

**From:** [Rich Libbey](#)  
**To:** [Storm, Bill \(COMM\)](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: MAP OF EXISTING UTILITY EASEMENTS IN THE NORTHERN HALF OF MINNESOTA-Certificate of need comment  
**Date:** Thursday, March 13, 2014 11:02:33 PM  
**Attachments:** [GNTL\\_EmailResponseAttachment\\_RichLibbey\\_20130430.pdf](#)

---

Mr. Bill Storm I would like to submit the above PDF file to the record for the Certificate of Need Docket E015/CN-12-1163. It shows the existing power line corridors and the proposed Great Northern Transmission Line routes. This will be helpful for the public to determine when the proposed line follows the existing corridors. Minnesota Power refused my request to include this map on their web site and at the informational meetings held in 2013. I feel this should be considered in the environmental review in determining the environmental impacts of paralleling existing utility corridors versus routing the line cross country through unfragmented forests and wetlands. No where in Itasca County do they propose to follow the existing corridor. I feel the environmental review should evaluate the impact of following the existing corridors vs. going cross country.

Cutting a new line corridor leads to forest fragmentation and the introduction of invasive species in an undisturbed environment. Paralleling the existing corridor minimizes the cost of vegetative management , line inspections, and maintenance . Richard Libbey-18603 Hale Lake Drive-Grand Rapids MN-55744

**From:** [Rich Libbey](#)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 25, 2013 4:52 PM  
**To:**  
**Subject:** Fw: MAP OF EXISTING UTILITY EASEMENTS IN THE NORTHERN HALF OF MINNESOTA

Hi The file above has a map of the existing power lines and the proposed routes. I am hoping they will parallel the existing routes as much as possible. Rich

**From:** **Great Northern Transmission Line**  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 30, 2013 4:01 PM  
**To:** [Rich Libbey](#)  
**Subject:** Re: MAP OF EXISTING UTILITY EASEMENTS IN THE NORTHERN HALF OF MINNESOTA

Hi Rich,

It was nice to meet and talk to you at the Grand Rapids Meeting last week. As we discussed, I am attaching an 11x17 map that shows our Route Alternatives and existing transmission lines with voltages greater than 69kV in the region. Per your recommendation, we are looking into adding the existing transmission line layer to our website mapping tool.

Thanks again for attending our open house meeting in Grand Rapids. If you have any additional questions or comments on the project, please email or call our information hotline (1-877-657-9934). You can always find current project information by visiting our website at [www.greatnortherntransmissionline.com](http://www.greatnortherntransmissionline.com).

Sincerely,

Christina Rolfes & The Great Northern Transmission Line Team

On Sun, Apr 21, 2013 at 11:52 PM, Rich Libbey <[rllibey@mchsi.com](mailto:rllibey@mchsi.com)> wrote:

Hi Thanks for your timely reply. I am inquiring if you can have a map of the existing utility easements in the northern half of the state available at your upcoming meetings? This would be helpful for the public when determining if your plan follows the best available existing utility corridors or if the corridor study area should be expanded to include them. Rich Libbey 18603 Hale Lake Drive Grand Rapids MN

--



**From:** [Rich Libbey](#)  
**To:** [Storm, Bill \(COMM\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Rich Libbey](#)  
**Subject:** Great Northern Transmission Line Certificate of Need PUC Docket No. E015/CN-12-1163  
**Date:** Friday, March 14, 2014 12:07:08 AM

---

Mr. Bill Storm--- I am submitting comments on PUC Docket No. E015/CN-12-1163.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I urge the consideration of Solar Power installations at Minnesota Power's generating stations combined with the upgrading of existing power lines as an alternative to the proposed project. Large solar power arrays could be constructed at abandoned ash ponds at The Clay Boswell station and the Sky Laskin generating station on abandoned ash pond sites. Solar generation is produced during peak periods of demand and when the price of power generation is at it's peak. The sites are close to the existing power lines. Other sites near by could be considered as necessary. If enough power were generated using solar the need for a new 500KV could be off set.

The existing 230KV line in Koochiching and Itasca counties could be upgraded to 500KV eliminating the need for a new line that is proposed to go cross country. I urge the commission to consider such an alternative. Solar power is emission free once installed. Minnesota Power is currently doing a study with the NRRRI at the government Complex in Duluth examining solar's potential. Solar is more efficient in cold climates. Seven acres is required for 1 MW generation. 200 MW generation would require 1400 acres. How many acres will be impacted by a 200 mile line 200 feet wide? I calculate 5280 acres.

I also would like to see an analyses of the potential for dispersed solar generation on roof tops and other hard surfaces that is now receiving solar rebates as part of the current Minnesota Legislative Rebate program for in state manufactured solar panels. Applications have out paced the program allocations requiring a lottery for applicants. This shows high potential. The environmental study should consider the potential of such a program to offset the need for a new power line.

Energy conservation programs should also be analyzed for increased potential. Conserving power has been shown to be the most effective form of energy conservation. The change to LED lighting has great potential.

Sincerely, Richard

Libbey-18603 Hale Lake Drive-Grand Rapids MN-55744

**From:** [Rich Libbey](#)  
**To:** [Storm, Bill \(COMM\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Rich Libbey](#)  
**Subject:** Certificate of Need-PUC Docket-No. E015/CN-12-1163  
**Date:** Friday, March 14, 2014 12:42:06 AM

---

Dear Mr. Bill Storm

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on Certificate of Need-PUC Docket-No. E015/CN-12-1163 submitted by Minnesota Power.

I would urge the commission to examine Minnesota Power's projections of increased load on the system requiring the need for the 500 KV line from Manitoba. Minnesota Power's goal of moving to renewable energy via Manitoba hydro is very commendable but I would urge the PUC to verify that the projected increased demand due to Minnesota Power's assumed increase in iron mining and questionable copper nickel development is a justifiable reason to build the Great Northern Transmission line. Iron mining has always been driven by the economy and is unpredictable. Boom and bust. The development of the proposed Polymet project and other potential copper nickel projects are uncertain due to environmental concerns and global fluctuations in the price of metals.

Richard Libbey-18603

Hale Lake Drive-Grand Rapids -MN-55744

**From:** [Rich Libbey](#)  
**To:** [Storm, Bill \(COMM\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Rich Libbey](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: Certificate of Need-PUC Docket-No. E015/CN-12-1163  
**Date:** Friday, March 14, 2014 1:13:46 AM

---

**Mr. Bill Storm** I urge the PUC to consider the Socio-Economic impacts of the proposed power line on land owners and the public. Land values both private and public are reduced when a power line transects their property. Surface acreage compensation does not compensate for real decreases in valuation of property crossed by the line. Widening an existing power line corridor will not affect the property values as much constructing the proposed line cross country through undisturbed parcels. The resale of a 40 acre parcel is greatly reduced when crossed by a new power line. Compensation for the actual acreage crossed is insufficient. This affects both public and private land owners. Following existing corridors would have less impact on the public and private land owners. Public enjoyment of public land is also reduced when a new power line crosses it.

The option of "no build" should be considered along with up grading existing power lines to higher capacity to reduce these impacts. Other renewable energy projects not requiring a new line need to be explored. These include wind ,solar, and energy conservation.

Sincerely, Richard Libbey-18603 Hale Lake Drive-Grand

Rapids, MN-55744

**From:** [Rich Libbey](#)  
**To:** [Storm, Bill \(COMM\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Rich Libbey](#)  
**Subject:** comments on PUC Application Docket E015/CN-12-1163  
**Date:** Friday, March 14, 2014 3:13:50 AM

---

Dear Mr. Bill Storm I would like to comment on Minnesota Power's PUC Application Docket E015/CN-12-1163

I encourage the PUC to consider the impacts to terrestrial and wetland vegetation and wildlife of the proposed power line compared to solar or other renewable energy alternatives as part of the environmental review.

Impacts of forest conversion to a cleared power line should be quantified. Old growth impacts need to be identified. Clearing the over story greatly impacts the soil dynamics. The Long term herbicide application and soil compaction and wetland disturbance from mechanical vegetative removal need to be evaluated compared to a localized solar energy farm adjacent to existing power substations and generating sources. It should also be compared to developing dispersed solar generation on existing structures such as homes and businesses. Soil compaction and disturbance during construction related activity impacts should be evaluated including the spread of invasive species along the corridor.

Avian mortality with power line structures needs to be considered. The proposed towers of up to 140 feet with supporting guy wires and power line conductors and their impacts on wild life need to be analyzed and mitigated.

Impacts to threatened species and species of special concern need to be evaluated compared to other more localized options such as conservation, solar, and wind power. Building a new cleared path through hundreds of miles of Northern Minnesota needs a thorough evaluation and consideration of viable alternatives.

Sincerely, Richard Libbey-18603 Hale Lake Drive –Grand Rapids MN -55744

