, but also then
16 to give some flexibility to work with landowners to
17 say, if you could bump that up a little bit, that
18 would be better for me, for whatever reason, for the
19 way I operate my operation, or for aesthetics,
20 because it's further away from us so we don't have
21 to look at it, but that's the way you could move
22 within that route width. That does not mean you
23 cannot use it. The route width does not put any
24 restrictions on how you can use your land, you can
25 use it in any way you want. The right-of-way,

1 though, the actual 200 feet may have -- to get an
2 easement across your land, may have restrictions on
3 how you could use that. Certainly, for instance,
4 you couldn't build something directly underneath the
5 line, but if you are farming underneath the line you
6 could certainly farm underneath the line. Anything
7 that could safely be done underneath the line, so
8 you're not creating any safety concern for that
9 area. Does that help? Okay.
10 This is a state permitting flow chart.
11 And I just want to spend a minute with you just so
12 you know where we're at in the process and have a
13 sense of where we're going.
14 The applications for these projects were
15 filed in March of last year. And they were accepted
16 in June of 2013 by the Public Utilities Commission.
17 We were out here -- I see some familiar faces --
18 last year in July of 2013 asking you what do we need
19 to know about this project to make a smart decision,
20 how can we make an informed decision, what impacts,
21 what mitigation measures, what routing options do
22 you want us to look at.
23 In October of last year we issued what's
24 called the scoping decision, which is sort of the
25 table of contents for this environmental impact

statement.

In March, a month ago, we issued the draft environmental impact statement. And let me just, being coy about it, it's a large document. There are four of them on the back table. It comes in one volume, which is mostly text, but also some maps. And there's also a map book, a detailed map book which comes in this 11-by-17 format.

So we put that out in March of this year. And here we are on the right side at the public meetings and comment periods on the draft EIS. The EIS is issued in a draft form so that we can improve it. There could be something we missed, there could be something that's an error. We want to get it right and that's why it's issued in draft form so that public comments can improve it.

In May of this year, about three weeks from now, the 12th -- excuse me, the 13th and 14th, an administrative law judge will be out here to hear from you all as to what's the best route for this project and why. And also, even before that, do you think it's needed or not needed. He'll be interested in knowing what you're trying to mitigate and what you're trying to avoid and how you're going about that. And I encourage you all to come and

1 talk with him when he's here.
2 The final EIS will be prepared in July of
3 2014, so all the comments that we've received will
4 be responded to in the final. And in September of
5 2014 the administrative law judge's report is due.
6 The judge's report will include findings and
7 conclusions and recommendations both as to the need
8 for the project and also for the route for the
9 project.
10 That report and the entire record goes to
11 the Public Utilities Commission, and in the fall of
12 this year, the fall of 2014, the Commission is
13 expected to make a decision on the need and the
14 route permit.
15 This is the same information in a more
16 tabular form. Again, we're at the public
17 information meetings on April 22nd here. The
18 hearings are the next thing up. And the Final EIS.
19 And then the judge's report in September. And the
20 Commission meeting in the fall of 2014.
21 UNIDENTIFIED: A question here.
22 MR. RAY KIRSCH: Yes, ma'am.
23 UNIDENTIFIED: Does the administrative
24 law judge make the final, final decision? Or does
25 he recommend one over another? Or is it the final

1 that the Commission -- or is it the five-person
2 Commission with the governor making a final
3 decision?
4 MR. RAY KIRSCH: Yes. Her question is
5 who's making the decision here, is it the judge or
6 is it the Public Utilities Commission? And the
7 answer is the Public Utilities Commission.
8 So the judge is, as I said, put on the
9 case, so to speak, by the Public Utilities
10 Commission, the Office of Administrative Hearings,
11 and they ask the judge to come out, listen to
12 people, take their testimony, and make a
13 recommendation.
14 The Commission does not -- is not bound
15 by the judge's recommendation. They give it great
16 weight, though, because they ask the judge to do it,
17 to undertake the process and to come out here and to
18 talk to everybody about it. And this is what the
19 Office of Administrative Hearings does, this is
20 their specialty. And so when the judge comes out I
21 think you'll find him very attentive to all of your
22 questions and comments.
23 The judge's report goes to the Commission
24 and, as I said, the Commission can decide to accept
25 the judge's report or to accept part of the judge's

1 report, or it may have questions, it can always send
2 the report back to the judge if there's something
3 that is not clear, but it is ultimately the Public
4 Utilities Commission that makes the decision.
5 UNIDENTIFIED: And that includes, number
6 one, the certificate of need and, secondly, the
7 route; is that correct?
8 MR. RAY KIRSCH: That is correct. The
9 question is do they decide both matters, and they
10 do. They decide if it is needed, and if it is
11 needed they decide the route permit. That's
12 correct. Anything else?
13 Okay. So I showed you the draft EIS.
14 I'm going to talk a little bit about its contents.
15 The idea behind doing a draft EIS is informed
16 decision-making. It doesn't mean that, as you see
17 the next comment, those two bullets on my slide are
18 comments and are facts and it does not advocate --
19 it doesn't advocate for any of the projects that it
20 examines. I mean, you're familiar with this
21 project, you might have heard about the Polymet
22 project in northern Minnesota where they've issued a
23 supplemental EIS. Again, the whole point is what
24 are the facts about the project so we can make an
25 informed decision.

1 People may agree or disagree about the
2 decision that the Public Utilities in this case
3 makes, but at least they know that they made an
4 informed decision.
5 The EIS is trying to establish a common
6 set of facts so that we're all on the same page.
7 For instance, the last time we were out here last
8 summer we learned about a couple of airstrips that
9 were not on maps that were in the application, and
10 possible impacts to the airstrips. And that's
11 something that we don't want to make a decision at
12 the last day and that the Commission is looking at
13 that saying why didn't we know about that before.
14 We want to get a common set of facts.
15 The document doesn't advocate for one
16 route over the other or one route variation or
17 alternative over the other. What it does do is it
18 talks about the other human and environmental
19 impacts of all the possible routing options and
20 possible mitigation measures, including how the
21 project is constructed, best management practices
22 and where the project is located, including routes,
23 route alternatives and route variations.
24 It also discusses the relative merits of
25 routing options. That is, it compares the different

1 options using the routing factors of Minnesota Rule
2 7850.4100. So you'll find that the EIS sort of
3 mirrors these factors and walks you through them,
4 and that's to aid the judge and to aid the
5 Commission and to aid all of you so there's a common
6 framework for the analysis.
7 Again, I can't go through this whole
8 document with you, but I do want to talk a little
9 bit about how it's set up so that you can utilize it
10 to your best advantage.
11 In the draft EIS the discussion proceeds
12 by dividing the project into two segments. One is
13 this orange segment, which is getting from Lakefield
14 over to Huntley, right, and the other shown here in
15 green, coming from Huntley south to Iowa. Basically
16 this -- over first, and then here, that's the way
17 it's presented in the document.
18 It talks about the routes that were
19 presented by ITC Midwest, A and B. It discusses
20 route alternatives, which use Interstate 90, so
21 there are a number of route alternatives that were
22 suggested by you all in the scoping process of using
23 Interstate 90 or using it more than it is currently.
24 And there are also several areas around
25 the project where we had a wave of route variations,

which are relatively small variations on what was proposed to mitigate specific impacts.

So at the Jackson Municipal Airport there are three variations there that folks suggested and that we studied. At Fox Lake there are actually six variations, route variations that we studied. Two on the west side of the lake, one crossing the lake, and three on the east side of the lake. At Lake Charlotte there are five route variations. Again, these are all from folks that live in the area and know the area and suggested possible better ways to manage the route in that area. One at the Center Creek WMA, one route variation just south of the Huntley Substation -- proposed Huntley Substation where there is a Blue Earth River crossing. And then there are four others in the route from Huntley down to Iowa. Very small changes in the alignment or the route that people suggested in order to mitigate specific impacts.

So if you look at the draft EIS you'll see a discussion generally of the project, what's been proposed, and it will walk through each of these routes, route alternatives, and route variations. It has text, it has graphs, it has pictures to try and relate to you the different

agricultural impacts, the different aesthetic impacts, the distances to homes and that sort of thing that you might be interested in for the project.

Again, for each of the routes or route alternatives and route variations, we worked through the list of different impacts that could occur and how they might be mitigated. I have here listed, very similar to the Minnesota rules list, under human settlements, looking at noise, aesthetics, property values, public services and airports. Looking at public health and safety. Land-based economies, which is sort of our term of art for, in this area, agriculture. Archaeological and historic resources. The natural environment. Rare and unique natural resources. The use of existing rights-of-way and cost.

So all things that you would want to know about and all things that are in the Minnesota rules that we need to cover in order for the Commission to make a decision.

Let me see here. Let me just state one other thing on this slide. What the rules don't say and what is not said in the draft EIS, because it doesn't advocate, is how to combine all of these

1 into making a decision. It doesn't say aesthetic
2 impacts are worse than ag impacts. Or in this
3 scenario archaeological resources could be impacted,
4 but for some reason it's counterbalanced by some
5 other considerations that we have. For instance,
6 distance to homes or something like that. That is
7 sort of the judge's job and your job and the
8 Commission's job, is to figure out, all right, we
9 know these impacts exist, we have an accounting of
10 them here in front of us, what does that tell us?
11 How do we make sense of that? And that is something
12 that you all can help the judge with when he comes
13 out here in May.
14 And the availability of this document.
15 It's on websites, it's on the Department of Commerce
16 website, it's also available through the Public
17 Utilities Commission website, which takes you to the
18 state's electronic docketing system. It's available
19 at six local libraries, I don't have the list but
20 they're in the notice there.
21 As I said, there are four review copies
22 on the back table, please look at them today. And
23 you can also get maps printed in the back for
24 specific properties. Again, that's not the whole
25 EIS but you can get a specific map that shows the

map layers that are in the draft EIS so you can get a sense of that.

We also have copies on CD. If you have a computer or you have someone who has access to a computer, we'll be glad to get you a copy on a CD, which is easier to carry around than the document itself and maybe more user-friendly.

If you have questions, you have questions about the draft EIS, if you have questions between now and the end of the comment period on this document, or at any time about the process, you can contact me, my information is there, or you can contact Tracy Smetana at the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission. She's the public advisor for this project. Folks who were here last summer, you met Tracy, she was out here then.

You can sign up for the project mailing list to make sure you're abreast of all the information about the project. You can also subscribe to eDockets. If you are someone who uses e-mail and likes electronic information, you could subscribe, which is an electronic subscription, you put in your e-mail address and they send you an e-mail every time something is added to the docket for this project.

So those are all three good ways to get information or help get your questions answered.

All right. One more topic I'd like to cover before we open it up for your comments.

Using the draft EIS. I envision it could be used in several ways, but I think the primary way is for you to advocate at the public hearing, for the need for the project, what the route permit should say, what the impacts are or how they could be mitigated, how the project should be constructed, where it should be located. The judge is interested in knowing how you balance all those factors and what's the conclusion that you personally come up with, and we'd like to know that.

I am going to walk through several maps with you of ITC Midwest's Modified Route A. So the hearing is next month, the 13th and 14th, but the procedural rules of the hearing, ITC and other parties have been required to put in their testimony in advance. And we have copies, we have copies in the back of the room of ITC's testimony. And in there they discuss Modified Route A. And they were all out here with you last summer and I think they've chosen to modify some of their original routing decisions. And I want to walk through them

1 and discuss them with you because I think, one, I
2 think you need to be familiar with them going into
3 the hearing. Two, they build directly on the draft
4 environmental impact statement. They use route
5 variations that you suggested and we studied and
6 they are using those. And, three, I think they
7 offer a good example of what you could do if you
8 wanted to when the judge comes to talk about the
9 different options in front of us.
10 So let's look at a couple of these maps.
11 I think we'll have to spend a minute here getting
12 oriented to them and then I think the others will be
13 easier to understand. So let's take one minute
14 here.
15 This is an option at the north of the
16 city of Jackson, so a bump-out in the route to
17 accommodate the Jackson Municipal Airport. Up here
18 on the slide, and you have the same map in your
19 handout, the part in orange, with the red line down
20 the middle, was Route A as proposed by ITC when they
21 first came in with this project. Their Modified
22 Route A is in this light blue line here. So it
23 seems to proceed and does proceed -- it doesn't seem
24 to -- on Route A, and then it jumps up to here and
25 follows JA-2, which is Jackson Airport Route

1 Variation 2. So it uses a variation that's examined
2 in the EIS and then rejoins Route A. So it uses a
3 portion of a route variation and a portion of
4 Route A. So that is something you could suggest.
5 You don't have to suggest a certain route or a route
6 variation to the judge, or you could if that makes
7 sense to you, but you could combine them as ITC has
8 done here.
9 Let's look at another example in the Fox
10 Lake area. In this area ITC's original Route A came
11 along here and dipped across the highway right here
12 at the city of Sherburn and proceeded along the
13 south side of I-90, and then proceeded back up north
14 connecting to the existing 161 line north of Fox
15 Lake. ITC modified its Route A going into the
16 hearing, saying, Judge, this is what we think now is
17 the best way to proceed. They stayed on the north
18 side of I-90 here and then they dipped south of I-90
19 just for a short section here, but not near the city
20 of Sherburn, and then they come up along Route A and
21 then they go over 140th and up 130th. This sort of
22 arrangement of routing options is known in the draft
23 EIS as Fox Lake Number 4. It's a route variation
24 that we studied. You can find all the information
25 about Fox Lake 4. You may personally not like that

1 option, you may personally think it is a grand way
2 to go or maybe somewhere in between. I just want to
3 show it to you as the change in thinking that ITC
4 has had, and as example of what you could say to the
5 judge and say I can use this document, you can use
6 the EIS, you can use the information to make your
7 case of what you think should happen here.
8 Here's a map at Lake Charlotte. Again,
9 the orange with the red is the original Route A,
10 over and down and up here. ITC has since shown
11 Modified Route A, this blue line, to maybe drop down
12 a little further west here and not go so far south,
13 which this is 160th Street along the south side of
14 Lake Charlotte and then back up.
15 There are a number of route variations,
16 1, 2 and 5, I'll do that in the draft EIS, and you
17 can find information about those route variations
18 and you may say I think that's a better way to go or
19 not, as you wish, but the information is there on
20 each of those.
21 And, finally, there's one other
22 modification that ITC is proposing as we go into the
23 hearing next month. Just south of the Huntley
24 Substation, there's this crossing of existing 161
25 line, it crosses the Blue Earth River there two

1 times. And there was a route variation suggested,
2 it's known as HI-1 for Huntley to Iowa 1, and ITC is
3 suggesting this blue line, which is similar to HI-1,
4 this dotted line, but stays along the existing line
5 a little bit and takes slightly different angles.
6 So, again, this idea of removing the line
7 from the river and proceeding slightly to the west
8 of it is examined in the draft EIS. So you have
9 information about all of the impacts associated with
10 that and you can say I think that's a good idea or I
11 don't think that's a good idea to the judge when the
12 judge comes out. Or it has benefits that are
13 worthwhile and I think we should do that or not.
14 So I want -- that's a very brief
15 overview, but that is all the changes that the
16 company has proposed going into the hearing, but I
17 wanted to just show you them because those route
18 variations are covered in the EIS and they are
19 something you could propose to the judge at the
20 hearing.
21 And now to the last part of our meeting,
22 which is comments on the draft EIS. As I mentioned,
23 it's issued in draft form so we can approve it, so
24 we're here to ask you today what needs to be
25 clarified, what's missing, what do we need to do to

make it a complete and accurate document?

I realize it requires you to look at the document and spend some time with it. You may or may not have had time to date to do that, I understand that. If you have, that's great, and if you need more time, there will be more time until May 9th. So you have time to look at the document and get us some comments.

So we'll do verbal comments today. You can submit a comment sheet. I have that out there, they're available at the back table. You can comment online at the Department of Commerce's website, Energy Facilities website. Once you go to that website, you should click on submit a comment, a little button there. If you submit a comment, you can go to this project and submit one. Or you can mail, fax, or e-mail me a comment directly. There's my contact information. And the comments have to be in by May 9th, 2014. All modes of commenting are equal, it doesn't matter if you mail or fax or e-mail, they all count the same. So however is easiest and most effective for you to proceed, but it has to be to me by May 9th.

All the comments that we receive that are timely, in other words, that I get by May 9th, will

be responded to in the final EIS. So we'll show every comment. It'll be another appendix to the document. Every comment that was received, and for every question or clarification or whatever you think is missing, we'll make sure we have that.

UNIDENTIFIED: Do you have a specific format that you want comments in, such as PDF files, Word documents, if we're sending e-mail?

MR. RAY KIRSCH: The question is is there a specific format. I do not have a specific format. You can send it in Word or PDF or just typed text, whatever you want to do, we will convert.

UNIDENTIFIED: Awesome. I'll find something unusual for you, then.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: I'll look forward to that.

If you do write it by hand, do your best to -- I mean, just legibly. I want to make sure I get your comment.

UNIDENTIFIED: The introduction of Modified Route A, what does that do to the original Route A, in terms of the process here? Is original Route A still a valid option that's going to be considered by the judge and everybody else, or can I shut up now?

1 MR. RAY KIRSCH: The answer is Route A
2 still exists. So the company has -- I don't know
3 how -- I don't know how I want to phrase this, but
4 maybe perceived some wisdom from the community and
5 modified it, and maybe when we get to the hearing
6 there are other people who will say I don't think
7 that's such a good idea, why don't you go back to A
8 because that was a better idea.
9 So I would say -- I would caution you to
10 say, yes, even though you might say that's a good
11 idea and even though the company -- I think the
12 company through the hearing process could say we've
13 learned some more. One of the blessings of the
14 process is it takes a long time, so hopefully we get
15 everybody's word out, right, so everybody has a
16 chance to speak their piece. I understand it takes
17 a long time and you have to pay attention for a
18 while, that's the difficult part.
19 UNIDENTIFIED: So one other question. I
20 haven't analyzed it. Does every part of Modified
21 Route A fall under the EIS now? Were all of those
22 areas commented on previously or is some of this
23 new?
24 MR. RAY KIRSCH: It's all in the EIS,
25 actually. All of the -- all of the changes or

1 modifications that the company is proposing build
2 upon route variations that were suggested by the
3 public and are analyzed in the EIS. So they're all
4 there.
5 Now, I will make this point. We did not
6 have the term Modified Route A before us when we
7 prepared this document. We will put it in the final
8 so that it appears in the final EIS. And when the
9 judge comes we will have the maps so that it appears
10 there and so everyone can refer to it if they so
11 choose. But all that information is in the draft
12 EIS and we'll make sure that we have some editing of
13 the text to describe what it is and we'll have to
14 edit the maps to show where it is. That's a good
15 question.
16 Yes, ma'am.
17 UNIDENTIFIED: When is that hearing
18 you're referring to now? Where comments are due
19 May 9th, the hearing is before May 9, isn't it?
20 MR. RAY KIRSCH: No, it's not. The
21 comments on the draft EIS are due to me by May 9th.
22 The judge's hearing is May 13th and 14th.
23 UNIDENTIFIED: That's his, the judge,
24 that's called a hearing?
25 MR. RAY KIRSCH: That's called a hearing,

1 yes.
2 UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you.
3 MR. RAY KIRSCH: So the comment period on
4 this ends and then the judge comes out.
5 I'm going to ask that we go one speaker
6 at a time, and please limit your comments to a few
7 minutes. If you have a lot to say we'll circle back
8 to you so we make sure everyone has a chance.
9 We have a court reporter with us today to
10 record your comments to make sure we get them
11 correct. I'd like you to state and spell your name
12 for the court reporter.
13 Please maintain respect for others who
14 may have a difference of opinion. And if you can
15 direct your comments to the content of the draft
16 EIS, that's what we're here to talk about today,
17 what needs to be clarified, what's missing, what's
18 not accurate about the document. And I understand,
19 we've already had a few questions, you may need to
20 ask a question in order to make a comment, so please
21 do that.
22 So I'll leave that slide up there as a
23 cue for all of us. I'm going to ask you to come up,
24 and although I've been standing on that side, stand
25 on this side so the court reporter can see you. It

helps her to record to actually see the person speak while they're speaking.

I'm going to go off the speaker sign-up list. We have a few people that have signed up. Once we go through these folks and they've all had a chance to speak, I will do a show of hands if anybody else has something to say. So just because you may not have signed up doesn't mean you do not have a chance.

All right. So the first person on the list is Carol Overland.

MS. CAROL OVERLAND: Carol Overland, O-V-E-R-L-A-N-D.

In this case I'm representing Citizens Energy Task Force and No CapX 2020.

First, for the record, I'd like to enter in like three studies. These are -- this is DEIS, and this is about corona and ultraviolet light and the impact on that, which is something that has not been considered in the EIS. And my Citizens Energy Task Force clients are very concerned about this and want to make sure that this is addressed in all transmission proceedings going forward because ultraviolet triggers cancer, and that's a problem.

Let's see. Okay. The DEIS addressed

1 project costs, and that's a problem in this because
2 it says project costs are from 194 million to 206
3 million, but this project is more than just this
4 part. This project is part of what is called MVP-3,
5 which goes all the way down into Iowa, and it also
6 is connected to MVP-4, which goes further east, it's
7 also connected to MVP-5, which is like the Badger
8 Coulee line and other lines in Wisconsin and going
9 down into Iowa.
10 And in this case the project benefits are
11 claimed, and the benefits that are claimed are only
12 available or are only possible to achieve, maybe not
13 even probable, possible, with all 17 of these MVP
14 projects throughout the Midwest being built, and all
15 these benefits are claimed. Well, if you're going
16 to claim all those benefits you need to claim all
17 the costs. And so the costs are a lot more than 194
18 to 206 million. And those are just like, say, the
19 project costs for just this part. But it's clear
20 that Minnesota ratepayers will only pay a part of
21 that, they're apportioned among all the recipients,
22 as are all the costs for the 17 projects. So it's
23 very important when looking at cost to look at the
24 cost to Minnesota ratepayers of all these 17
25 projects.

1 You have to look at the socioeconomic
2 aspects of this project in the DEIS, and you need to
3 look at project costs and what it will cost
4 Minnesota ratepayers. And those are like two
5 different things, but you need to look at the costs
6 of all those 17 projects, not just this part of this
7 part.
8 And then looking at alternatives to the
9 proposed project, well, everywhere in the DEIS where
10 it says need -- that word is used a lot -- and that
11 should be changed to either want or desire. Because
12 the kind of need that this is is not recognized
13 under the statute. This is an economic need, and
14 there are really no alternatives to this project.
15 This is a for-profit line by a private company, it's
16 not a utility. So really the only alternative to
17 this that would meet their need would be to just
18 stuff cash into their pockets. And so in looking at
19 alternatives, we have to look at, you know, define
20 the need, the DEIS needs to define the need, which
21 it does not do. And it should state that it's an
22 economic need, and wherever it says need, it should
23 say want or desire rather than need.
24 On page 47, I'm looking at the
25 alternatives to project, section 4, and in the

1 system operating procedures, as I understand it
2 that's not being used so that should probably be
3 corrected in the DEIS.
4 It often refers to wind generation, but
5 under the FERC rules you can't discriminate against
6 sources. So it's like whatever is there. And then
7 also given the case that just came down regarding
8 Minnesota's Next Generation Act, the Next Generation
9 Energy Act, there could be new coal plants coming
10 down. And in that case they talk about one in South
11 Dakota. Now, this line is an extension of the Sioux
12 Falls to Lakefield Junction line marching across
13 Minnesota. And so we're bringing in -- you know,
14 this line will tie directly into that, which brings
15 in energy from the Dakotas. So we need to
16 acknowledge that in this. So everywhere where it
17 says wind, you should back up that it is wind,
18 because you can't discriminate. And so what really
19 is on the line? It's whatever happens to be there
20 and it is a very high probability that it's going to
21 be coal. And that's not right to be saying that
22 this is for wind.
23 On page 47 it says ITCM notes that the
24 need for this project has been substantiated by its
25 own studies and those of MISO. Well, these are

1 transmission companies. They didn't look at
2 anything but transmission. So that should be clear.
3 It's like a misleading sentence and it supports need
4 where that hasn't -- that's not right. And all
5 Promod modeling that they've done, that's all
6 economic modeling, that's not about reliability.
7 Also, it should be clear that congestion
8 does not equal a reliability problem. On page 47 it
9 talks about reliability issues. And that's not
10 reliability, that's an economic issue. Let's see.
11 On page 48 there's more about the it's for wind
12 again and I just discussed that.
13 It's clear on page 48, it specifies ITCM
14 is an electric transmission company, that it is not
15 generation, it's not a utility. It's not a public
16 service corporation. And so to the extent that they
17 want to claim additional land for the easement,
18 which in some places it may be necessary if they say
19 they need a 200-foot easement, how do they do that?
20 You know, eminent domain, what is that going to do?
21 And that could also have an impact, if they have to
22 pay market rates for land, that could really impact
23 the costs of this project.
24 I'll try to keep this quick. I'll have
25 more for tonight.

1 Let's see. Okay, page 49. They're
2 talking about that they studied lower voltages. And
3 there's confusion here, and the DEIS should be clear
4 about what voltages are and what capacity is,
5 because they're looking for a certain capacity. And
6 that capacity should be named. As well as defining
7 the need for this project, it should also define
8 what capacity it is that they want.
9 You can have a 161 kV line really big
10 that would equal a lot of 345 kV lines. So the part
11 on page 49 which is talking about different
12 voltages, it should address capacities, you know,
13 specifically MVA for the line.
14 Let's see. On page 49 it's talking about
15 that section you pointed out where it was going over
16 the wetlands where there's a 161 line, and it says
17 the 345 line would have relatively longer span, it
18 would be capable of spanning natural resources.
19 Well, it seems to me the 161 line is already
20 spanning it, so that statement doesn't really make
21 sense.
22 And then when you're talking about, on
23 page 50, about generation rather than transmission,
24 there's a lot of presumptions implied in here. And
25 it presumes that to build generation here to ship

elsewhere, that that's a good thing to do, that that's something we should do. And that should be questioned.

It also presumes that elsewhere wants it. That's not a safe assumption, that certainly is not clear from the Mid-Atlantic governors, all 10 of them got together and said we don't want your transmission, we don't want your generation, we want to do it here. So there's some presumptions.

It also -- it says ITC Midwest business model, and that's not necessarily something that we should be doing. So those are some things in section 4.6, the assumptions are flawed.

And that'll do it for now. Thank you.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Thank you.

Oh, good. Ron Mixer. Ron, if you could state and spell your name for the court reporter.

MR. RON MIXER: Yes. It's Ron Mixer, I'm the interim pastor at Sherburn Regional Worship Center.

COURT REPORTER: Could you spell your name, please?

MR. RON MIXER: With letters? M-I-X-E-R. Just like you thought it was, but were afraid to ask. I know.

1 There are several things that we've
2 noticed in the draft EIS that are of concern to us.
3 In section 2.1.3, item C, it states that
4 the certificate of need has to be based on section
5 216B.243, Minnesota rules -- I won't read it all,
6 you can read it in the book. But it says, By a
7 preponderance of the evidence on the record, the
8 proposed facility or suitable modification of the
9 facility will provide benefits to society in a
10 manner complete with protecting the natural,
11 socioeconomic environments, including human health.
12 Route A, as it is proposed at the moment,
13 is within 120 feet of the church building in
14 Sherburn. Now, Modified Route A, which we were
15 thankful to read about, removes our concerns. But
16 if Route A were selected, it makes our building
17 virtually unusable. We would not be allowed or able
18 to bring children there for concerns of leukemia, we
19 would not be able to bring senior adults who may
20 have pacemakers, insulin pumps, et cetera, into the
21 building. The cost then becomes great on the social
22 and economic side to us and we definitely want to
23 heavily, you know, push for Route 1A -- or Modified
24 Route A, as far as it concerns us.
25 Grounding becomes a problem. In section

1 4.71, grounding, it states that the permittee
2 shall -- permittee shall construct and operate the
3 transmission line in a manner so that maximum
4 induced studies state short circuit current shall be
5 limited to 5 milliamperes and it goes and it says
6 all fixed metal objects on or off the right-of-way
7 except fences that cross the right-of-way shall be
8 grounded.
9 Our concern -- and there's more there,
10 but our concern here is that our building is --
11 within that 120 feet is an all-metal structure.
12 Metal girders, metal roof, metal sidewalls, metal
13 steel stud, metal screws holding it together. If
14 there were a catastrophic failure with a 130- or a
15 190-foot transmission pole that landed on the
16 church, the church would be immediately electrified
17 and it would be extremely dangerous to our
18 congregates.
19 And for that reason we have to stand in
20 opposition to Route A as it currently is described
21 coming through Sherburn.
22 I'm not even going to address some of the
23 health concerns, I think the others have done that
24 and will do so. We, however, because we would be in
25 close proximity to the transmission lines, there are

1 issues with communication devices for us, public
2 address system, wireless microphones, wireless
3 projection for hearing impaired. We have a
4 low-level radio frequency device so that hearing
5 impaired can hear in our church. We also have video
6 transmission within the church, wireless
7 transmissions for Internet use, cellular phones,
8 et cetera, that can all be impacted by the EMFs from
9 the transmission line. We're very concerned about
10 that.
11 We certainly qualify as a human
12 settlement, and as that we really think that
13 consideration should be given to moving that line to
14 the Modified Route A, keeping it away from the
15 church as far as possible. I'll hit you up with
16 more later, but let some others talk now.
17 MR. RAY KIRSCH: Thank you very much.
18 If I can just add on to Mr. Mixer's
19 comments. I believe he was quoting part of it,
20 there's a generic route permit template in the draft
21 environmental impact statement, and it's an appendix
22 in there. And it's included so you see what a route
23 permit looks like. And there is some standard
24 language and he was quoting some standard language
25 about the National Electric Safety Code that has to

be followed in grounding that has to be done for every project. It's the Commission's, quote, unquote, standard language. And I would encourage you to look at that in the appendix if you're so interested in those kinds of details.

Sarah Jagodzinske Rohman.

MS. SARAH JAGODZINSKE ROHMAN: Sarah is S-A-R-A-H, Jagodzinske, J-A-G-O-D-Z-I-N-S-K-E, and Rohman, R-O-H-M-A-N.

So, as you said, my name is Sarah Jagodzinske Rohman. I would like to kind of use your routing factors as my kind of lead to explain what I'm thinking.

I wear many hats. I'm a mother of three small children, five, three, and one; I am a farmer, and I am also on the school board.

The human settlement factor, property values. I believe that if you put up these high voltage power lines across our farmland that that will bring down the value of the land. Nobody wants to take the time, the extra time to farm around these huge poles. It takes a lot of time. We are very busy, we put in a lot of time, and we would not be appreciative of that.

Also, being the fifth generation in

1 somebody you are speaking to here, every farm has a
2 different story. And if you take the time to speak
3 to the people in the farm families, there's a reason
4 why the land is important to them. And so by just
5 coming through our land and doing an easement or
6 saying we need 1,000 feet, but it'll be 200 feet,
7 that's significant both on an emotional level, but
8 also on a economic level of the concept of farming
9 around this, the extra resources it takes. You
10 can't have aerial, anything aerial, like spray or
11 anything put on your field 'cause nobody is going to
12 go through a pole that would be there. So that's an
13 issue there.
14 Public health. That's probably my most
15 valid concern, in the sense that I was here last
16 time and gave you some research. And there's a lot
17 of research out there that suggests that this such
18 high voltage is harmful to humans. And it's not
19 that big of a deal probably if, you know, even in
20 the terminology of some of the answers to those
21 questions that said the problem was minimal. It's
22 not minimal if you live here. It's more of a, not
23 if you just drive by. Say if it goes along I-90,
24 that would be fabulous. It's not a big deal if
25 you're just driving by quick, but for somebody like

me who lives or potentially could live less than a quarter of a mile, or if it goes with Route A, or B, for that matter, it goes right across my driveway, that is a significant problem.

And with three small children, it's actually supposed to be harder on small children's bodies because their cells are obviously rapidly developing. Even unborn children. And any time you have electric potential hit a cell, that changes the function of that cell. And if they are developing quickly, obviously that's a problem.

Is there a lot of research on that? No, it would be unethical to put somebody under electromagnetic radiation and say, oh, yeah, let's test you out. Nobody is going to volunteer for that and I certainly don't want to be the guinea pig for that experience. So I'd really like you to consider the health problems for everybody, but specifically the reason why it's important to me is for my small children.

Land-based economics, that's the ag part, I kind of touched on that already. But that soil compaction, the farming around it, the extra time that takes.

And the easement, my understanding is if

you do have an easement, that's kind of there. And so it may go within that 200 feet, but if there was another project or if you wanted to sell that off, can that be done? Can you sell an easement? And then all of a sudden I might have, I don't know, a railroad going through my field or something? Is that possible? Does anybody know that?

MR. RAY KIRSCH: I'll try and answer your question. I think the answer to your question is no. So the easement is for that transmission line, so if there was even -- you couldn't put another line there or you couldn't put a railroad or anything else there.

MS. SARAH JAGODZINSKE ROHMAN: Okay. Thank you for that.

And then the use of an existing right-of-way. Like kind of talking about what I'd like to add or suggest, and it's already on there, is to follow I-90. I don't want -- my point isn't to push this off on anybody else, nobody wants to have this by their house or by their children or their grandchildren, so that's not the point.

But I just believe by looking at the route and looking at I-90, there's less homes close by I-90, as well as there is already lines going

1 through there. And so -- and I believe based on the
2 lines going through there there must be some kind of
3 an existing right-of-way there.
4 The cost factor, in ITC's -- I'm on the
5 mailing list so I have received a whole lot of stuff
6 from you, huge packets, a lot of reading, and I
7 really appreciate, actually, the Department of
8 Commerce and the factor that they seem very on top
9 of things and not naive at all to any, like, to try
10 to go on one side or another, kind of like you said,
11 you're not supposed to push one side, I appreciate
12 that. But one of the things they did talk about is
13 that they felt like ITC didn't necessarily do a good
14 enough job on the cost factor. And we're looking
15 into that. And I would just question if that has
16 been actually done. Plus or minus 30 percent on
17 millions of dollars is a lot of money and obviously
18 they're not going to cover it, we're going to cover
19 it as the ratepayer. So I would just like to make
20 sure that our rates don't go up versus what they
21 suggest, which they will go down. And in 2007 that
22 happened where they said it would go down and they
23 went up and that came from one of your testimonies
24 from one of your people.
25 Yeah. So I would just suggest looking in

to protect us, the ratepayers, as well as to protect us as humans, and our children, future children, and the future generations to come. Not only for electricity, but also health.

Thank you.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Thank you very much.

Is it Derald Harris? I apologize if I'm getting that wrong.

MR. DERALD HARRIS: I'm Derald Harris.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: From Sherburn.

MR. DERALD HARRIS: Yep, that's me. It's D-E-R-A-L-D, H-A-R-R-I-S.

I think Pastor Mixer covered it quite well, we're not in favor of that route that they proposed first. This subsequent route would be the best for us. And I think after you get past our property you could head back across I-90 and continue east.

That's all I have to say.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Thank you very much.

Michael -- I can't read the last name -- from Blue Earth.

MR. MICHAEL JOHNSON: I think that's Johnson.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Johnson. Thank you.

MR. MICHAEL JOHNSON: It must be my handwriting. It's J-O-H-N-S-O-N. I'm with the law firm of Frundt & Johnson in Blue Earth. My partner, Ryan Gustafson, is here with me today. I'll keep my comments fairly brief. I do have a written comment that I'll turn in at this time.

We are appreciative of the process. The process gives all of us an opportunity to comment. And we are also appreciative of the Modified Route A being submitted, as it affects individuals who we are working with and who have been very concerned about the original project as originally designed, and also some of the proposed alternatives are problematic for some of our clients also.

In general, I want to say that the Modified Route A does appear to meet all of the requirements of the parties that we have dealt with and so we're appreciative of ITC listening and coming up with that alternative and modification.

Specifically, in Sherburn it's not only the church. It's the residents, it's the school, it's the whole community that is adversely affected by the original Route A and so the modified proposal I think alleviates all or most of those concerns.

The other comment I want to make is

specifically with respect to the farm ground, and there have been some comments on this with respect to farming practices. I don't know of any farmer that wants to have power lines going through his farmland, but if that does happen, if it has to happen because there is no other alternative or that is the route selected, at least we should encourage the routing to be on the edge of the field, not down the middle of the field. Working around a power line in the middle of a field is just so much worse than having it along the property line. So that is just one routing factor that, regardless of who is involved, I think is relevant and of great concern.

So that's all I really have to say, is just the Modified Route A appears to be a consideration given to many of the concerns that have been raised, so we appreciate that.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Thank you for your comments.

Ryan Gustafson. Is there a Ryan Gustafson from Blue Earth?

MR. RYAN GUSTAFSON: Yep. Ryan Gustafson, R-Y-A-N, G-U-S-T-A-F-S-O-N. I'm with the law firm of Frundt & Johnson in Blue Earth. I'm here representing clients of ours that own some

1 agricultural property that would be affected by the
2 proposed I-90 routes 3, 4 and 5. And also some of
3 the proposed alternative 161 kilovolt lines.
4 And going off of the comments that my
5 partner made, is that I believe that routing these
6 lines through the middle of farmland will have an
7 adverse effect both on the farming operation and the
8 economic value of that farmland. Because of the
9 difficulties in farming, the future sales, future
10 rental incomes are adversely affected by the
11 difficulties that are associated with having to farm
12 around the support structures, be it planting,
13 spraying, maintaining the crops, and harvesting.
14 So because of those issues we would
15 request that, to the benefit of our clients, that
16 the Modified Route A would be the preferred route.
17 And that if any of these other I-90 routes were to
18 be considered, that, again, that if they not proceed
19 through the middle of a field or through the middle
20 of a piece of property, but to the best that they
21 are able, proceed along the property boundaries to
22 cause as little impact to the farming operation as
23 possible.
24 Thank you.
25 MR. RAY KIRSCH: Thank you for your

comments.

Dorothy Behne.

MS. DOROTHY BEHNE: Behne.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Behne. Excuse me. Please come on up. If you could state and spell your name.

MS. DOROTHY BEHNE: Dorothy, D-O-R-O-T-H-Y, Behne, B-E-H-N-E.

I am Dorothy Behne, I'm the mayor of Sherburn and also a concerned citizen of the community. And while we all understand that electricity is a commodity that needs to get to market, there are many concerns on where the transmission lines will go to get that product to market.

In all of the information that's been presented there appears to be many routes that the lines can take. And the original Route A comes into Sherburn city limits at the edge of Kum & Go on the west side and travels over Highway 4, crosses the Assembly of God Church property on the north side of their building, which is metal, and continues east.

And in the information were properties that need to be protected in the book that you're talking about. There is things like the airport,

some animal confinement, some historical sites and, you know, plants and wildlife areas that need to be considered.

I'm here to ask you seriously to consider Modified Route A that places the transmission lines north of our community or follow the same route as the current transmission lines.

I believe that a community of 1,200 people with two schools that have hundreds of children from Sherburn and surrounding communities in town on weekdays, a church that serves hundreds of parishioners several times a week, and a business that sells food, gas, and diesel fuel deserve to have the same consideration of protection that plants, animals, historical sites have in this decision.

I thank you for the opportunity to be here.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Thank you.

Pamela Hill.

MS. PAMELA HILL: No comment.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: No comment, okay.

Allison Schmidt.

MS. ALLISON SCHMIDT: Hi. Allison Schmidt, A-L-L-I-S-O-N, S-C-H-M-I-D-T.

I am the superintendant of Martin County West Schools, and I have a wonderful school district that runs north from Trimont down to the Iowa border over into Welcome and Sherburn.

And I am very concerned about the proposed Route A line. I currently have 760 students. Over 500 of them attend school in Sherburn, either Sherburn Elementary or Martin County West Junior/Senior High School, which is very near to the proposed Route A line.

I would like to thank you for giving a proposal for a Modified Route A, and giving serious consideration for the Modified Route A if that takes it further away from my students.

But I believe, in looking at your draft EIS, an area that needs further clarification is the health and safety impact on locating that Route A. If that is still truly under consideration in such close proximity to my over 500 students and staff that attend there daily, there are indoor, outdoor activities, we have a community garden, we have athletic fields, we have playgrounds that are in the shadows of those proposed lines. And I am very concerned about that and I think that more work needs to be clarified on that health and safety

impact.

I also think that clarification needs to be placed on the economic impact not only in Sherburn as a community, but our Martin County West Schools. We will have businesses that are not willing to expand or develop in that area because of that proposed Route A line. That has a negative impact on the tax base of Sherburn, which has a negative impact on the tax base of Martin County West Schools.

And I'm very proud of the opportunities we provide for our students because of that tax base. And if this proposed Route A jeopardizes that tax base, I'm concerned about what that's going to do not just for our residents, not just for the people that live there, but for our students who deserve every opportunity that children in any district have. So I just think some more clarification needs to be placed on that.

Again, I'd like to thank you for proposing Modified Route A. That addresses the needs of the school district. I understand that it's difficult to make a decision on where it's going to go because as we all kind of can think about it, nobody wants it to go through their yard.

But that proposed Modified Route A does take it away from our schools and our students and our staff, so I would like to thank you for that.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Thank you for your comments.

Carroll Behne. Now you're up.

MR. CARROLL BEHNE: My name is Carroll Behne, two Rs and two Ls, B-E-H-N-E.

I have one question for you. Now, I've driven Interstate 90, and there are two places on the interstate where the power line crosses the interstate. Are you aware of that?

MR. RAY KIRSCH: I'm not familiar with it.

MR. CARROLL BEHNE: Okay. Four miles out of Sherburn, the power line crosses the interstate. Now, before the power line gets to the Sherburn, before the bridge crosses over Highway 4, it once again swings north. It stays north.

Now, my question is, why can't it stay north? Why does it have to come into Sherburn?

Thank you very much.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: So let me -- stay here, if you would, and let me see if I can answer your question.

So as I understand your question, Route A that was proposed by ITC Midwest in their application to cross the highway, and as we've heard from several folks, skirted the northern edge of Sherburn and then eventually --

MR. CARROLL BEHNE: I want it to go north before it reaches the bridge and then goes west. That's what the power line is doing right now.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Right. And there is an existing 161 line there. It could. The answer to your question is it could. And so there are options in the draft EIS and the company has now proposed a Modified Route A which says leave that line north of I-90. All right. So that is a possibility. I would encourage you to come back in May, I know we're all busy, but I would encourage you to come back in May and see the judge and say, Judge, here are the reasons why I think we need to stay north of I-90, it just makes sense to me for the following reasons.

MR. CARROLL BEHNE: Thank you very much.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: You're welcome. All right. I have two more folks on the list and then we'll go to the show of hands.

Beverly Schafer.

MS. BEVERLY SCHAFER: Beverly Schafer, S-C-H-A-F-E-R. I live in Austin all winter because I live out on the farm and I'm cold.

So I've just come home and found out about this meeting. And in Austin, while I was there, I heard a family say that they had lived by the line and their daughter got cancer and died.

Are you willing to live by the line and have that happen to your family? I think we should have more thought to it and go north of I-90. Because it isn't fair for all of our families to be aware of these diseases and think we may get them. I don't think that's even fair. And I don't think that any of you would want to do that.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Thank you for your comments.

Doug Hilgendorf. If you would state and spell your name.

MR. DOUGLAS HILGENDORF: Oh, a test, I didn't know that. Douglas Hilgendorf, D-O-U-G-L-A-S, H-I-L-G-E-N-D-O-R-F.

I'm already affected by the 169 kilovolt, or whatever the current line is. It crosses our farm, right through the middle of our farm.

Now, the current proposal of Route A also

1 changes the route of the original line. It brings
2 it right up across the end of our runway that we've
3 had there since 1978. My son uses it for rebuilding
4 planes and also for people that can fly in and have
5 any minor repairs done. Plus, both my son and I
6 myself fly, and it would be a hazard. I don't know
7 how to explain how big a hazard it would be to have
8 that kind of a power line right on the end of our
9 runway. The most hazardous time of flying, I feel,
10 is on takeoff, and if you had a failure, an engine
11 failure on takeoff and you're headed towards that
12 power line, there's no place to go.
13 So I really hope that it takes another
14 alternate, whether it's alternate -- what do they
15 call it, alternate A, I still think along I-90 is a
16 better place for it. You've already got high lines
17 there, you've got right-of-way, you've got access to
18 service the line, to rebuild the line and everything
19 right there.
20 Again, I strongly object to it coming
21 across the original Route A because of what it would
22 do for our safety as we fly in and out of there.
23 Another thing that has been brought up
24 here today is the unknown health effects of the
25 line. As it goes across section 13, we've already

had to fight around that for quite a few years now, and even though it's on the end of the field it's still a problem. But I also pasture livestock out there on both sides of the line. And as I stated before when I was here, just with the 169 volt line, we have an electric fence and we didn't have to have it plugged in because if we ran long enough along that line it had enough shock all by itself. I've been shocked enough from it, I think it's someone else's turn to have the shock and have the fun.

Again, I just hope you don't follow the current Route A and take the alternate or some other alternate.

Oh, one other thing. Our farm is also certified organic, so all of section 13 and the farm that the runway is on is all certified organic. And, again, now you're getting into an area that is controversial about the effects of radiation from it. I know it's a controversial issue, but, again, it would affect us again because of all the uncertified organic.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Thank you for your comments. And I'll add, Mr. Hilgendorf, we did -- we talked, I recognize you from when you were here, and one of the corrections we made is to note your

airstrip on the maps. And it's talked about in the draft EIS and indicated as definitely an impact that would occur if Route A, as proposed, were to go through. So I think we've -- I think we've captured that pretty well in there, and the Commission would know about that if they were to proceed that way.

Is there anybody else who has a question or comment?

Yes, sir. Would you come on up, please? State and spell your name.

MR. EUGENE LEHMAN: It's Eugene Lehman, E-U-G-E-N-E, L-E-H-M-A-N. I live in the Charlotte Lake area where there's different proposals of line to go around Charlotte Lake.

And we have a lot of residents there with young children close to the existing lines. And I've been farming around the existing poles for 50 years and I'm tired of it.

Anyhow, the best alternative that I can see is I-90 1, and I-90 2. That would eliminate the line over Charlotte Lake and over Fox Lake, if I understand right, to get the lines away from the lakes. Because the DNR will harass that line forever crossing those lakes.

Anyhow, that's my proposal.

1 MR. RAY KIRSCH: Thank you very much for
2 your comments.
3 Anybody else?
4 Yes, sir. Please come on up.
5 MR. JONATHAN SCHAFER: My name is
6 Jonathan Schafer, that's J-O-N-A-T-H-A-N,
7 S-C-H-A-F-E-R.
8 I just want to make sure this is in the
9 record so the judge knows this. I don't believe
10 that this was in the EIS.
11 That on the original maps where Route A
12 was proposed, the Regional Worship Center Church was
13 not identified as a church. I don't believe you
14 guys would have ever proposed a route that went
15 right by a church. Now, I could be wrong. Maybe
16 I'm giving you a break you don't deserve, but I
17 don't think you would have done that. And for that
18 reason, you know, if there was a way to extract that
19 one out of there and just forget that piece of
20 routing, it would be best. But I would like the
21 judge to know there's no way he should consider that
22 because there was erroneous information or lack of
23 information regarding that to start with.
24 I have a question. Somewhere in the
25 proposals, and I have not looked at the information

lately, it's mentioned that there is the potential of two 345 kV lines in this right-of-way. Am I right on that? That you are -- that the permitting or the request actually states the need for two 345 kVA lines within this right-of-way?

MR. RAY KIRSCH: I can answer the question. I don't believe that's correct. So it's just one 345 kV line that they've asked for.

In fact -- not in fact. But if Route A were selected, which uses primarily the 161 Lakefield to border line, that would be the other line on there, so there would be no more room for another transmission line on that pole if that was selected. But it is only for one circuit, one line.

MR. JONATHAN SCHAFER: All right. I don't remember where we picked up that piece of information. But Helen Murphy and I have talked about that and we've looked, I can't put my finger on it, I maybe can if I go in.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: If you find it, please send it.

MR. JONATHAN SCHAFER: But the impression that we got was that this was -- this would -- once that easement was there this would give them the right to put two 345 kV lines in that easement.

Which would be devastating. Well, it would make us -- it would make it impossible for us to be anywhere close to that thing. And our blood boiled a little bit, without electrical charge added to it.

I believe that's all I have --

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Okay.

MR. JONATHAN SCHAFER: -- to say.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Thank you very much. Thank you for your comments.

Does anybody else have a question or a comment here?

Please. Yes, ma'am. Could you state and spell your name?

MS. HELEN LEE MURPHY: My name is Miss Helen Lee, L-E-E, Murphy, M-U-R-P-H-Y.

Yes, a big thank you to the ITC people. I've read your testimonies that were just handed to the library and so grateful, as our superintendent said, you chose to modify Route A. Because everything I have written here alludes to the fact, when I found out last July 18 in Blue Earth, after we got the maps that came to us in the mail, all of us did not see that dip into Sherburn.

By the way, I'm from Sherburn. And I'm just so proud of the Sherburn people here, bless

your hearts.

Anyway, I did not see that dip. In fact, my neighbors threw their maps away. I kept mine. But after the meeting Mr. Kirsch announced if we would like a picture of our house or our farm, I said I'd like a picture of my house. When I saw that red line behind my neighbors to the north, two houses away, I said what's that red line? That's the new transmission line. And I said what? I came back to the City of Sherburn, went to the office of the mayor, Mrs. Behne is here, went to the office of the city administrator. And they said, oh, no, someone from the ITC company was here in the wintertime and said everything is north of I-90. I said look at this map.

And the reason I'm still not completely confident that Modified Route A will go through, I'm going to go through the agony and the anguish that some of us have gone through depicting as we've talked about the health, property values, aesthetics, noise, all kinds of items in relation to the school, which is right across the property from my home.

So my first question here is did Modified Route A really come -- not come south into the city

of Sherburn and so far we've been told yes, it stays away from our homes, our businesses, our church, our fire department. And we have a young man who wanted to build right near I-90. I was still awake at 4:15 not reading this, but my brain couldn't quit on me. I really mean that. So anyway, he said he would not build any business there, he's right between I-90 and County Road O, because this would kill the town of Sherburn.

And so anyway, so we were unaware that this was running into our land and into Sherburn. And then we found out, too, that the overall cost, the ratepayers, we will be paying for that. I just discovered that a day ago. I read that this doctor from Harvard, this was in this testimony book, and we will be paying for this. And, of course, we wonder how much more will our bills be every month once we have to pay for all of this.

And, of course, we're very concerned about health and leukemia. And that second book, and I've read all three of them, the second book I do have a few pages left, but I did find where it mentioned depression, suicide, Alzheimer's disease, immune problems, nerve problems, all kinds of other health problems, not just cancer. It scares me.

1 And I remember, Mr. Kirsch, July 18, that
2 was my first question to you after the meeting. Is
3 it true that this causes cancer? And I remember how
4 well you went and you found and handed me your
5 pages. It's documented, it has been for certain
6 caused cancer in children. Leukemia. And my
7 neighbor, Dusty Faber, has three little children all
8 under the age of five just like Sarah, who is also
9 my student. And these children are our future.
10 Their life is more important than trying to get this
11 so we don't want it over our heads.
12 Also, I had students that work at Kum &
13 Go right near I-90. And they said, Miss Murphy,
14 you've got to get that out of town. I said what do
15 you mean? They said, we can't come to work here and
16 work in a radiation microwave. We can't have all
17 that over our heads. And then also about refueling,
18 and I know you addressed refueling in your book, but
19 that's another strong concern.
20 So when I told the city administrator and
21 the city mayor that it was coming into our city,
22 they were in disbelief. And so then we started to
23 gather all of our people.
24 And then Jonathan just alluded to the
25 fact that in that first book we have the word

footprint in italics, which means, and here's what it says, they would likely expand in the future resulting in more negative effects to the residents of Sherburn. This would be an additional 345 kilovolt from the present project that would add up to 506 kilovolts, 345 more to that on another separate line and that would be 850,000 kilovolts from one single electric line.

And then they alluded to the church, which is very active. Also we have two businesses there in that area. And we're also disturbed, too, and this is simply timing, but we received the two documents within the last two weeks. This is Holy Week time, this is income tax time, our men are in the field, and now we just have two weeks until May 9th. Can we at least have another week so we can contact people? Some people are gone, weddings. Once the winter is over it's hard to find people. Even if they're in the field, they're out there all night.

We have also been disturbed and, as I said, I'm still concerned that Modified Route A might not be chosen. And this is why I wrote something like this. We're disturbed that animals are protected, plants are protected, prairie grass,

I guess there's a bush called prairie bush clover that is even protected by the federal government. It's God's creation, but it's protected. No structure and no conductor, no line may go near these. They may not go near the rest areas, airports, animal confinement buildings, ancient ruins. They're all protected, but not our human life. The highest form and order of life on this earth is human life and we have to fight to protect that. And we will fight. And even -- I just about fell over when I got this last one -- it said migratory -- this is the DNR, migratory birds are protected. They travel twice a year. We live there all the time. So that's why Route A cannot be chosen. I'm so pleased that everybody today speaks about Route A just cannot be chosen and I will be telling Judge LaFave that several times.

I'm also disturbed, too, whoever made the maps up. Now, these people are strangers to all of us. And Sarah said it so well. As she said, six generations, I come from a family farm, this is our land, this is our home. And no other town, Grenada, Imogene, Blue Earth, Fairmont, no other town has been hit like we've been hit. I was shocked.

And I also read in this last book, oh,

they can't go near I-90 in Fairmont, it's commercial land use. They can't go near I-90 in Jackson for an area used for airport use, but north and south of Sherburn, well, that's still being developed. In other words, that's kind of open. Good grief, we live there. This is what I meant.

The maps are misleading because these strangers in the Twin Cities, the governor and the five-person Commission along with the judge will make the final decision on our lives. They're all strangers and this, of course, is very personal and we'd like to see the homes they live in.

But anyway, here's the point. You look at the map and the word Sherburn is way down by the old Highway 16. And you look at the map and the part that we're at, the Kum & Go, the church, the fire department, the businesses, it all looks like we're wasteland up there, and the school district, it looks like we're maybe apart, it doesn't even look like we belong to the city. So I can see these people in the Twin Cities look at this map and say what's the matter with these people down here in Sherburn, Sherburn is way down there. We are right -- the city property starts at I-90. We pay city taxes, we have city services, we are a part of

the city. So that map needs to be -- if you can print them again, particularly for the governor and for the five people on the Commission and the judge, they need to know that that is city property, but on the map it doesn't look like that. It's misleading.

And, of course, my bottom line is that we're very grateful, as I said, you've have a Modified Route A. When I read that on Good Friday I just about fell off my chair, and I said am I reading this right? And I said to the pastor, I said, don't take it for granted now, we have to be sure, be sure, be sure.

Anyway, so we are very grateful for that and we want to protect our health and our property values. And that's another thing. When I came back from that July 18 in Blue Earth, the whole weekend, that was a Thursday, I walked around my house just thinking health, health. Do I have to move? Do I have to move? What am I going to do, I'm alone, what am I going to do?

Well, then I met the Shafers the next day and I found out that Jon served on the Regional Land Committee. And he found out that right over their church, then I read the letter Jon Schafer wrote about thousands of dollars. I thought my house,

1 money, I never thought of money. I went to the city
2 mayor and the city administrator and, yes, of
3 course, if our property value is down, that's less
4 money for the city. Our city doesn't have a
5 business that brings in income. So property taxes
6 in Sherburn are already high, but we choose to live
7 there and we want to live there. We have an
8 excellent school system, and I'm so grateful that
9 our superintendent is here.
10 In fact, we thought December 18 was that
11 date -- we got all the mailing from the Department
12 of Commerce, so we were going up -- I was going to
13 pay my lawyer $500 to come along, Mr. Johnson is my
14 lawyer over here, and the superintendant of schools
15 over here and the school board chairperson was
16 going, and at the last minute my lawyer found out
17 from the Department of Commerce that the meeting
18 they had on December 18 was only how the Department
19 of Commerce could do better work with what you had
20 already decided throughout the year; is that
21 correct? So then we didn't have to go. But we have
22 excellent cooperation.
23 And I said to somebody, we need Martin
24 Luther King, we need Nelson Mandela, we need
25 somebody to stand up and fight and help lead us. So

we're so grateful for what people have done to help us out.

And we sincerely hope -- and every time I've called Mr. Kirsch, he's been very courteous, very professional, I appreciate that. 'Cause I even said to him, and I'll quit now, when I called him in the beginning, when was that, in December, do you remember the lady that asked you the questions about cancer in Blue Earth? And he said I think I do, I said I'm the one. And that meeting was over at 2:00. I got a picture of my house, I was up until 4:00. The people were very courteous and professional to me, but they could see I was getting a little bit more excited and more excited and more excited. And I walked back to Sherburn, alone that whole weekend, then Monday morning to the mayor's office and city office, so then we started so the process -- we just thank you for what you've done and continue to please help us out.

Thank you very much.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Thank you very much.

Yes, ma'am, please.

MS. KARAN WORTHLEY: Karan Worthley, K-A-R-A-N, W-O-R-T-H-L-E-Y.

After listening to Mr. Hilgendorf's story

about his so-called electric line, the electric wire for his livestock not needing to be connected to anything, I'm very concerned about how close that proposed line was coming to the Kum & Go. Because I see the signs, shut off your engines. I wonder how close those lines are that would be affecting any metal surrounding those pumps. Because there could be a tremendous explosion just from static electricity.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Thank you for your comment.

Is there anybody else who has a question or comment today?

Anybody else?

Okay. I want to remind you that comments are due to me by May 9th. We have copies at the back of the draft EIS and we have folks who can print you a map if you want to send me a comment about something that's missing or inaccurate in the EIS. We have copies on CD if that's helpful for you in reviewing the document and sending in comments.

Anything else?

All right. Then we'll conclude our meeting. We are back here again at 6:00, if any of you should want to come, and we'll be in Jackson

tomorrow and then Blue Earth the following day.

All right. Thank you very much for coming.

(1:00 session concluded at 2:48 p.m.)

(6:00 SESSION.)

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Good evening, everyone, and welcome to the public information meetings on the draft environmental impact statement for the Minnesota to Iowa 345 kV transmission line project.

I'm Ray Kirsch, I work at the Minnesota Department of Commerce, and I want to welcome you to tonight's meeting.

Here is how I propose we spend the next bit of time we have together, and we have as much time as we need to be here tonight.

I'd like to do some introductions and talk about some of the materials on the back table. Briefly discuss the proposed project, the state's permitting process, which some of you have heard before, but I want to refresh where we are. The draft environmental impact statement. Using the draft environmental impact statement, which is sometimes called an EIS. And then we're going to open it up for your comments here tonight. And I anticipate those first five items taking 20 to 25

minutes, and then we'll have time for your comments and questions.

Before I begin with the introductions, I just want everyone to know about something that I learned recently, which is they are going to have a prairie burn outside the building here tonight. Evidently it was scheduled and the meeting was scheduled to be in here, and I asked the gentleman if he thought it was safe and he said they thought it was safe and we could continue with our meeting, but just to let you know that they're going to burn the prairie -- I see the fire truck has arrived -- and then put that out. So I hope that doesn't interfere with our goings-on tonight.

So my name is Ray Kirsch, I'm with the Minnesota Department of Commerce Energy Environmental Review and Analysis Unit. And our job is to conduct environmental review for large energy facilities that come before the Public Utilities Commission for some type of permit or approval.

With me tonight also is Suzanne Steinhauer. You met her when you came in, sort of greeting folks and making sure you have materials for tonight.

I also want to introduce ITC Midwest

staff, because we have a number of them here, and I'll start with Amy Ashbacker, who is the project manager. And Amy, could you introduce yourself and the team?

MS. AMY ASHBACKER: Sure. Thanks, Ray.

My name is Amy Ashbacker, I'm the project manager for ITC on this project. And as Ray said, we also have additional ITC folks here and representatives for ITC. We spoke with some of you prior to the meeting and we'll certainly be available afterwards if you have further questions.

But I want to introduce Joe Berry of our planning department. Dick Coeur with MBN Engineering, a design engineer who helped assist with routing. Jack Middleton, from Burns & McDonnell, also with route development. And Dave Grover of our regulatory group.

We also -- I know some of you have chatted with JCG Land Services in the back and Ray will talk more about what they can do for you as far as printing maps of particular property locations.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Thanks, Amy.

And Amy is correct, we have folks in the back of the room who can print a map for you of your property or any particular property that you're

interested in. It may help you formulate a comment on the draft EIS. It may also help you understand about the project or raise some questions. And it may help you participate in the public hearing next month. And we'll get to that in just a second.

On the back table you have a copy of the presentation, which I'm going to walk through with you all here. There is a public comment form. We're certainly going to take comments tonight, but we've provided a form for you to provide written comments. As we'll discuss, they're due by May the 9th.

There's a copy of the notice for today's meeting. Many of you likely received this in the mail, but I wanted to bring a copy just in case you did not receive it, it has good information about the project.

And, lastly, there's a project mailing list sign-up card. If you're not on the mailing list or you're not sure you're on the mailing list, I encourage you to fill one out. You can drop it off with us, but it's also a mailer to the Public Utilities Commission. They can also make sure that you're on the mailing list.

So, with that, let's talk about the

proposed project.

ITC Midwest is proposing a 73-mile-long 345 kilovolt line, transmission line, and with some associated facilities, with some other things in addition to the line. They're going to expand the Lakefield Junction Substation. Construct a new substation. Relocate several lines so that they meet at this new substation. And remove the Winnebago Junction Substation and that's perhaps best pictorially.

So the Lakefield Junction Substation exists over here in Jackson County. There's several routing options to bring it sort of eastward. The Fox Lake area is right here. And then through the Lake Charlotte and Fairmont area where we are today. And then further on here, very near the Blue Earth River, where there are two substation sites, one proposed and one alternative. And then the project proceeds south to Iowa and continues on into Iowa. The permitting of the project in Iowa is done by the Iowa Utilities Board. That done in the state of Minnesota is done by the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission and so we stop at the border.

These are fairly large structures. They're 130 to 190 feet in height, 700 to 1,000 feet

in span, and they require a right-of-way, which is if it were to cross your property, the width of the easement across your property of 200 feet.

And I'll stop there. If you have questions about any of that or anywhere in the process of this presentation, you should stop me and we'll certainly try to answer.

The state's permitting process. Because of the size and type of this project, it requires two approvals from the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission.

One, a certificate of need, it's a very specific approval about whether the project is needed. And a route permit, which is where it would be located and how it would be constructed. Those processes are prescribed in statute and rule. 7849 is the Minnesota rule for need, 7850 for route permitting.

And the Commission has a big job and they get assistance from a number of state agencies, including the Department of Natural Resources, Pollution Control Agency, and a number of others. But I'm going to call out two because the statutes and rules do.

The Department of Commerce, which is

1 charged with doing environmental review, which is
2 what are the possible impacts of this project.
3 And the Minnesota Office of
4 Administrative Hearings, which holds hearings
5 throughout the state on various matters, but in this
6 case, coming down here to have your thoughts on is
7 this the appropriate project and, if so, where
8 should it be located.
9 Let me say a little bit more about that.
10 The question on the need side is, is this project
11 needed or is a different project more appropriate
12 for Minnesota. And we typically think of this as
13 size, type, and timing. Is this the right size
14 project. Is it going from the right endpoint to the
15 right endpoint. Is it the right voltage. Should it
16 be a higher voltage or a lower voltage for the need.
17 Is it the right type. Is it transmission or should
18 it be generation. What's the issue we're trying to
19 solve. And is it needed now or is it needed
20 sometime in the future, is it needed 10 years from
21 now, and so really this project is premature and we
22 should wait. Those are questions the Public
23 Utilities Commission has to answer.
24 They also have to answer, if they answer
25 first, yes, it is needed, where it should be located

1 and how it should be constructed.
2 In your packet, in your presentation,
3 you'll find a page that lists the Minnesota routing
4 factors. Let me flip to that page for you. It
5 looks like this. It says Minnesota Rule 7850.4100,
6 and it describes all of the things that the Public
7 Utilities Commission is supposed to take into
8 account when it makes a route permitting decision.
9 And you'll see it starts with A and goes to N. So
10 there are a number of things they have to take into
11 account.
12 Impacts on human settlements, public
13 health and safety, land-based economies, the natural
14 environment. Will this project use existing
15 rights-of-way or does it create any new
16 right-of-way. So those are the factors that the
17 Commission is looking at when it's making a
18 decision. And I also bring them up because those
19 are the factors that the judge will be looking at
20 when he makes a recommendation to the Public
21 Utilities Commission.
22 I've included here -- on there, on the
23 screen here, a schematic, let's call it a schematic,
24 of a route width and the right-of-way and the
25 anticipated alignment. These are all terms of art

in the Commission's business.

The route width is, when they issue a route permit, is the area where the route could go. ITC has requested 1,000 feet in most instances for this project, but the actual alignment, and I show that in red, the actual poles and lines could move up or down, so to speak, in that route width, so there's some predictability about where the line will go, but also flexibility to deal with things that we don't know about now. For instance, a soil boring, it will not support a pole, or to work with landowners so that it could be adjusted one way or another to reduce impacts on a specific site.

I'm going to walk through the state permitting process flow chart to get you up to speed or just to get us all on the same page as to where we are in the process and then describe future events that you can participate in, and I hope you do.

So the applications for this project were submitted in March of 2013, the certificate of need and the route permit applications. They were accepted in June. We were here in July of last year. I see a few familiar faces of folks that were here at those meetings where we took comments on

1 what we need to know in order to make an informed
2 decision about this project. What impacts need to
3 be looked at, what route alternatives and variations
4 do you want us to look at. ITC at that point had
5 come in with an application, what could we do
6 better, how can we make it a better project.
7 In October of last year we issued a
8 scoping decision, which is terminology for the scope
9 of this document we created, or the table of
10 contents, what are we going to look at.
11 And in March of this year we issued the
12 draft EIS. There's some on the back table, but let
13 me just hold it up for you. So it's a fairly thick
14 document, it comes in two parts, this is the first
15 part, with text, maps, pictures. We tried to use
16 charts where we can and other information to make it
17 more readable and understandable, but there's a lot
18 of information in here, because not only does it
19 include ITC's project, but it includes all the
20 alternatives that you all suggested that we studied.
21 And the second part, and it is an
22 11-by-17 detailed map book, so these pages fold out
23 and you can look at the maps in great detail. I
24 think they're at a scale where you can find your
25 house and your buildings and anything that you would

1 want to see about the project.
2 We are at April 22nd here, following this
3 right-hand branch where we have the public meetings
4 and the comment period on the draft EIS.
5 Next month, the 13th and 14th, an
6 administrative law judge will be out in this area,
7 and he will be taking your comments as to the
8 project's need, and if it's needed, where it should
9 be located. What's the most appropriate route.
10 What are the conditions that should be placed on ITC
11 while they construct this project so that they don't
12 goof anything up, so to speak. They want to have as
13 few impacts as they can on your land.
14 We're going to take all the comments that
15 we receive on the draft EIS and prepare a final EIS
16 and that's due in July.
17 In September the administrative law judge
18 will take the whole record, the final EIS,
19 everything that he hears from you all, and he'll
20 have briefs that people will submit, and comments.
21 He will issue a report that includes findings and
22 conclusions and recommendations. So they are
23 recommendations to the Commission on whether or not
24 the project is needed, and if it's needed, what
25 should be in the route permit.

We had the question earlier today, and I think it's a good one, is that the final say-so? No. The Minnesota Public Utilities Commission is the final say-so. The judges's report is a recommendation. It goes to the Commission. I will say the Commission gives it great weight, they're the ones who ask the judge to take up this process and ask you all to participate in it, so they take it seriously when the judge makes a recommendation.

So in September the judge's report is out, it goes to the Public Utilities Commission, and depending on their schedule and their workload, it's anticipated in the fall of this year we'll know whether they granted a certificate of need for the project and, if they do, a route permit.

Here's the same information basically in a tabular format, which goes through the dates of where we've been and where we are right now.

The draft EIS, the document itself -- I can't go through the whole thing with you tonight, but I do want to walk through many parts of it, or some parts of it, so that you have an understanding.

The idea behind an EIS or any environmental review document is to inform decision-making that we know as a community, as the

State of Minnesota, what the impacts are of the project and how they might be mitigated. It doesn't mean that when there's a decision finally made by the Public Utilities Commission everybody is happy about it, some people may not be happy with their decision. But at least we had an informed decision. We got it out on the table, we rolled it over, we talked about it, we gave it a good kick, we got all the ideas out there and we know what's what. Or we think we know what's what to the best of our ability.

The EIS is designed to bring us to a common set of facts. It does not advocate. You won't find in the document advocacy about this is the way this project should go. Instead it'll tell you about aesthetic impacts or agricultural impacts or archaeological and historic resource impacts along the routes. And it's up to us as a group and the judge and finally the Commission to decide based on all those impacts and based on the mitigation measures what's the best way to go.

It discusses, as it says here, the human and environmental impacts, the mitigation measures, how the project is constructed and where it can be located. It also discusses the relative merits of

the routing options. And by that I mean it takes the list of factors and sort of compares each route or route alternative to those factors to say are there any fatal flaws here, are there any things that really scream out that are going to be impacts that we really cannot mitigate in any way, or are there some things that might happen and we think we can mitigate them in the following fashion.

So just to give you an orientation to the document, I'm going to use a map from the document, I think that's a good way to proceed.

In the EIS you'll find that the document discusses two segments. One is indicated in orange here from Lakefield to Huntley, and then the other in green from Huntley to the Iowa border. So it's just organized in that way. First do one segment and then look at the other. It discusses each of the routes, Routes A and B, that ITC proposed.

It then discusses route alternatives that utilize to varying extents Interstate 90, which was a suggestion we got from you all when we were here last year. Those are called route alternatives in the document. And then it also evaluates what we call route variations, which are smaller segments of route designed to mitigate specific instances of --

specific impacts in specific areas. Excuse me.

And those are called out in these boxes here. So at the Jackson Municipal Airport, there's a bump out here where the routes seem to bump a little further north to accommodate the Jackson Airport and a possible expansion of that airport. So there are three route variations in this area that could be used.

At Fox Lake, we received a lot of comments last year on the Fox Lake area. We have six variations in that area, two around the west side of the lake, one that crosses the lake because there's already an existing line crossing the lake, and three that go around the east side of the lake.

There are five route variations in the Lake Charlotte area and we received a number of comments from folks about how to navigate that area better. And we'll talk about those in a little bit.

There is the Center Creek area as one variation. There's one route variation near the Blue Earth River right here. And there are four more as the line proceeds south to Iowa of a slightly smaller nature than the ones on the Lakefield to Huntley segment.

But each of those are discussed in the

1 draft EIS. We talk about the possible impacts of
2 it. We talk about how those impacts might be
3 mitigated. And we map them all out so you can see
4 them and you can discuss them.
5 Here's the list that looks suspiciously
6 like the Minnesota rules list of route alternatives
7 and route variations and the things we look at.
8 Like impacts on human settlements, noise and
9 aesthetics and property values. Public health and
10 safety. Land-based economies -- that's sort of a
11 descriptive term we use for agriculture, mining,
12 forestry, tourism. Impacts on the natural
13 environment, plants, animals, natural resources, the
14 use of existing rights-of-way and, finally, cost.
15 I'll note that -- and the EIS talks about
16 these things and the Minnesota routing factors
17 describe these things -- there's no balancing of
18 those done. So whether, say, for instance,
19 oftentimes a transmission line, you might want to
20 follow an existing feature like a road or another
21 transmission line. But sometimes there's homes that
22 are built up there or have been there for quite a
23 long time along there. So it's a conundrum whether
24 or not to follow the existing right-of-way which are
25 closer to homes, or should you be further away on a

1 different route alternative or route variation. So
2 these are factors to consider, but the balance isn't
3 clear on how they should come out.
4 And I would suggest to you that the
5 administrative law judge would like assistance with
6 that, and the Public Utilities Commission would like
7 your assistance on how to balance those and find the
8 most appropriate route or routes, and that may be
9 something that is very close, for the project.
10 The draft EIS is available electronically
11 on the Department of Commerce's website. It's also
12 available on the Public Utilities Commission's
13 website. It's available at local libraries. And we
14 have some review copies on the back table right back
15 here, which I encourage you to look at. We also
16 have CD copies. If you'd like a copy on a compact
17 disk and you can pop this in your computer, I think
18 it's pretty convenient and it's got this whole
19 document and all the maps in there and you can
20 certainly take one home, if you'd like. I encourage
21 you to do so, it would help you understand the
22 project and also help you make some comments.
23 I include contact information here. If
24 you have any questions, you can certainly contact me
25 at any time. Or you can contact Tracy Smetana, who

is the public advisor. Tracy was out here last summer, if you were all at those meetings. You can sign up for the project mailing list to make sure that you receive information about the project. And if you are electronically inclined, you can sign up for eDockets, as a subscription, that's for electronic docketing, and every time an item is added to these dockets, it's like a giant file folder for the project, you'll get an e-mail and it will tell you that something has been added and you can click on it and view if you'd like to. It may be a lot of e-mail, but it's the most up to date that you can be.

And this is the last topic I want to cover before we get to your comments, which is using the draft EIS. To my mind, my hope or my goal is that when we do a draft EIS it's helpful to you all and to the judge and the Commission.

The goal here is informed decision-making. Even though it's lengthy, I think we hopefully have presented it in a way, with pictures and graphs, text and maps, that is accessible to you and that could be helpful to you. And I think the most immediate way is using it at the upcoming public hearing.

It would be able to give you a set of facts that everybody has about the need for the project, about the route permit for the project, about the impacts of all the different route alternatives and route variations and how they could be mitigated. So you could come to convey to the judge and ultimately to the Commission how the project should be constructed and where it should be located.

I want to walk through four maps with you tonight. And these are ITC Midwest Modified Route A. And by the way the hearing process works, ITC and all the parties to the hearing are required to submit in advance their testimony going into the hearing.

And ITC has a Route A and a Route B, but they also have now a Modified Route A. So going to the judge, they said, Judge, we've looked at everything that's come up in the record to date and we want to modify Route A in the following way.

I want to walk through these for a few reasons. One, so you're familiar with Modified Route A. But two is that the modifications follow the draft environmental impact statement's route variations to a great extent. They build on what

1 you suggested we study, and we studied it, and it's
2 been incorporated, at least in part, in ITC's
3 Modified Route A. And, third, I think it is a great
4 example of what you can do when the judge comes out
5 to talk about what you prefer and why and what your
6 suggestions are.
7 So let's look at those four. And we need
8 to do a little bit of orientation here so that we
9 understand what we're trying to depict here.
10 This is a small section of Route A north
11 of the Jackson Airport. On the map that I have up
12 here and in the map that you have in your packet, in
13 the orange is the route width originally for
14 Route A, and there's a little red line, the
15 anticipated alignment of Route A as it was in the
16 route permit application and as it is in the draft
17 EIS.
18 In their testimony ITC has proposed
19 Modified Route A, which is depicted by this light
20 blue line. And you'll notice that in this area it's
21 slightly different than what they had proposed
22 before. It uses this little segment here, which is
23 called JA-2, which stands for Jackson Airport
24 variation 2, which we studied in the draft EIS.
25 So it uses this part of the variation, it

1 doesn't go all the way up here, it uses this and
2 then connects with Route A and comes on over and
3 then continues on. So it's a combination of route
4 variation JA-2, Jackson Airport number 2, plus
5 Route A. And that is something that you could do if
6 you wanted to before the judge, you can suggest any
7 of the route variations that are in the draft
8 environmental impact statement, or you can combine
9 them. All right? So you can use part of one and
10 part of another.
11 Let me show you another example. This is
12 the Fox Lake area. This is the city of Sherburn
13 down here in the corner, and Interstate 90 coming
14 along here. Route A in this area came along here,
15 it kind of dipped down right here into Sherburn, you
16 can see it on the south side for a bit, and then
17 came back across and then went all the way back up
18 to the existing 161 line and then over. And that's
19 how it is represented in the application and in the
20 draft EIS.
21 ITC has modified that and now they are
22 staying on the north side of I-90 through this whole
23 area, so they don't go into Sherburn there. They do
24 drop down where there's an existing crossing briefly
25 and then back up. And then right here, instead of

1 going straight up, they propose to go to 140th
2 Street and then 130th Avenue. And then you'll see
3 right here there's a little marker on there of Fox
4 Lake number 4. It's route variation number 4 in
5 this area which was studied in the EIS. And there's
6 some difference in the alignment here, but basically
7 that's the route variation that they prefer, that
8 they said they prefer in their testimony. So it's a
9 Modified Route A.
10 You could certainly come in and say,
11 Judge, I like the one that goes over here and comes
12 around this side, which is Fox Lake 6. Or, Judge, I
13 like this Fox Lake 1, which goes right across the
14 lake. Or what ITC proposed, I think that looks
15 good. Any of those or all of those, right, you can
16 argue in the alternative. It doesn't have to be
17 just one thing, you could like several things.
18 This is the Lake Charlotte area. Again,
19 the orange is the original Route A. It comes down
20 here and then it comes right back up on this side.
21 Modified Route A uses route variations in the area,
22 primarily Lake Charlotte 5 across and up. So
23 instead of going down here, it's crossing a little
24 bit closer, I think this is 160th Street right here.
25 So, again, in this area, Modified Route A is sort of

1 moved up there and uses Lake Charlotte 5, which is a
2 route variation. Which you all -- I don't know if
3 it's anyone in particular, which was suggested by
4 citizens to better navigate this area. Whether or
5 not it is a better way, I mean, that's for you all
6 to advocate for and the judge and the Commission.
7 And, finally, here's a map near the Blue
8 Earth River just south of the proposed Huntley
9 Substation. Originally Route A was to take the same
10 exact line as the 161 line, but it crosses the river
11 twice and the Department of Natural Resources
12 actually suggested what's called here HI-1. It's
13 route variation 1 in the Huntley to Iowa section.
14 And then this little blue line is Modified Route A.
15 And ITC has suggested that they would think this is
16 an appropriate modification. So it's very much
17 similar to HI-1, which is a route variation of the
18 draft EIS.
19 So I just want to show you, one, to
20 inform you about ITC and their Modified Route A, but
21 show you how you can use the draft EIS and call out
22 any of those route variations by name, make a map of
23 any part of the route or anything you want to have
24 here, and use that to advocate before the judge and
25 ultimately help the judge make a recommendation to

the Commission as to where you think the project should be located.

Now to comments. The draft EIS is issued in draft form and the idea here is through your comments and questions we can make it better and create a final EIS. So we're looking for things that need to be clarified. Things that might be missing in the document, what needs to be added such that it is complete and accurate. That's what we're trying to get to.

We made great strides, I think, since we were out here last summer in describing the area and different impacts. Airstrips that perhaps we had missed originally. More information about GPS and its use in farming systems. Stuff that we needed to make sure that we covered. But there could be other things that we missed. There could be stuff that we've described and you read it and you're like, I'm not sure what that means, or I need to have that clarified for me, and we'd like to know that.

You can make comments at tonight's meeting. You can complete and submit a comment form. You can comment online. If you comment online you can go to the Commerce's website, Energy Facilities, and click on submit a comment and you'll

be taken to the opportunities for commenting. Or you can mail or fax or e-mail me a comment. There's my information at the Minnesota Department of Commerce. The most important part is the comment period ends May 9th, Friday, May 9th, this year. So you need to get your comments to me by Friday, May 9th. All modes of commenting are equal, it doesn't matter how it gets to me, it just has to get to me by May 9th.

I'm going to ask that we proceed one speaker at a time. And to limit your comments to a few minutes. If you have a lot to say we'll come back to you, that way we make sure that everybody in the room who wants to speak can speak.

We have a court reporter with us this evening. I'm actually going to ask you to come up and stand on this side of the stage, so to speak, so that she can see you speaking, or you can talk to the group, but she has a better chance to understand what you're saying if she can actually see you speak and record it correctly.

I'd ask that you maintain respect for others and have a civil discussion. And if you can direct your comments and questions to the contents of the draft EIS. I understand that you may have a

1 question that will help you formulate your comment,
2 please ask it while we're all here and we have a
3 chance of doing that. And, also, I think you ask
4 better questions if you've had a chance to look
5 through the draft EIS. And I realize we're all
6 busy, it's a big document and you may not be able to
7 get to it electronically or what have you. Please
8 take a chance, an opportunity to look at it tonight,
9 take a CD home with you, go to the library. I
10 encourage you, please, to make sure that you can get
11 your comment in by May 9th.
12 Is there a comment here? Miss Murphy?
13 MS. HELEN LEE MURPHY: Yes, I have a
14 question. Is our last chance to contact, written
15 comments to the judge when he's here the 13th and
16 14th, and then the judge goes back to the Cities, do
17 we have an opportunity to contact the Minnesota
18 Public Utilities Commission, or are they off -- do
19 we have the liberty to contact them at all?
20 MR. RAY KIRSCH: Let me -- so the
21 question is about the judge's comment period and the
22 Public Utilities Commission. The judge, and I
23 think -- I don't have the notice in front of me, but
24 I think that the notice for the judge's hearing is
25 coming out or came out today electronically. That

1 will have a comment period with it associated also.
2 So the meetings, the judge will be here on the 13th
3 and 14th, but there will be days after that where
4 the comment period ends. So you won't just have
5 those two days, you'll have a couple weeks after
6 those to get your comment in.
7 Your question about the Public Utilities
8 Commission. The Commission's understanding of the
9 process is that if you have something that you want
10 to get into the record that you say it at the
11 Department of Commerce's meetings or to the judge.
12 So that's the appropriate place to comment. But I
13 will say that people send stuff to the Commission if
14 they want to send something to the Commissioners.
15 The Commissioners, by this process, are intended to
16 be available only through the record. And by that I
17 mean they want to avoid the appearance of
18 impropriety by being influenced by, I don't know
19 what, talking to certain people and not talking to
20 other people or something like that. So it's
21 through the record and through the judge that they
22 maintain this sort of perspective.
23 But if you feel compelled to send
24 something to the Public Utilities Commission, you
25 can certainly send something to the Commission, I

1 think they would put it in the dockets that they
2 think it was appropriate.
3 UNIDENTIFIED: The comment deadline is
4 May 30th.
5 MR. RAY KIRSCH: Okay. So the comment
6 deadline in the judge's notice, which we don't have
7 in front of us, but that someone has been kind
8 enough to look up electronically, is May 30th. So
9 there will be time after the judge comes out here to
10 get your comments in. Thank you.
11 MS. CAROL OVERLAND: Could you actually
12 be more careful about the ex parte contact stuff?
13 MR. RAY KIRSCH: I'm sorry?
14 MS. CAROL OVERLAND: The ex parte
15 contact.
16 MR. RAY KIRSCH: Yeah. So thank you for
17 bringing that up. Ms. Overland, at the back of the
18 room, mentions -- the idea here is that you are not
19 intended to curry favor with the Commissioners by
20 personally meeting them or shaking their hands or
21 any other nefarious ideas you might have about
22 influencing their decision.
23 And so Ms. Overland points out that it's
24 what are called ex parte communications, are
25 communications about something that they're going to

make a decision on, they want to hear about it through the record. They don't want you showing up at their house or talking to them or sending them cookies or something like that, influencing them. They want to hear about it through the record. That's why they sent me out here, that's why they send the judge out there. As I say, tell it to the judge. You need to talk to the judge, the judge will get it to the Commission. That's what the judge's job is.

Okay. I take your point. Nonetheless, it's my observation that sometimes folks send stuff, letters to the Commission. And I'll stop at that. They don't encourage it, I'll say that they don't encourage it.

So I'll put this last slide up. What needs to be clarified, what's missing, what needs to be added such that the final EIS is complete and accurate.

And we have one person who has already signed up, and then after we go to this person we'll do a show of hands. So be sure to be thinking about if you'd like to make a comment.

Dawn Hartung.

MS. DAWN HARTUNG: I'd like to pass and

hear other comments first.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Okay.

MS. DAWN HARTUNG: But I can quickly comment.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Please, come on up, help us get started. That would be great. And come to this side and state and spell your name for the court reporter. That would be great.

MS. DAWN HARTUNG: My name is Dawn Hartung, D-A-W-N, H-A-R-T-U-N-G.

And I would like to comment on my son actually is the one that does the public speaking better than I do, and he is not here. But I would like to comment on Route B.

And, first of all, it affects our family by five generations, we're the fifth generation family on the farm. And it's not my husband and I, it's also our son and our other son and our other son. So a family farm, of course, which there is several family farmers here, and there's a few century farmers here also that I do see.

First of all, we'd like to reiterate that we built a new home less than three years ago. And the proposed Route B comes within approximately 300 feet of our brand-new home. We also built the home

to overlook Eagle Lake, which is a natural habitat for many of the animals. And we also built the home hoping that one of the boys would come home to the farm, which they intended to do.

Having the large power structures in the backyard, that is no longer an option. Our boys have said they don't want to return to the farm with that because of the health risks to their children, to our family.

Let me just go ahead and try and brief this up a little bit.

My son had sent a letter. It just said, My parents just built a new home three years ago on our Century Farm located in section 19. The home was a dream home for my parents. I'm the fifth generation to farm this land. One of the proposed power line routes would pass within 300 feet of my parents' home. There have been many questions raised about health issues involving prolonged exposure to magnetic fields and stray voltage these power lines are known to produce. Not only will my parents have to worry about their health, but so will future generations of my family.

These power lines also produce very annoying sounds. And any time we are outside we'll

have to listen to the constant sound of the lines humming. My parents' house was built to overlook Eagle Lake. Now instead of a nice lake to look at, we can open our blinds and see huge poles.

We're planning hog expansion on the farm in section 19. The controversy surrounding these various power line routes make us hesitant to make an investment. We already have an existing 200-head pig nursery on the site. We own very extensive barns and lease them out to someone else to finish the pigs in the building. The owners of the pigs will almost certainly have concerns with these transmission lines being so close to the barns we rent to them. Animal health, normal weight gain, are known to be inhibited and disturbed by the environment. The size of the financial loss could be a potential suffer for all of us. Not only my family, my brother's family, and my other brother's family.

I know I'm getting lengthy.

When the first project came out we were told the transmission lines are supposed to follow fence lines and fields. From maps that we've received transmission lines will cut one row of crop fields right down the middle. This field is bigger

than our neighbor's field, our boundary fence lines do not match up. The attached and the affected parcel of land is 66 acres, which sounds small to some, but considering there's also a drainage ditch that runs down it.

The large farm equipment we currently own or rent will make it impossible for us to farm this piece of land. We will be forced to buy smaller equipment to farm this land. The capital expenditure will result in the loss of thousands.

In addition to very expensive, guidance [sic] position system equipment will not work with the smaller equipment because of the interference the transmission line creates. When the GPS can't be employed it will be forced -- we will be forced to buy more seed, more chemicals for the land per acre. Seed and chemicals cost a very significant part of farming, as you farmers know.

And what will this do to our property value? In addition to farming, I'm also a licensed real estate agent. Land in our area of the state is currently selling for a very high price. In my opinion, in transmission lines recited as proposed, some versions of Route B, the land would be worth half of the current value, or even that value might

be optimistic. No one is going to want to buy land they can't farm.

Eagle Lake and its natural habitat is located only an eighth of a mile from the proposed power line route. What will this power line do to the Eagle Lake and the surrounding area? You could badly damage one of God's finest natural habitats with a disturbance caused by these power lines.

And then also the way it affects is proposed line B comes within 50 feet of a 24-head hog and finishing barn. With the proposal of Route B, how am I going to convince someone to rent my hog barn facility known with the adverse effects of how it affects the animal health and human health of working in the facility.

Not only are you taking farmland that is used to feed the American people, but it's also used to produce animals to again feed the American people.

There's four items, in closing. First of all, which you've talked about, why not place the transmission lines closer to Interstate 90 where there is already lines. Properties that have power lines next to them already, these landowners -- I'm going to probably try not to step on toes, have been

farming around larger poles for a number of years. And, third, it must be less expensive to follow a straighter line or an existing line already there without cutting through a person's farm and livelihood of their income.

Thank you.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Thank you for those comments.

Does anybody else want to make a comment?

MR. BOB POSIVIO: I've got a question.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: A question. Please come on up. If you could state and spell your name, please.

MR. BOB POSIVIO: Okay. Bob Posivio, P-O-S-I-V-I-O.

I've got two questions. First, it's where is the ultimate final destination of the line? You know, down into Iowa or wherever it's going to go. And is the Huntley Junction a necessary destination?

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Okay. I'll try to answer those questions and maybe I'll ask ITC folks to explain. It does go into Iowa, but I don't know the names of all the substations. Could you?

MS. AMY ASHBACKER: Yeah. Without a map

it's kind of hard to explain. But we do head south into Kossuth County in Iowa. In about seven miles we hit a new substation that we're calling the Ledyard Substation. And from there we will, for our MVP-3, we will have a line that continues south to a Kossuth County substation, and that substation will be owned by Mid-American Energy, and that's just near Burt, it's several miles. I'm trying to think, I think we're about 24 miles from between Ledyard and Kossuth.

MR. BOB POSIVIO: Is that where they ultimately want the power to, is down in Burt?

MS. AMY ASHBACKER: No, it's not delivering power. The ultimate endpoint, I mean, the load is all over the region. But this is just the project itself, MVP-3 is in Minnesota and in Iowa.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: And maybe to try and answer your question. The electrical grid takes electricity where it's needed. So it will go to loads, as they say in the business. So where it is being used. And it may go locally, if there's a load, but it could go to the Twin Cities, that's probably the largest load in the area. It could go to other loads in Iowa or other places further east.

1 So, I mean, the electrons can flow where they need
2 to go.
3 And to the second part of your question.
4 So is it Lakefield to the Huntley Substation, and
5 then down. In the draft EIS we talk about some of
6 the other alternatives that ITC looked at. And sort
7 of in an overarching way, look at the possible human
8 and environmental impacts of those options. But
9 there's also another set of parties and folks also
10 at the Department of Commerce who are -- who look
11 more at the power flow and the money and try to
12 decide if this is the project that's needed. And
13 they are also providing testimony to the judge.
14 And they have raised that particular
15 point. Is it that you need this particular project,
16 or would one that stops a little short or it's a
17 different length would be the most appropriate one.
18 And they have testimony, you can find that on
19 eDockets, I can help you. You can go through the
20 links here, you can go there and you can look at all
21 the documents that they've put in there. But
22 they're looking at that and also the cost. So how
23 should the cost be apportioned, what's the best cost
24 project for the state of Minnesota? Because
25 ratepayers will have to pay, the project will be

reflected in their rates, so that's an important part of that.

Yes, in the back.

MS. CAROL OVERLAND: Carol Overland, O-V-E-R-L-A-N-D, representing Citizens Energy Task Force and No CapX 2020.

I'm very glad you asked that question because, as she noted, this is MVP-3, which is coming in through Minnesota, going south, part of Iowa, it goes east, but it attaches to MVP-4, which brings it all further east, and then it is also relying for the benefits on MVP-5. You know, no objections, that's part of the record. To gain the benefits it claims, it's attached to MVP-5, which is the northern part of MVP-5. It's sort of like an E focusing towards the Madison area, I mean a V. And part of it is the Badger Coulee line from LaCrosse down to Madison. And another part -- I'm not sure what the other part of MVP-5 is, but it's from further south down, you know, Iowa, Illinois, going up towards Madison. And the idea is to get all this power further east, power for export. And it's all interdependent, all these MVP projects are interdependent, so where this power ultimately goes could be anywhere out there who wants to buy it.

Thank you.

Oh, also, you can get more information on this, the nocapx2020.info, and that's all on that yellow sheet I passed out.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Thank you for the comments.

Anybody else have questions or comments about the project? Or anything we can try and answer for you tonight? Could you please --

MS. HELEN LEE MURPHY: My understanding -- my understanding is this is going to cost all of us more money because it's ratepayers; is that correct?

MR. RAY KIRSCH: And so it's Miss Murphy, right?

MS. HELEN LEE MURPHY: Yes, but I just have a question.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Okay. I just want to make sure we get you identified for the record.

MS. HELEN LEE MURPHY: Ratepayers means that -- that's customers, that's us?

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Customers, yes.

MS. HELEN LEE MURPHY: So we're going to be paying costs for people in the Twin Cities, Austin, Madison, and LaCrosse? We're going to pay

1 the cost for them?
2 MR. RAY KIRSCH: Yeah, I can't answer
3 authoritatively on how the costs are allocated, but
4 there is an organization, the Midcontinent
5 Independent System Operator, MISO, and they have, in
6 cooperation with the states, a number of cost
7 allocation schemes for all the different kinds of
8 transmission lines and the purposes that they serve.
9 And so I can't answer your question as to
10 how much, but a portion of it will be paid by folks
11 in Minnesota for that portion that is related to
12 Minnesota. There is more information in the
13 certificate of need docket where folks have looked
14 more at the financial part of it and how it's
15 divided up, but, I'm sorry, I cannot answer the
16 specifics.
17 MS. HELEN LEE MURPHY: I tried to read
18 that last testimony in the book --
19 MR. RAY KIRSCH: Could you come up,
20 please, just to make sure we get you on the record,
21 Miss Murphy? If you would, please. I want to make
22 sure everybody else benefits also from the
23 questions.
24 MS. HELEN LEE MURPHY: I tried to read
25 that last testimony, that Dr. Schatzki from Yale --

Harvard, excuse me, Harvard. And it's like a calculus book, you couldn't understand it. It's all math. But that is all dealing with the cost, economic impact. And my basic question is is it going to cost us more money here by sending it on farther east and down south? And it probably will be, correct?

MR. RAY KIRSCH: As I understand it, there will be costs associated with the project, yes. So that will be paid by folks in Minnesota. There are also benefits to the project, and I think ITC was also going to make that case to the judge and to the Public Utilities Commission, that this project is needed, but they have to make that case to the Commission.

MS. HELEN LEE MURPHY: I do want to speak, so should I stay here?

MR. RAY KIRSCH: You may. Why don't you, if you have further comments, please include them.

MS. HELEN LEE MURPHY: Okay. I spoke this afternoon, but I'm deliberately speaking again tonight and I have some more information. I have pages and pages about the three books that have come out, but I won't read all of it to you, just some of the highlights.

But it's so important that we are all aware of some of the significant impacts this has on our life. And the reason I'm speaking tonight is this.

We got some good news today, in the last book we got this last weekend. Modified Route A does not come into the city of Sherburn, correct? Whew. However, if it is not approved by the judge, the next alternative is Route A and then Route B. So I'm still hanging by the clouds, you might say. Because what if Modified Route A is not accepted by the judge, and the Commission, and I can't contact them, then -- and I would if I could -- then the Route A would be. And Route A is one that's just devastating and I want to tell you about that.

On July 18 last year I attended the last meeting in Blue Earth. And during the meeting I saw the power points on the wall, I never saw the dip into Sherburn. And I was about to leave and someone said if you would like a picture of your farm or your house, you can go back and get a picture. I thought I'd like to have a picture of my house. And as soon as they handed it to me, I said, what's that red line behind my house? Mr. Jansen's house, just northwest of me. They said, oh, that's the new

transmission line, and I said what? And then Mr. Kirsch got the benefit of my surprise.

I said, Mr. Kirsch, is it true, is this true? And he said yes. I said is it true that this cancer line does cause cancer? He said yes. So very politely he and the other people found for me lots of pages particularly about childhood leukemia. By that time I wasn't even walking on the floor anymore. I remember staying from 2:00 until 4:00, I was last one out, and I'm sure they were glad to see me leave.

That whole weekend, that was Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday, I was at my house in anguish. This is terrible, cancer over my head, what are we going to do.

Monday morning I go to the city mayor. She did not know this. Oh, no, she said, they came to our office last winter, the electric company, and said everything is going to be north of I-90. I said look at my map. I went to the city administrator's office and they said the same thing. So I'm the one who went back to the City of Sherburn and tells them it's coming into our city. Then I really got traveling around the world and this is what happens.

1 After I found out from them and they
2 didn't know it, I went to the library and I spent
3 thousands of hours in the library going through that
4 big thing. You should see how thick those books
5 are, I could hardly carry them. And I was so
6 shocked. These six Minnesota departments were
7 involved in the application: The Department of
8 Agriculture, Department of Historical Society,
9 Department of Natural Resources, Department of
10 Transportation, Department of Pollution Control,
11 Water and Soil Resources, but where was the
12 Department of Health? It's not in there. Not the
13 Department of Health.
14 Well, foolish like me, I called the
15 Department of Health and of course I got one
16 recording after another recording, another
17 recording. There were about 50 sites to call. I
18 picked out the ones and I never did get through.
19 So now I was in total shock. So I was in
20 the library, and these are some of the sentences I
21 wrote down in my first shocking find. Minnesota
22 Department of Transportation -- this is
23 interesting -- will not permit the physical location
24 of any utility line or structure to encroach on the
25 vegetation requirements at rest areas, as well as

for aesthetic reasons. Aesthetics reasons is another word for beauty. So a rest area cannot have any contact, but they could put it into the city of Sherburn.

Next one. Pole structures may not be placed within the native prairie habitats. Prairie bush clover is a threatened species, and actually it's in Martin County, and it is federally protected. Prairie grass from God's creation is protected, but human life is not protected?

Also, historical remains such as aboriginal mounds, artifacts, ancient burial grounds, prehistoric ruins are protected, but not human beings. By that time my Irish was really up and I just kept on reading.

And then this bothered me. The Minnesota Statute 216B.01, subdivision 8, reads, A route may have a width of up to 1.25 miles, within which the right-of-way for the transmission facilities can be located. In our little town of Sherburn that takes us from I-90, which is the beginning of city property, way down to Old Highway 16. That's a mile and a quarter, which means -- and maybe I'm all wrong. If I'm reading it right, that pole can be put anyplace within that easement. Within that we

have our school district of two buildings, we have a nursing home facility, Temperance Lake Ridge, we have a Kum & Go station, we have two other businesses, corn and soybean. We have a church, we have eight homes, and one of those homes happens to be mine. We have athletic grounds, we have football. It just made me shudder.

And then the ITC route width of 1,800 feet near I-90 and Highway 4, that's our corners, they propose to locate the structures 6,500 feet from the Minnesota DOT right-of-way, which means they had to come back, if I understand it -- and I'm not an engineer, I happen to be a teacher, if I'm reading this wrong -- but as I read it, it has to be a hundred and -- what did I say, 6,500 feet away from I-90 and then start the width they can have. Well, that takes them to the front door of the high school. And you might say I'm making this up. No, I'm not. My neighbor, who is a real estate man, Mr. Harris, walked that and measured it. And he got to the front door of the high school.

Then this bothers us, and Jon Schafer referred to it this afternoon, he talked, we find out that there might be a second 345 kilovolt line. Well, that's in this book on page 28. And it

1 happens to say, to allow for future expansion in the
2 remaining locations for the collocation of existing
3 transmission facilities is not proposed at this
4 time. At this time we have a 161 -- if I'm
5 incorrect, you correct me -- plus the 345 makes 506,
6 then in the future 345 extra and that's 850,000
7 volts of electricity over our heads. 850,000.
8 Well, that really sent me to the stars.
9 Okay. The next one. ITC estimates the
10 service life of the transmission line, this is page
11 47, 55 to 60 years. Well, that's longer than some
12 of us will be living. A higher voltage transmission
13 line is seldom retired. Poles are 190 feet high.
14 This is really the killer, migratory bird staging
15 locations at Fox Lake are identified by Minnesota
16 DNR so ITC developed a route south of I-90 for 3.9
17 miles, crossing I-90 into our community and back
18 again. Migratory birds, which travel twice a year.
19 We live there the whole year long.
20 And then I went to see the DNR man. I
21 didn't know him, my neighbor lady knew where he
22 lived. Oh, he said, Miss Murphy, I'm just a law
23 enforcement, I don't handle the birds. But he said
24 they found an eagle's nest in Fairmont and he said
25 they took them down, the electric company did.

Because the people were saying, oh, Miss Murphy, don't worry, just by Temperance Lake Ridge over there, had eagles, they hatched over there on the north end of the lake. Evidently the eagles weren't going to save us either. Here it is, 161 kilovolt.

The Jackson paper, the Jackson paper Pilot says 125 more turbines are going to be built on 34,000 acres taken out of crop production, our plan for the Jackson areas. That's more surface of electricity has to pass over our heads on to Minneapolis, if you please, to Austin and Iowa and now Madison, Wisconsin, LaCrosse. Gracious. Over our heads and we get to help to pay for it. I was really upset. Oh, here it is. Let's see, I've said that already.

Okay. Well, then I found out about the noise. There is such a thing, and this was mentioned, I believe Mrs. Hartung mentioned it, ionizing of the molecules, particularly in damp weather and underneath these poles is a hissing sound, but they say you can even hear it on a calm evening, you can hear the noise. Well, it's a nuisance.

Again, I'm an English teacher, I was, and a music teacher as well. But when I looked through

the books, and I'm so grateful to the ITC people, and I don't want you to feel badly when I say this because they did recommend Modified Route A. Because if you didn't do Modified Route A that goes into the city of Sherburn. Because Route B, and the DNR, five or six times, the DNR is very unlikely to allow any crossing of their WMAs, wildlife management areas.

Our local newspaper comes out, Fairmont Sentinel, the DNR received $10,000 to buy more land, Four Corners north of Sherburn. Guess where that $10,000 came from? Who knows? This is school now. Who knows? Yes. Now, maybe ITC people, maybe we're wrong, but that's what our paper said. And I told that to my lawyer who happened to be here this afternoon, he said that's sabotage. Because in school, if I made a rule but I make it impossible to keep, you can't do that. Maybe that's wrong, but that's what the paper said.

So anyway, on the third book we just got over the weekend, the DNR has about five places, they are very unlikely to allow in that area because the birds and the bees are protected. And my dear neighbor said, he's sitting right back there, he said, oh, we should be a duck or a goose, I'd be

1 protected. And that's about the bottom line.
2 But another thing, too, and of course
3 being an English teacher -- I just said that. I
4 read so often prudent routing, I said my students
5 can use the word maybe once or twice, but three
6 times it's old, that's it, and I won't read any more
7 if I find it again. The next word, minimal. These
8 lines are minimal to noise. Minimal to property
9 values. Minimal to human health. Minimal to the
10 vegetation. Minimal, minimal, minimal. And it's
11 just trying to say -- at another spot, too, it said,
12 the first book, I've read most of the second book
13 not quite through, but the first book said cancer or
14 leukemia. Then this last book, the second book
15 added Alzheimer's disease, reproductive problems,
16 immune problems, nerve problems, depression,
17 suicide, also caused by these.
18 I was taught by one of my friends who is
19 an engineer, milligauss. And our physics teacher in
20 our high school taught me just yesterday morning
21 that the human being can stand three milligauss and
22 not be harmed by health. But yet if you look at the
23 charts, they have the electric field and magnetic
24 field. Now, the electric field we don't have to
25 worry about, according to the book that these people

had published. The electric field can be stopped by buildings and trees. But the magnetic field can go through anything. And that's what we have to worry about. And so they have the columns, 50 feet away, 75 feet away, 300 feet away.

And, oh, I should ask you people. I asked the physics teacher, who is very intelligent, the plus and minus. Does minus mean left and plus mean right? Minus 30 on this side, plus 30 on this side. Can one of you engineers tell me what that means? Mr. Coeur, can you tell me?

MR. RAY KIRSCH: I believe in the charts in the draft environmental impact statement --

MS. HELEN LEE MURPHY: There's five pages of magnetic fields.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Yes. So the idea is that zero is right underneath, if you were standing underneath it, and minus would be one side plus the other. I don't think they refer to left and right, but just on this side and on that side.

MS. HELEN LEE MURPHY: Of the pole?

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Of the line. It's if the line were an imaginary plane.

MS. HELEN LEE MURPHY: So if I step over here it's plus?

1 MR. RAY KIRSCH: And if I stepped over
2 here it would be minus.
3 MS. HELEN LEE MURPHY: Like a dance,
4 almost. Thank you.
5 MR. RAY KIRSCH: So symmetrical.
6 Were you finished with your comments?
7 MS. HELEN LEE MURPHY: Do I have to worry
8 about the electricity problem -- it's horizontal, do
9 I have to worry about the vertical power? Because
10 we would never be climbing up, so this is the space
11 on the ground, the 25 feet this way, 25 feet that
12 way.
13 MR. RAY KIRSCH: So, yes, the figures in
14 the draft environmental impact statement are for
15 someone standing on the ground. And, yes, the
16 anticipation is to not climb electrical towers.
17 They're very, very dangerous.
18 MS. HELEN LEE MURPHY: And then also on
19 page 63 in that second book. Health impacts, stray
20 voltage, impaired air quality, environmental
21 contamination, and electrocution.
22 Now, they spoke to that this afternoon in
23 relation to the Assembly of God Church because it's
24 all made of steel. The builder was here this
25 afternoon and he mentioned that everything in it,

and he said that would be -- eventually could be like a magnetic lightning rod.

Another item I read in that first book is the footprint that would likely expand in the future. The proposed voltage of 345 kilovolt from the present project in addition will give us 506 kilovolts. Then an additional -- this is right from the book -- 345 kilovolts in the future adds to this right-of-way on another line would then generate another risk from a single incident in addition to the increased risk for health and safety hazards for the residents of Sherburn.

Now, I already mentioned we have a Subway restaurant, we have a Kum & Go station, city fire department. One gentleman who owns a triangular field between I-90 and Kum & Go wants to plan to build a residence -- excuse me, to build a business, but Mr. Ravity (phonetic) said right away, he said since this will kill the town of Sherburn he doesn't plan to develop it. I tried to get ahold of him on the phone and I just couldn't, he maybe will be here at one of these meetings, but that would stop it, as well as this active church and our residences.

I also mentioned today, I was not pleased they gave us such a short time to go through these

1 documents and now they're giving us only two weeks
2 to May 9 to send our comments in to the judge. Here
3 we had income tax time, Holy Week, we had Easter,
4 well, now the men are in the field. I wish we would
5 have had another week or so.
6 And this is -- really I want to read
7 this. We're disturbed that animals are protected,
8 plants are protected.
9 Oh, I must mention this. On these maps I
10 see a red circle, I see a green circle, I see a blue
11 circle. I thought, oh, what does that mean. Well,
12 the green is animals with vertebrae are protected.
13 Another one, animals without a vertebrae are
14 protected. Another one said communities. I
15 thought, oh, good, I'll find people are protected.
16 Oh, no, a community of plants. Vascular plants all
17 protected by the DNR. Unbelievable. So they're all
18 protected. Even wells, airstrips, airports, animal
19 confinement buildings, all are protected, but not
20 human life, which is the highest form in order of
21 life on this earth.
22 And God bless Sarah Jagodzinske Rohman, I
23 had her in school, she now has her degrees in
24 chemistry and physics. She spoke today on her
25 family farm, and she mentioned the born and the

unborn. She has three little children, Ida, Stella, and Oliver. All under the age of five. Like my dear neighbor, she has three little children all under the age of five. And she said she's so worried about her children. In particular, she said the cells as they develop when they're little are so affected by electricity. And then she mentioned the unborn. And isn't that amazing, I'm so proud of her.

The migratory birds -- and God bless Michael Hook. Michael Hook, do you want to stand up back there?

MR. MICHAEL HOOK: Sure.

MS. HELEN LEE MURPHY: I cornered him, I'll tell you, about this. Back there on the map and all these maps, I was so disturbed, the word Sherburn is way down at the bottom so it looks like where Kum & Go and where the church is, where Mr. Ebeling's (phonetic) plant is, where the fire department is, where our homes are, it looks like we're all a wasteland like a park. Then where the school is, the football field, the gardens they have in the summer. And the word Sherburn is way down at the bottom in the south. But the problem is our city limits do start right at I-90. We pay city

1 taxes, we get city services. So Michael says he can
2 take care to put that word Sherburn up higher.
3 And why is that important? Because to
4 Judge LaFave, to the governor, to this five-person
5 Commission, they have no concept of what our little
6 town of Sherburn is like. They could look and say,
7 oh, we can put in Route A, that just dips down into
8 that wasteland, that little empty spot up there.
9 But Sherburn is down here where all these houses
10 are.
11 In fact, the Sherburn Assembly of God
12 people were really upset. The first maps that came
13 out, the church wasn't even identified. But then
14 one of the last maps in this big book, they do have
15 a capital C there for the church.
16 And we also want to respect our health
17 and economic -- I think I'm just about done, I've
18 got a lot of notes here but I think I've covered --
19 oh, yes. If you have a pacemaker, a fibrillator
20 [sic], and they even say AM radio will be disturbed
21 by this high voltage.
22 I thank you very much.
23 Another thing, too, I have a little bit
24 of a question. In this last book we have a picture
25 of Assembly of God Church, and they have up at the

top 120 feet away from the freeway, but then it says ITC won't put any building or any structure near where people congregate within 200 feet. You should know Mr. Ross, he's a teacher, and he said, well, Miss Murphy, I have my degree in math, I can figure that out, that's wrong. And I said, yes, that's wrong.

Anyway, thank you very much. The big thing is if all of you could get more people to come to the meetings tomorrow in Jackson, the two in Blue Earth. Because the more we have from the public, we like to think we have a democracy, right? We pay our taxes, and I've been impressed, if ITC sees the sense now to listen to people and their concerns and change and come up with the Modified Route A, if that goes through we'll all be happy. But the next preferred one is Route A, that will not do. I will go to the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission if that happens.

Thank you very much.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Thank you, Miss Murphy.

I would just add, if you would allow me just to try to clarify. It is, I think, the company's testimony that they prefer Modified Route A, and if not that Route A, and then Route B,

1 but that's not necessarily the way the judge would
2 look at it or anybody else would look at it. To
3 make sure, that's what the company wants, that's
4 what they suggested in their testimony, is Modified
5 Route A, but I would ask you to consider all the
6 route variations and alternatives equally, because
7 the judge could come to the conclusion that one of
8 them is the best way to go.
9 MS. HELEN LEE MURPHY: And I meant to
10 mention, the superintendent was here today from
11 Martin County West. She did a good job of
12 reiterating how many hundreds of people, 500, 600
13 between the two buildings and the activity on the
14 football field, all of the extra things outside.
15 The children need to be protected. And if we have
16 this dipping down into Sherburn it will be right on
17 top of the children's heads and that can't happen
18 either. She did a good job. Thank you.
19 MR. RAY KIRSCH: Thank you, Miss Murphy.
20 Another point you mentioned about this
21 other line, to my knowledge this is the only project
22 being proposed, is the 345 kV line. I will have to
23 go back and look at the application, but I think for
24 ITC that is the only one they are proposing.
25 MS. HELEN LEE MURPHY: We understand that

now, but I think in the future they want to add that; is that correct? That's what the book said.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Well, I will have to go back and look at that, but I don't believe that's the case. We'll just leave it at that.

And then you mentioned the Department of Natural Resources. And I don't know if there's anyone here from the DNR, they've been an active participant in this project, and I very much appreciate their participation in the project.

But to my knowledge, just to be clear, all of the routes, route alternatives and route variations in the draft EIS and to be considered are permitable by the DNR. Now, that doesn't mean that -- that means they may not prefer one or the other. I think they have the duty to protect Minnesota's natural resources and they take that very seriously. And including -- and, in fact, they asked to study in the draft EIS crossing both Fox Lake and Lake Charlotte, where there are existing crossings, and to examine taking those lines off the lake, and the draft EIS discusses that.

So I wouldn't necessarily say they fall in one camp or the other or for one route or the other, they want to look out for those routes that

do the least amount of impacts to Minnesota's natural resources, which is the task with which they've been charged.

So does anybody else have any comments or questions?

Yes, sir. Please. Can you come on up, please, so we can get your name on the record here? Could you state and spell your name?

MR. DONALD MORITZ: Donald Moritz, M-O-R-I-T-Z. A couple things. One is this extra line that they're talking about, or an additional line, I don't know if there's anybody from ITC that could possibly answer that.

Is that additional lines on the poles that they are going to be putting in for this one that they're putting in here now? Because last year when they were here they were talking about several lines on these poles and possibly future lines they would add on those same poles. That was one issue.

And the other thing, what she was just talking about, the Modified Route A is probably because ITC was not aware of the structures that were in the area where the Route A is. There's no streets in there, it's all driveways off of the highway, that's why it doesn't look like it's part

of the city.

So I would say that probably that is why they are now proposing the Modified Route A, because it does avoid all the issues, and the one that I heard last fall was about the church, we happened to be there and they were talking about it. And, yeah, it's -- it would be within less than 100 feet of that church.

So I'm thinking that many of the things that she was talking about are being addressed by the Modified Route A.

And the other thing was about that extra line. I don't know, that might be something that they could answer if that is what the possibility that they're talking about, an additional line.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: I'll ask ITC if they'd like to address it. But as far as I know, there are two routes, Route A and Route B, and we've seen some variations on that. Route A follows for the most of its length the existing 161 line. So it would look like that picture that you have in your packet where there is lines on one side and lines on the other. There would be no room for no other lines so there couldn't be an additional one.

Route B, on the other hand, let's just

say that part of Route B gets selected for the project, it doesn't follow an existing line so there would be a pole up with lines on one side and nothing on the other side.

Now, Route B, then, could accommodate, I suppose you could say, a line in the future if such a line was needed and was permitted by the Commission. But at this time I don't know of any other project that would use that line, and I could ask ITC.

MS. AMY ASHBACKER: I just want to reiterate, and you just stated it, too, Ray. If we were ever to add a new line that doesn't presently exist, we would have to go through the same process. So you'd certainly be able to come forth again and discuss it with us. But right now we don't have any plans for anything additional beyond the 345. That is the project.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Great. Anybody else have a question or comment?

Can we let this gentleman, and then we'll come back to you, Miss Murphy.

MR. TIM SCHAFER: My name is Tim Schafer, S-C-H-A-F-E-R, from Sherburn. We go to that church, the one that is being talked about. We built it.

The church is over 90 years old in the community and we kind of like our church. And I don't think most people would like to have a power line almost going over the top of your church.

The I-90 fence, the right-of-way fence on the on-ramp to our north door is 100 feet. The power line would have to -- if the easement's 200 feet wide and you have to come from the I-90 easement, it would be over us. So I don't know, it just doesn't seem like a good plan, I like the alternative. And I hope the judge likes the alternative.

And just by the way, I like electricity when I can use it at home, and when it's off I don't like it. So we like electricity, we just want it going in the right places at the right time and the right way, okay?

Thank you.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Thank you for your comments.

Anybody else have a question or comment?

Yes, sir. Please come up. If you could state and spell your name, please.

MR. MAYNARD JAGODZINSKE: Sure. Thank you, Ray.

My name is Maynard Jagodzinske. And that's J-A-G-O-D-Z-I-N-S-K-E. A lot of my comments probably will be from questions. I've received probably eight to 10 inches of information from the courts, documents and testimonies and what have you. And in one of the maps there I see that Mid-American has a line right south of Lakefield down in Iowa.

My question is, if you're looking at an economic, commonsense way to go, why not just from Lakefield go down to Iowa, pick up that Mid-American line because it probably already has easements and take it right over to where ITC will terminate their line in Kossuth County. Okay?

I think my daughter, our daughter had some comments about health. And I'd like to comment a little bit about we have a valuable resource here in our farmland. And to farm, as Dawn shared, without encumbrances is really an economic advantage to us. That's why we bought the farm. And the ease of farming it, the misapplications of chemicals from slowing down, from overplanting in going around structures. So to me you should probably pick the least intrusive route.

And as I look at the maps, whether it's Modified A, B, A, whatever, you're zigzagging around

and messing with a lot of people's health and economic wellness. And that really is upsetting to me to do that.

So I guess my suggestion would be, let's head to Iowa with this electricity, pick up that Mid-American line and take it to your terminating point. Economics would dictate that.

Number two, my other route would be Modified A to a certain extent. Avoid the Sherburn area, okay, take it over to where the Modified A goes north. And I guess I speak from a personal respect there, because those lines would be going down considerable, probably one mile of our farmland, you know, which we would now have to work around, have to, you know, and it is right by our daughter's place and she does have three children, yes.

But I guess my point is why not follow Interstate 90? I've read that in the documents that ITC has put out and, you know, there's some hesitation about I think going across Kramer's slough. If you were to come in the fall or the spring and you see the migrating birds, they're not landing near I-90, they are landing in land north or south of Interstate 90. Interstate 90 is kind of a

dead zone for migratory birds, I think there's probably a handful found in that slough, but, you know, the real action is away from Interstate 90. So if you have that straight route, that's my number two choice, you know, over there.

Okay. Part of the information in the maps that I received is how many places in A, B, C, Modified A, is counting the number of structures that they would be 300 or less feet from. Any of the routes are considerably more than if they just went down Interstate 90, according to the maps, if I can count the structures correctly. So I guess my comments are take the less intrusive route and don't mess with people's health and economic issues.

I appreciate it.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Thank you for your comments.

There's sort of a question in that first part, and I don't know that I can answer it completely for you. Maybe I'll ask ITC to take a stab at that.

I know that the planning process for this project and for projects of this size goes through the utilities and through MISO, which is the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, sort of

1 the folks that run the transmission system here in
2 the Upper Midwest. They take a lot of time to plan
3 out and figure out what the best way to make the
4 connections are, to make it, as you said, economical
5 and make sense.
6 And I don't know that they looked at, you
7 know, I'm assuming that they did look at all the
8 different variations of getting through Iowa and
9 connecting Minnesota to Iowa and then, as you've
10 heard, further east and how this all connects
11 further together, and that's their job to do that.
12 And I know the Department of Commerce is looking at
13 it and they will also say is this the project that's
14 needed or is there some other project needed and
15 they've raised some questions about that and so the
16 judge will have to resolve what that is. Do you
17 want to talk about that?
18 MS. AMY ASHBACKER: Yeah. This project
19 is titled MVP, and that stands for a multivalue
20 project. And as Ray said, it was developed by MISO
21 to meet -- and for a variety of benefits, and that
22 is improved access to lower-cost generation, it's
23 increased reliability, reduced congestion on the
24 line. And to meet all of that criteria, MISO
25 determined that the terminus should be Winnebago

Junction. And, of course, we've moved that slightly down to Huntley to a new substation.

So Ray is correct in that MISO, they did analyze looking going directly south into Iowa, they went through a variety of route alternatives, and we did as well internally. But that was developed to meet those needs, that route was the superior choice.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Okay.

MR. MAYNARD JAGODZINSKE: Excuse me, Ray. Do you have -- Amy, do you have figures to back that up? 'Cause when we originally started, as I understood it, you were going to have to modify the Huntley Substation, and now I understand that you bought more land to make a new station; is that correct?

MS. AMY ASHBACKER: Have we bought additional land -- I mean, we purchased land for Huntley, we haven't purchased any more land than we did originally for Huntley.

MR. MAYNARD JAGODZINSKE: Well, part of my testimony that I received said that you had bought 40 acres.

MS. AMY ASHBACKER: Correct.

MR. MAYNARD JAGODZINSKE: And that you

planned to build a new facility there.

MS. AMY ASHBACKER: That's correct. Because Winnebago Junction could not accommodate --

MR. MAYNARD JAGODZINSKE: Okay. So if you've got to build a new facility, why not build it closer to Interstate 90?

MS. AMY ASHBACKER: Well, do you want to talk about the specifics? I'm not a planner so I don't want to get into the details.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Maybe I can interpret your question. I don't know, was it before or during the application, putting the application together, ITC was thinking that the proposed Huntley Substation would be near the Blue Earth River. They purchased some land.

Whether the permit issued by the Public Utilities Commission tells them to put the substation there or not, their purchase means nothing, it does not weigh into this at all. And we state that in the draft EIS. That's their risk of buying that land. Maybe they thought it was a good deal and were pretty confident that that is the best spot for the substation, but if not, then they own 40 acres in Minnesota. And they could resell it, you know, they can use it -- if the Commission tells

them to put the substation somewhere else, that's what ITC needs to do. So that doesn't have any bearing on it and it is not for any other facilities. I think they just anticipated where it would go. Am I correct in that?

MS. AMY ASHBACKER: We needed an endpoint, essentially, and knowing Winnebago Junction could not accommodate what we needed to do, we had to have a defined endpoint. And so that's why we moved forward with the purchase, so that we could say, yeah, here's point A, here's point B, how do we connect the two.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Yes, sir. Can you please come up?

MR. DONALD MORITZ: One of the options I see for the Huntley Substation is having it -- I don't know if it's four or five miles further south?

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Correct. Could you state your name, please?

MR. DONALD MORITZ: Donald Moritz. I see that on the map there is another Huntley Substation alternative.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Yes. Yes. So when we were out here last year, a number of folks, as Mr. Jagodzinske points out, suggested using

Interstate 90. And there are several options that use Interstate 90. Some of them go along and then actually go up north of Fairmont right here and go up to the Huntley Substation. Some of them continue further east along there. And some of them, I-90 option number 5, it's called in the document, suggest putting the substation much closer, right near I-90, and then bringing the lines further down.

So that is an option, it's an option that the judge could consider and the Commission could consider. And we talk about the pluses and minuses of doing that in the draft EIS. So hopefully that discussion is helpful to you there.

Anybody else have a question or a comment?

Yes, sir. Please come on up. State and spell your name, please.

MR. JIM OLTMAN: Jim Oltman, O-L-T-M-A-N.

I've known Helen Lee for going on 50 years. I've known Maynard for probably 50 years. I give Helen Lee -- I support you on the animal thing.

You know, as I interpret the Bible, the good Lord says that man has superiority over the animals of the land, the fish of the sea, and the birds of the air. But it don't work that way. DNR

says no, you can't touch the animals, but we can kill the people. PETA says people aren't important, animals are. Now, where are we at?

So that, I think, has to be considered. Now Maynard is talking I-90. Now you're talking my back door, because I-90 went back across the back of our farm, and I didn't realize that you were even thinking about that until just the other day. Because in the meeting you were staying north in the existing area. So all of a sudden here we are down I-90. Well, we weren't happy about I-90, but it's going there, like it or not, so it's there. And this will be the same thing, I guess, like it or not, it'll be there.

But anyways, you made the comment that it's going to cost Minnesota residents a higher electric bill. Well, back up a little bit. I just got off Federated Rural Electric Board of Directors, I served my 20 years. Okay. Now you're going to charge us more for our electricity, possibly. What are we going to get in return for these lines? Is there kind of any tax type thing or is there some return to us for that also?

But I really think this -- you're right on, Helen Lee, man is a little important and the

1 good Lord said so. Thank you.
2 MR. RAY KIRSCH: Thank you very much for
3 your comments.
4 And to be sure, I think I made this point
5 and I'll make it again. The routing factors that
6 the Commission has before it and the list that you
7 have in front of you does not say that therefore
8 once you've looked at these impacts and you've
9 looked at these impacts, these are more important
10 than the others. It doesn't say the city of
11 Sherburn or any persons or anything like that, we go
12 through a lot of detail trying to map out where
13 everybody lives, how close they could potentially
14 be, and what the impacts are, so people are
15 important.
16 If you feel that way, and I understand
17 that you do, you know, please make that clear to the
18 judge and to the Commission. Here's how we in this
19 area interpret those impacts. These weigh much more
20 heavily for us than these. I understand there could
21 be impacts to birds that fly through the air and
22 collide with these lines, I'm sympathetic to that,
23 Judge, but I feel much more strongly about the
24 people who live here.
25 I'm just paraphrasing your -- and so I

1 would encourage you to make that advocacy, to make
2 those arguments to the judge and ultimately to the
3 Commission so they make a decision and they have the
4 best information and your best thinking on what the
5 best solution is. I appreciate your comments.
6 Does anybody else have a comment?
7 MR. JIM OLTMAN: You didn't answer my
8 question. Is there any return to the state of
9 Minnesota?
10 MR. RAY KIRSCH: I'm sorry. Back to the
11 benefits. Yes. I'll let ITC talk to this also, but
12 in their application they talk about the -- not the
13 monetary benefit for like a tax or something like
14 that, but the benefit to the electrical grid and its
15 reliability and its congestion and its ability to
16 move electrical generation in the Upper Midwest.
17 And so those are all benefits to these communities,
18 but all of Minnesota.
19 Do you want to --
20 MR. DAVE GROVER: Hi. I'm Dave Grover
21 from ITC. That's David, D-A-V-I-D, Grover,
22 G-R-O-V-E-R.
23 I've submitted testimony in this case,
24 which you can find on the Commission's website. We
25 talked a lot about the costs of the project and the

1 benefits.
2 This project you've heard referred to as
3 a multivalue project, it's called MVP-3. It's part
4 of a portfolio of 17 projects that the midwest or
5 the Midcontinent Independent System Operator
6 developed. And they were studied as a portfolio.
7 They provide benefits over the entire Midwest
8 region, so it's a several-state region.
9 There are benefits in Minnesota from the
10 portfolio of projects. There are benefits in other
11 states. And the projects are being paid for on a
12 per kilowatt-hour basis, the same across the entire
13 footprint. So there are impacts on rates. The
14 impacts in Minnesota per kilowatt-hour are the same
15 as the impacts in Indiana or Illinois or Wisconsin.
16 And the projects have been studied by
17 MISO and determined to have benefits that exceed the
18 costs. The benefits, a variety of things, it
19 enables more wind generation to be added, it enables
20 existing wind generation to not be curtailed and
21 that reduces energy costs.
22 There's a tremendous amount of
23 information on this in the application. If you want
24 I can show you some of it after the meeting is over.
25 It's more than I can go into right now. But there

are benefits from the project, and the questions earlier about the costs, you know, there are costs here, but they're the same costs in Minnesota as in the other Midwestern states that are also paying for these projects.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Thank you, Dave.

Yes, please, come up. If you could state and spell your name.

MS. JOANNA LANGE: Joanna Lange, L-A-N-G-E, Joanna, J-O-A-N-N-A.

My comment is with respect to the proposed Route B. I understand that's the least preferred route. However, I live along that route in section 30 of Fox Lake Township. I married a farmer. I don't really know the townships that well, but my home is the only property marked as a home on section 30 in Fox Lake Township, Martin County, and it's marked as within 150 to 300 feet, is what you're key says.

Last year we put an addition on that home. And it's an old home and the road has been modified many years in the past. But in order for us to get the permit to put the addition on our home, our entire home is within the Martin County 75-foot setback requirement from the road. And so

if your power line follows along Route B, I can't imagine that it would be within -- I mean, beyond the 200-foot requirement.

So I would encourage you to send a person on foot to come out and measure some of those properties that are within that listing so you can get an accurate measurement.

Thank you.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Thank you for your comment.

Anybody else have a question or comment?

Yes, sir, please, come on up.

MR. BEN CUBA: Thank you.

My name is Ben Cuba, C-U-B-A. I live in Sherburn.

And I served in the U.S. Air Force as an electronics technician, so I understand a little bit about electricity. And my main concern is that little jog into Sherburn. If they go into there my house will be within 100 yards of it. And I would prefer to live out the rest of my life without any further outside interference to my health.

Thank you.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: Thank you for your comments.

1 Does anybody else have a question or a
2 comment?
3 All right, Miss Murphy, I don't see
4 anybody else who wants to comment right now, so if
5 you'd like to come up and make another comment, you
6 certainly may.
7 MS. HELEN LEE MURPHY: When I read
8 through all three books, I read future generation
9 and wind power constantly. So I do think that there
10 is a purpose of future generation with all of these
11 turbines being built, they'll have to send that
12 power somehow. So future generation is a constant
13 theme in the ITC three books, as well as the word
14 minimal to aesthetics and to health and to property
15 value, as well as the words prudent routing.
16 Prudent routing. So often I read those phrases. So
17 that was the question about the future.
18 Then I have a question, all of a sudden
19 my brain says to be like Mr. Oltman, who said, as
20 Mr. Jagodzinske said, look at the map and here's the
21 substation from Huntley, let's say. And all of a
22 sudden the judge and the Public Utilities Commission
23 decides to move the Huntley Substation let's say 10
24 miles further to the east or west. Could there be a
25 surprise for all of us when the judge and the Public

1 Utilities Commission gets done with this that there
2 would be something that we're not expecting or
3 prepared for? Could that happen?
4 MR. RAY KIRSCH: Let me try and respond
5 to that directly.
6 The Commission is bound to permit
7 something that is supported by the record. So
8 there's judicial review of the Commission's
9 decision, if need be, if somebody wanted to
10 challenge that. So it has to be developed on the
11 record. And the record so far includes everything
12 in the draft environmental impact statement. Those
13 are all the routing options and substation options
14 that there are. So the answer to your question is
15 no, I do not anticipate anything else would happen.
16 Now, is it possible that somebody could
17 do a whole bunch of work and dream up some other
18 thing and try to make the case that this was
19 supported by the record by bringing in a bunch of
20 information? That's a possibility, but I think you
21 would also run into procedural defects in that
22 nobody knew about it, nobody had a chance to comment
23 on it. So it's a very hard route to do. So I think
24 the answer to your question is no.
25 Anybody else have any comments or

1 questions that I can answer? I'm not seeing any
2 hands right now. Let me see if changing the slide
3 changes that.
4 May 9th is when comments are due to me.
5 Mail, fax, or e-mail. Comment online. Submit a
6 comment form that you can get up at the table.
7 Anybody else? Anybody else have any
8 questions or comments?
9 All right. Well, then, one other -- all
10 right.
11 If you'd like to come up, please.
12 MS. DAWN HARTUNG: Do I have to come up?
13 I just have a comment on when this whole
14 system came about, the timing of your project, and
15 I'm guessing it maybe was planned. But a lot of the
16 farmers are in the field. We're in rural America
17 here, and I think if you look around there's a lot
18 of husbands, sons, moms, dads missing. The timing
19 of these meetings. I don't think you're getting
20 full information to the farmers out in this
21 community or the other workers because of the time
22 of the year that you're planning these.
23 And I think Miss Murphy hit on that also,
24 was the timing of the meetings. People are not
25 informed. I think when it first started people

weren't even aware of this. I called different neighbors, they hadn't even heard of it. They were throwing their mailings away thinking it was junk mail. So I think some time periods really need to be looked at further.

MR. RAY KIRSCH: I appreciate your comment. I appreciate your comment.

Anybody else have a comment or a question?

Okay. Well, then, I want to thank you all for coming out tonight. I very much appreciate your attention and all your questions and comments.

We're adjourned. Thank you very much.

(6:00 session concluded at 7:48 p.m.)