OAH 5-2500-32715
PUC ET-2, E-015/CN-14-787
TL-14-797

STATE OF MINNESOTA
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

FOR THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Application of Great River Energy and Minnesota Power for a Certificate of Need and a Route Permit for the Menahga Area 115 kV Transmission Project in Hubbard, Wadena and Becker Counties, Minnesota

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY

This matter came before Administrative Law Judge Jim Mortenson for a public hearing on October 19, 2015. The public hearing was held at the Menahga Senior Center in Menahga, Minnesota, and was convened to receive public testimony on the proposed high voltage transmission line and substation changes and additions.

Procedural History

On January 15, 2015, Applicants filed a joint certificate of need and route permit petition for their proposed 115 kV transmission line project, described above.[1] On March 18, 2015, the Commission found the application complete and authorized record development according to the alternative permitting process under Minn. R. 7850.2800-.3900 (2015).[2]

On March 18, 2015, the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (PUC or Commission) issued an Order accepting the application from Great River Energy and Minnesota Power (Applicants), for a high voltage transmission line certificate of need and route permit.[3] In this same Order, the Commission directed the use of a defined informal review process in order to develop the certificate of need record.[4] The Commission approved joint hearings and combined environmental review for the certificate of need and route proceedings.[5] The Commission requested the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) to conduct at least one public hearing on the project.[6]

On March 24, 2015, Minnesota Department of Commerce Energy Environmental Review and Analysis staff (DOC) and the Commission held a joint public information

[1] ORDER (July 8, 2015) (eDocket No. 20157-112236-02).
[2] *Id.*
[3] ORDER (March 18, 2015) (eDocket No. 20153-108363-02).
[4] *Id.*
[5] *Id.*
[6] *Id.*

and environmental assessment scoping meeting. At the meeting, and through a separate public comment period, several site and route alternatives were proposed for consideration in the Environmental Assessment.[7] The DOC generated comments and recommendations regarding site and route alternatives for inclusion in the scope of the Environmental Assessment. The Commission met on May 21, 2015, to consider these comments and recommendations.[8]

On July 8, 2015, the Commission ordered that the summary report process would be used to develop the record for the route permit.[9] The Commission requested the Administrative Law Judge file a report summarizing the comments received on the route permit application.[10] The Commission also extended the deadline for the DOC to issue its scoping decision.[11]

The Environmental Assessment was issued in September 2015. Notice of the public hearing was issued on October 2, 2015.

At least 26 people attended the public hearing on October 19 in Menahga.[12] 59 exhibits were entered into the record. Five people asked questions and made comments during the public hearing.[13] The Administrative Law Judge encouraged additional attendees to take advantage of the opportunity to ask questions of the panel, share comments, or both, but no further attendees accepted.[14]

Following the adjournment of the public hearing, the record remained open until November 2, 2015, for interested persons to submit written comments. Donna Andersen and her attorney filed additional written comments, as did Lori Elmore, Wayne Haverinen, and Peter-Mark and Lynn Hendrickson.[15] The Minnesota Departments of Natural Resources (DNR) and Transportation (MnDOT) filed written comments.[16] Great River Energy filed a written comment.[17]

A Public Comment Report (PCR) was generated from the comments received through the PUC's website. This report contained comments from four people, one of whom spoke at the public hearing on October 19, 2015.

---

[7] *Id.*
[8] *Id.*
[9] *Id.*
[10] *Id.*
[11] *Id.*
[12] SIGN IN SHEET (October 19, 2015)
[13] Menahga Public Hearing Transcript (Menagha Tr.) at 17, 22, 26, 50, and 58 (October 19, 2015).
[14] Menagha Tr. at 60-61 (October 19, 2015).
[15] Comments by Carol Overland (November 2, 2015) (eDocket No. 201511-115353-01); Comments by Donna Andersen (November 2, 2015) (eDocket No. 201511-115330-01); Comments by Lori Elmore (November 2, 2015) (eDocket No. 201511-115409-01); Comments by Wayne Haverinen (November 2, 2015) (eDocket No. 201511-115409-01); Comments by Peter-Mark and Lynn Hendrickson (November 2, 2015) (eDocket No. 201511-115409-01).
[16] Comments by DNR (November 2, 2015) (eDocket No. 210511-115391-01); Comments by MnDOT (November 2, 2015) (eDocket No. 201511-115379-01).
[17] Comments by Great River Energy (November 2, 2015) (eDocket No. 201511-115396-01).

The Commission will issue an order on the application following a review of this summary, the hearing transcripts, and the filings submitted into the hearing record.

Description of the Project

The project is to construct a 22.5 mile 115 kV transmission line in Hubbard, Wadena, and Becker Counties.[18] The project consists of:

- construction of 4.5 miles of new double–circuit 115 kV line and approximately 2.5 miles of single-circuit 115 kV line;
- construction of approximately 15.5 miles of primarily new single-circuit 115 kV transmission line;
- construction of three new substations;
- modifications to Great River Energy's existing Hubbard substation and the Minnesota Power Pipeline substations; and
- relocation of the existing Todd-Wadena Menahga substation to the Blueberry substation site with a conversion of the voltage from 34.5 kV to 115 kV.[19]

The stated need for the project is to address transmission overload issues in the Menahga area and to serve a new substation and new pump station proposed by Minnesota Pipe Line Company as part of the Minnesota Pipe Line Reliability Project.[20]

Applicants requested a route width of approximately 500 feet, or 250 feet either side of the line where the line runs cross country, and 250 feet on either side of the centerline of road rights-of-way where the line follows a road.[21] Additional route width has been requested at substations and where the line will cross an existing 230 kV line.[22] Applicants indicate that the new 115 kV line will require a right-of-way (easement) of 100 feet.[23]

Applicants propose to use single pole wood transmission line structures for the new 115 kV line.[24] The structures will be 60 to 90 feet in height, with a span between structures in the range of 275 to 400 feet for single circuit structures and spans of 350 to 400 feet for double circuit structures.[25]

Applicants indicate that construction on the project is anticipated to commence in late spring 2016 and be completed by early 2017.[26] The estimated total project cost is $23 million dollars.[27]

---

[18] ORDER (March 18, 2015) (eDocket No. 20153-108363-02).
[19] *Id.*
[20] *Id.*
[21] ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT at 16 (September 28, 2015) (eDocket No. 20159-114311-01).
[22] *Id.*
[23] *Id.*
[24] ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT at 23 (September 28, 2015) (eDocket No. 20159-114311-01).
[25] *Id.*
[26] *Id.*

Summary of Public Testimony

Carol Overland

Carol Overland of Legalectric, Inc. had several questions and comments, as summarized here. Ms. Overland asked what the ampacity of the line would be.[28] Eric Messerich from Great River Energy responded that the ampacity would be greater than 702 amps based on a conductor of 795 ACSR.[29] That answer was subsequently corrected to state the conductor was 477 ACSR, but the resulting ampacity was not clarified.[30]

Overland asked for a description of the relationship between mega volt amps (MVA) and megawatts (MW).[31] Messerich responded that MVA were similar to MW because they are both volt amps multiplied together, but that MVA has a square root of three associated with it and includes reactive power.[32]

Overland commented that proposals for transmission lines in the area had changed over time.[33] She stated that peak historical demand has been 16.48 MW and that the proposed line would provide 140 MW.[34] Overland remarked that charts showing historical demand use were misleading because they did not look far enough back in time. If they had, according to Overland, the average energy use growth rate would be smaller than reported.[35]

Overland asserted that the no-build alternative in the Environmental Assessment was inadequate because a number of combined alternatives were not examined.[36] She commented that a transmission solution was being applied to address a distribution problem, and that the deteriorating distribution system would still need to be rebuilt.[37] Overland commented that there is a good north-south transmission line from Hubbard to Wing River which could be upgraded, and this should be given closer review.[38] She also commented that no phasing connected action was considered in the Environmental Assessment.[39] Overland remarked that there was no record of the power needs of all the pumping stations to be served by the project.[40]

---

[27] *Id.*
[28] Menagha Tr. at 19 (October 19, 2015).
[29] *Id.* at 21.
[30] *Id.* at 32; *see also* Comments by Great River Energy (November 2, 2015) (eDocket No. 201511-115396-01).
[31] Menahga Tr. at 35 (October 19, 2015).
[32] *Id.*
[33] *Id.* at 32-34.
[34] *Id.* at 35-36.
[35] *Id.* at 36-37.
[36] *Id.* at 37.
[37] *Id.* at 38, 44.
[38] *Id.* at 38.
[39] *Id.* at 45.
[40] *Id.* at 38-39.

Overland asked whether upgrades to the system had been made since 2007 or 2008.[41] Messerich responded that Minnesota Power had installed a voltage regulator to help prop up voltage in Sebeka.[42] Overland also asked whether a bat study would be entered into the record, because she believes the Commission needs to know whether the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) will require a take-permit for bats, prior to the Commission making a decision on the project.[43] Lisa Agrimonti, on behalf of Great River Energy, responded that the bat study will be submitted once the USFWS approved the study features.[44]

Donna Andersen

Donna Andersen owns 78 acres of property in Hubbard County that she intends to leave to her children.[45] Andersen stated that there is already a 230 kV transmission line to the north of her property.[46] The proposed transmission line will run on the south side of her property.[47]

Ms. Andersen raised issues with the Environmental Assessment. First, she commented that the Environmental Assessment does not address Section 31, where her property is located and which she believes is biologically significant.[48] Second, she commented that the Environmental Assessment is not accurate with regard to the proposed route following existing rights-of-way, and that the Environmental Assessment minimizes the impact the line will have on her property.[49] Andersen commented that the impact of the line on her trees cannot be mitigated because any trees cut in an easement will not be replaced.[50] Ms. Andersen also commented that she had not received a bat-study concerning northern long-eared bats.[51]

Curtis Andersen

Curtis Andersen, Donna Andersen's husband, also commented. Mr. Andersen commented on wetlands near or on the Andersen property that contain frogs, turtles, and other animals, and is concerned about the elimination of that habitat.[52]

---

[41] *Id.* at 45.
[42] *Id.* at 45-46.
[43] *Id.* at 46-47. The report was submitted on November 5, 2015. No northern long-eared bats, an endangered species, were determined to be present on the Andersen property. *See* REPORT (November 5, 2015) (eDocket No. 201511-115499-01).
[44] Menahga Tr. at 46 (October 19, 2015).
[45] *Id.* at 22.
[46] *Id.* at 23; *see also* ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, Appendix D (September 28, 2015) (eDocket No. 20159-114311-03). Andersen also stated that there is a power line to the east of her property, but the maps do not show this fact.
[47] ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, Appendix D (September 28, 2015) (eDocket No. 20159-114311-03).
[48] Menahga Tr. at 23.
[49] *Id.* at 23-24.
[50] *Id.*
[51] *Id.* at 25.
[52] *Id.* at 58-59.

Mr. Anderson was concerned that the DNR had not assessed this possible habitat loss and would like such an assessment completed.[53]

Lori Tomperi

Lori Tomperi owns 440 acres in Wadena County for which she has a stewardship plan and intends to leave to her children for development.[54] A gas pipeline runs under the eastern portion of her property, near where the proposed Blueberry Substation may be located.[55] Ms. Tomperi commented that the project should follow the existing transmission line running through her property, as opposed to cutting through the middle of wooded land, or it should run along the nearby oil pipeline.[56]

Wes Renneberg

Wes Renneberg commented that because much of the need for the new transmission line is for the benefit of the oil pipeline, the transmission line should run along the pipeline corridor.[57] Mr. Renneberg asked whether it would not be less expensive to do so.[58] Ray Kirsch, for DOC, responded that following the pipeline is one of the alternative routes in the southern portion of the project.[59] According to Mr. Kirsch, because the pipeline crosses several agricultural fields with irrigators in the northern area of the project, the impact would be too great on the irrigators, and so the Commission had agreed to looking at following roadways in the north.[60] Mr. Renneberg asked about the cost of the project based on the length of the transmission line.[61] Kirsch responded that often the shortest length is the least expensive, but not always.[62] In this case, according to Kirsch, the alternative route in the south that follows the pipeline is the most expensive due to the terrain, including wetlands.[63]

---

[53] *Id.*
[54] *Id.* at 27.
[55] *Id.*; *see also* ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, Appendix D (September 28, 2015) (eDocket No. 20159-114311-03).
[56] *Id.*
[57] Menahga Tr. at 50 (October 19, 2015).
[58] *Id.*
[59] *Id.* at 51-52.
[60] *Id.*
[61] *Id.*
[62] *Id.*
[63] *Id.*

Summary of Written Comments

Carol Overland

Carol Overland provided additional comments in writing, and on behalf of the Andersens and the Donna J. Andersen Trust.[64] Overland commented that the law requires the project to utilize a pre-existing corridor near the Andersen property. She commented that route alternatives in compliance with *People for Environmental Enlightenment & Responsibility (PEER), Inc. v. Minnesota Environmental Quality Control,* 266 N.W.2d 858 (Minn. 1978), and Minn. Stat. § 216E.03, subd 7(e) (2014), were not reviewed.[65]

Overland commented that the proposed project is oversized because it allows for 140 MVA and that peak demand is below 20 MW. Even with the addition of a new pumping station on the oil pipeline, according to Overland, the proposal is overbuilt.[66] Overland commented that claims regarding growth in peak demand are misrepresentations because insufficient historical data was considered.[67] Overland commented that the range of magnetic fields from the project are understated because they were based on less than 138 amps, not 700 amps.[68]

Overland commented that the project proposal is not what was proposed as 2007-NE-N3 in the 2007 Biennial Transmission Projects Report, and subsequent versions proposed in 2009 and 2011.[69] She commented that new substations are not needed because it is not clear why a new pumping station for the oil pipeline is required.[70] Overland commented that a referenced "future project to the north" should be disclosed by the Applicants and considered in relation to this project.[71]

Overland commented that distribution upgrades are required, should be completed prior to this project, are an alternative to this project, and must be completed whether this project is built or not.[72] According to Overland, options regarding upgrades to existing facilities should not have been rejected and should be further considered. She commented that the following alternatives should also be considered:

- upgrade the existing system with removal of an existing pumping station on the oil pipeline;

---

[64] Overland's comments included issues with the Administrative Law Judge's management of the October 19, 2015, public hearing, and how public hearings are managed in general. These comments are not included in this report because they are not relevant to the certificate of need or route permit for this project.
[65] Comments by Carol Overland at 15-17 (November 2, 2015) (eDocket No. 201511-115353-01).
[66] *Id.* at 2-3.
[67] *Id.* at 5-8.
[68] *Id.* at 8-9.
[69] *Id.* at 3.
[70] *Id.* at 3-4.
[71] *Id.* at 4.
[72] *Id.* at 4-5.

- removal of the pipeline substation on the north-west end of the proposed project;
- use of the proposed new Menahga substation as the pumping station for the oil pipeline;[73]
- the impact of the Sandpiper oil pipeline proposal on this project;
- upgrade or replacement of the existing oil pumping station near Hubbard, rather than removal and relocation of that pumping station;
- a direct 69 kV line from the east to the proposed Sebeka pumping station;
- an east-west distribution line through the Menahga area, in addition to the north-south options.[74]

Overland commented that the Environmental Assessment is inadequate and that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is necessary. This is because, according to Overland, transmission infrastructure is presumed to have a significant environmental impact. She commented that the DOC has not conducted a sufficiently in-depth review of environmental issues, did not provide the detail or procedures found in an EIS, and did not provide opportunities for public participation.[75]

Donna Andersen

Donna Andersen provided additional comment in writing.[76] Ms. Andersen commented that the proposed transmission line should run along the south side of the Hubbard Line Road, as opposed to the north side of the road where her intentionally cultivated forested property is located.[77] Andersen commented that trees cut on her property for the transmission line would be lost and not replaced.[78] She commented that the DNR and the USFWS recommendations should be followed, particularly minimizing removal of trees.[79] Further, Ms. Andersen commented that no forest can grow north of her property, due to an existing transmission line, and it would not be fair to have another transmission line on the southern portion of her property.[80]

Ms. Andersen commented that existing corridors should be used for the transmission line, and that such a corridor does not exist along the south side of her property.[81] Specifically, Ms. Andersen commented that the pipeline corridor, east of but not adjacent to her property, should be used for the transmission line route in the northern portion of the project.[82] She comments that the pipeline company is the

---

[73] While the comments often refer to both electrical substations and oil pumping stations, in this instance it is not entirely clear.
[74] Comments by Carol Overland at 17-18 (November 2, 2015) (eDocket No. 201511-115353-01).
[75] *Id.* at 9-15.
[76] Andersen's comments were received directly on October 28, 2015, and through her attorney on November 2, 2015.
[77] Comments by Donna Andersen at ¶¶ 5, 21 (November 2, 2015) (eDocket No. 201511-115330-01).
[78] *Id.* at ¶ 6.
[79] *Id.* at ¶ 18.
[80] *Id.* at ¶ 15.
[81] *Id.* at ¶¶ 7, 19.
[82] *Id.* at ¶ 8.

primary beneficiary of the proposed project, and so the pipeline company should pay the lion's share of the transmission line cost, including use of its right-of-way. This would also avoid impacts on forested land, according to Andersen.[83]

Ms. Andersen commented that there had not been sufficient opportunity for public comment on the project. She had been focused on a different project, the Sandpiper pipeline, and so did not recognize the urgency of this proposed project.[84]

Ms. Anderson commented that there should be a full EIS. According to Andersen, the Environmental Assessment completed is inadequate and leaves out very important information which has an impact on the transmission line route.[85] She commented that errors and omissions in the Environmental Assessment should be corrected and considered before a decision on the project is made.[86] Andersen commented specifically:

- a wetland on her property should be avoided;[87]
- trees that would be cut could be habitat for northern long-eared bats, and that a study about bats she requested should be made part of the record and considered before a decision is made;[88]
- her forest land is not adequately documented in the Environmental Assessment;[89]
- the Environmental Assessment does not state that the impact to forests cannot be mitigated due to the inability to regrow cut trees where the transmission line will be;[90]
- the Environmental Assessment map incorrectly shows land south of hers, across the Hubbard Line Road, as forested, when it is an agricultural field, as shown on other photographs and maps in both the Environmental Assessment and application;[91] and
- there is an area of moderate biological diversity on the southern edge of her property that is not clearly addressed in the Environmental Assessment.[92]

Lori Elmore

Lori Elmore submitted comments on October 30, 2015. Ms. Elmore commented that her property will be impacted by both the proposed route, which would pass through her front yard and close to her house, and an alternate route, cutting through

---

[83] *Id.* at ¶¶ 7-9.
[84] *Id.* at ¶ 10.
[85] *Id.* at ¶ 11.
[86] *Id.* at ¶ 20.
[87] *Id.* at ¶ 13.
[88] *Id.* at ¶ 14.
[89] *Id.* at ¶ 15.
[90] *Id.* at ¶ 16.
[91] *Id.* at ¶ 17.
[92] *Id.* at ¶ 19.

the middle of her managed forest land.[93] Ms. Elmore commented that the proposed route may decrease her property value, impact the aesthetics of her property, and result in a loss of her windbreak.[94]

Wayne Haverinen

Wayne Haverinen submitted comments on October 30, 2015. Mr. Haverinen commented that it was his belief that the Highway 71 route has considerable advantages over all the other routes.[95] Mr. Haverinen commented that the route was an existing right-of-way, leaving the most untouched land. Mr. Haverinen commented that though the Environmental Assessment concluded the Highway 71 route was the most expensive, it did not factor in the cost he would incur on his organic farm including loss of spring feeding ground and the cost of brush control under the powerline because chemicals would not be permitted on his organic farm. He also commented that his neighboring livestock farmers would be spared the added cost of production if the Highway 71 route were used.[96]

Peter-Mark and Lynn Hendrickson

The Hendricksons provided comments on October 30, 2015. The Hendricksons commented that their dairy farm would be impacted by the Pipeline South alternate route, which would cross their farm diagonally, following the oil pipeline. The Hendricksons commented that this would affect tillage, planting, harvesting, and crop spraying, sharply reducing the efficiency of their farming operation. The transmission line would also prevent them from installing an irrigator in the future. The Hendricksons commented that storm damage to the transmission line could cause crop damage, as could maintenance of the transmission line and structures. They commented that following a well-maintained road would be the best route for the transmission line.[97]

Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT)

MnDOT filed comments on November 2, 2015. MnDOT commented that it has adopted a formal policy and procedures for accommodation of utilities on the highway rights-of-way, called the Utility Accommodation Policy.[98] This policy seeks to guide the balance between accommodation of utility operations in the highway rights-of-way and preserving the safe and efficient operation of the transportation system.[99]

MnDOT commented that its approach to the proposed project is to work to accommodate the transmission line within or as near as feasible to the trunk highway

---

[93] Comments by Lori Elmore (November 2, 2015) (eDocket No. 201511-115409-01).
[94] *Id.*
[95] Comments by Wayne Haverinen (November 2, 2015) (eDocket No. 201511-115409-01).
[96] *Id.*
[97] Comments by Peter-Mark and Lynn Hendrickson (November 2, 2015) (eDocket No. 201511-115409-01).
[98] Comments by MnDOT (November 2, 2015) (eDocket No. 201511-115379-01).
[99] *Id.*

rights-of-way. This would be based on an evaluation of the specific locations to ensure that appropriate clearance is maintained to preserve the safety of the traveling public and highway workers and the effective operation of the highway system now and in the foreseeable future. Specifically, MnDOT commented that the transmission line must cross roadways at right angles, utility poles that are three to seven feet outside of the existing road rights-of-way will not likely be permitted, and that the vegetation management considerations stated in MnDOT's scoping comments should be applied to the Highway 71 alternate route.[100]

Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR)

DNR filed comments on November 2, 2015. DNR commented that it generally encourages co-locating transmission lines in existing rights-of-way in order to reduce fragmentation of forested habitat. In this case, according to DNR, the preferred route, west of Menahga, appears to result in fewer impacts to natural resources, as does the 119th Avenue route alternative.[101]

DNR commented that it recommends an Avian Mitigation Plan be required for the project. DNR recommends bird diverters at public water crossings and near the Red Eye Wildlife Management Area.[102]

DNR commented that it recommends border zone/wire zone right-of-way management, to allow for different types of vegetation in the transmission line right-of-way. DNR commented that vegetation should be maintained and not sprayed within fifty feet of streams. DNR suggested that wildlife-friendly erosion control be used in areas that may be disturbed by construction or maintenance. DNR urged that impacts on wetlands be reduced by pole placements and route-alignment shifts. DNR commented that construction in wetland areas should be performed in the winter when the ground is frozen.[103]

Great River Energy and Minnesota Power

Great River Energy submitted a comment on November 2, 2015, clarifying information in the joint application for the project. Specifically, Great River Energy clarified that the conductor it proposes to use for the project is 477 ACSR, which will have a summer rating of 141.6 MVA.[104]

Public Comment Report

Four people submitted comments through the PUC's website, using the "Speak-Up" function. The commenters were not identified. The topics listed for comments were:

---

[100] *Id.*
[101] Comments by DNR (November 2, 2015) (eDocket No. 210511-115391-01).
[102] *Id.*
[103] *Id.*
[104] Comments by Great River Energy (November 2, 2015) (eDocket No. 201511-115396-01).

- Should any specific permit conditions be placed on this project?
- Are there other project-related issues or concerns?
- Is the proposed transmission line needed and in the public interest?
- What is the most appropriate route for the proposed transmission line?
- What are the costs and benefits of the proposed transmission line?
- What are the environmental and human impacts of each route under consideration and how can these impacts be addressed?[105]

There were no comments regarding permit conditions, other project-related concerns, and costs and benefits of the proposed transmission line.[106]

The summary of the two comments as to whether the proposed line is needed and in the public interest is: No, the project is not needed and is not in the public interest.[107]

The summary of the two comments regarding the route for the transmission line is: Follow the oil pipeline.[108]

One comment was received concerning the environmental and human impacts of the routes proposed. That comment requested reconsideration of the route to follow the pipeline, rather than CR-156, so as to avoid partly surrounding an unspoiled area of woods with transmission lines.[109]

Dated: November 17, 2015

JIM MORTENSON
Administrative Law Judge

NOTICE

This report contains a summary of public testimony. It is not a final decision. Pursuant to Minn. R. 7850.3900, the Commission will make the final determination of following a review of the record from the administrative law judge.

---

[105] Comments (November 2, 2015) (Speak Up) (eDocket No. 201511-115409-01).
[106] *Id.*
[107] *Id.*
[108] *Id.*
[109] *Id.*

MINNESOTA OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

600 North Robert Street
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101

Mailing Address:
P.O. Box 64620
St. Paul, Minnesota 55164-0620

Voice: (651) 361-7900
TTY: (651) 361-7878
Fax: (651) 539-0310

November 18, 2015

See Attached Service List

Re: In the Matter of the Application of Great River Energy and Minnesota Power for a Certificate of Need and a Route Permit for the Menahga Area 115 kV Transmission Project in Hubbard, Wadena, and Becker Counties

OAH 5-2500-32715
MPUC ET-2, E-015/CN-14-787 &
ET-2, E-015/TL-14-797

To All Persons on the Attached Service List:

Enclosed and served upon you is the Administrative Law Judge's **SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY** in the above-entitled matter.

If you have any questions, please contact my legal assistant Rachel Youness at (651) 361-7881 or rachel.youness@state.mn.us, or facsimile at (651) 539-0310.

Sincerely,

s/Jim Mortenson

JIM MORTENSON
Administrative Law Judge

JRM:ry
Enclosure
cc: Docket Coordinator

STATE OF MINNESOTA
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
PO BOX 64620
600 NORTH ROBERT STREET
ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA 55164

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

In the Matter of the Application of Great River Energy and Minnesota Power for a Certificate of Need and a Route Permit for the Menahga Area 115 kV Transmission Project in Hubbard, Wadena, and Becker Counties	OAH Docket No.: 5-2500-32715

Rachel Youness certifies that on November 18, 2015 she served the true and correct **SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY** by eService, and U.S. Mail, (in the manner indicated below) to the following individuals:

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method
Julia	Anderson	Julia.Anderson@ag.state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-DOC	1800 BRM Tower 445 Minnesota St St. Paul, MN 551012134	Electronic Service
Sharon	Ferguson	sharon.ferguson@state.mn.us	Department of Commerce	85 7th Place E Ste 500 Saint Paul, MN 551012198	Electronic Service
Emerald	Gratz	emerald.gratz@state.mn.us	Office of Administrative Hearings	PO Box 64620 Saint Paul, Minnesota 55164-0620	Electronic Service
John	Lindell	agorud.ecf@ag.state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-RUD	1400 BRM Tower 445 Minnesota St St. Paul, MN 551012130	Electronic Service
Michelle	Lommel	mlommel@GREnergy.com	Great River Energy	12300 Elm Creek Blvd Maple Grove, MN 55369	Electronic Service
David	Moeller	dmoeller@allete.com	Minnesota Power	30 W Superior St Duluth, MN 558022093	Electronic Service
James	Mortenson	james.mortenson@state.mn.us	Office of Administrative Hearings	PO BOX 64620 St. Paul, MN 55164-0620	Electronic Service
Carole	Schmidt	cschmidt@grenergy.com	Great River Energy	12300 Elm Creek Boulevard Maple Grove, MN 553694718	Electronic Service
Janet	Shaddix Elling	jshaddix@janetshaddix.com	Shaddix And Associates	Ste 122 9100 W Bloomington Frwy Bloomington, MN 55431	Electronic Service
Donna	Stephenson	dstephenson@grenergy.com	Great River Energy	12300 Elm Creek Boulevard Maple Grove, MN 55369	Electronic Service
Daniel P	Wolf	dan.wolf@state.mn.us	Public Utilities Commission	121 7th Place East Suite 350 St. Paul, MN 551012147	Electronic Service

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method
Julia	Anderson	Julia.Anderson@ag.state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-DOC	1800 BRM Tower 445 Minnesota St St. Paul, MN 551012134	Electronic Service
Sarah	Beimers	sarah.beimers@mnhs.org	Minnesota Historical Society	345 Kellogg Boulevard West St. Paul, MN 55102	Electronic Service
Sharon	Ferguson	sharon.ferguson@state.mn.us	Department of Commerce	85 7th Place E Ste 500 Saint Paul, MN 551012198	Electronic Service
Emerald	Gratz	emerald.gratz@state.mn.us	Office of Administrative Hearings	PO Box 64620 Saint Paul, Minnesota 55164-0620	Electronic Service
Linda	Jensen	linda.s.jensen@ag.state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-DOC	1800 BRM Tower 445 Minnesota Street St. Paul, MN 551012134	Electronic Service
Will	Kaul	wkaul@grenergy.com	Great River Energy	12300 Elm Creek Blvd Maple Grove, MN 553694718	Electronic Service
Stacy	Kotch	Stacy.Kotch@state.mn.us	MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	395 John Ireland Blvd. St. Paul, MN 55155	Electronic Service
Karen	Kromar	karen.kromar@state.mn.us	MN Pollution Control Agency	520 Lafayette Rd Saint Paul, MN 55155	Electronic Service
John	Lindell	agorud.ecf@ag.state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-RUD	1400 BRM Tower 445 Minnesota St St. Paul, MN 551012130	Electronic Service
James	Mortenson	james.mortenson@state.mn.us	Office of Administrative Hearings	PO BOX 64620 St. Paul, MN 55164-0620	Electronic Service
Debra	Moynihan	debra.moynihan@state.mn.us	MN Department of Transportation	395 John Ireland Blvd MS 620 St. Paul, MN 55155-1899	Electronic Service
Bob	Patton	bob.patton@state.mn.us	MN Department of Agriculture	625 Robert St N Saint Paul, MN 55155-2538	Electronic Service
Carole	Schmidt	cschmidt@grenergy.com	Great River Energy	12300 Elm Creek Boulevard Maple Grove, MN 553694718	Electronic Service
Jamie	Schrenzel	jamie.schrenzel@state.mn.us	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources	500 Lafayette Road Saint Paul, MN 55155	Electronic Service
Janet	Shaddix Elling	jshaddix@janetshaddix.com	Shaddix And Associates	Ste 122 9100 W Bloomington Frwy Bloomington, MN 55431	Electronic Service
Daniel P	Wolf	dan.wolf@state.mn.us	Public Utilities Commission	121 7th Place East Suite 350 St. Paul, MN 551012147	Electronic Service