

From the Alliance Lawyers
November 25, 2013
By Mark E. Truesdell and Justin LaVan
Beving, Swanson & Forrest, P.C.

Opposed to the Rock Island Clean Line? Join the Alliance. Why? A truly effective opposition to a huge transmission line project like this requires at least two things:

1. LOTS OF PEOPLE. Many voices raised together in singular, clear, convincing, relevant, repeated opposition. To Clean Line. To County Supervisors. To our legislators. To Governor Branstad. To the Iowa Utilities Board.
2. EXPERT WITNESSES. The up-or-down decision on a high-voltage transmission line franchise, the grant-or-deny decision petition is not decided by the Iowa Utilities Board on the basis of land-specific arguments like interference with row-cropping operations; or EMF causing threats to human health or livestock well-being; or undue proximity to a residence or building; or objections to taking down several trees in the grove; or objections to the presence of utility crews conducting maintenance to the lines on your land; or stray voltage. I have never read an IUB decision denying a transmission line request on any of these bases. Those issues are parcel-specific. The IUB will order the utility to move the line a little bit if a parcel-specific objection is found valid. But there are only two criteria prescribed by Iowa law of sufficient weight to stop a transmission line cold in its tracks:
 - a. PUBLIC USE: *Has the Petitioner established that the proposed transmission line is necessary to serve a public use?* I.C. 478.3; 478.4 (2013 Code).
 - b. REASONABLE INTEGRATION INTO THE EXISTING GRID. The statute puts it this way: *Does the proposed line represent a reasonable relationship to the overall plan of transmitting electricity in the public interest?* I.C. 478.3.2; 478.4 (2013 Code). I will elaborate further on each of these two criteria in future columns. But for now, my point is this:

TO ARGUE EITHER OF THESE TWO QUESTIONS CREDIBLY REQUIRES BONA FIDE EXPERTISE.

These two questions require people with PhD's in engineering or economics or equally relevant academic credentials plus years of experience in utility planning. They clearly require unquestioned expertise in the federal scheme of electric transmission regulation and deregulation as administered by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. They require a working knowledge of FERC Orders 888, 889, and 2000. They require expertise in the transmission planning process of the Midwest Independent Operator System (MISO). They require an expert who is at home talking about "Baseline Reliability Projects" a "Narrow Constrained Area," "Generator Interconnection Projects," and the "MTEP Appendix A." They require expertise in the interface between MISO, which is Iowa's Regional Transmission Operator, and PJM, the RTO to our east

into which these electrons will be delivered south of Chicago. They require expertise in the demand curve for electricity, current and projected, in the relevant markets and the role of wind energy in meeting that need. They require expertise in electricity-industry facts and factors we haven't even yet identified.

Why join the Alliance? **Because these Expert Witnesses don't come free!!** And individually, we can't afford these experts. But together, through the Alliance, we intend to obtain the best expertise we can to advance our strongest arguments against this line.

Consider: In a recent franchise hearing for a high-voltage transmission line, the transmission line company retained the following experts to submit testimony to the IUB in support of its proposed transmission line:

- Black & Veatch, a Forbes 500 engineering firm with 100 offices worldwide which conducted a route study to determine which of 24 different routes would best meet the legal requirements.
- To counter allegations of stray voltage and EMF,
 - A PhD. Professional Engineer with many years of experience in EMF exposure assessment.
 - A Board-Certified Physician/Public Health Specialist and Epidemiologist.
 - A Doctor of Veterinary Medicine/Board-Certified Veterinary Toxicologist.
- As to the public use and integration criteria, the petitioner relied heavily on the studies completed and filed by the engineers and planners of the Midwest Independent System Operators (MISO).
- The Office of Consumer Advocate introduced the expert testimony of an expert Electrical Engineer who criticized the findings of several MISO reports relevant to the public use and integration criteria.
- A group of seven landowners presented on the Health and Safety issue the testimony of two asserted expert witnesses: A physician and a PhD. zoologist. Apparently, neither was regarded as sufficiently expert because their testimony was uniformly discarded by the IUB in favor of contrary authority cited by the ITC experts.

Expert Witnesses do not come free! And the Alliance wants to retain the BEST, most credible, most authoritative expert witnesses!! Clean Lines will have well-paid experts to make its best arguments to the IUB. Will the Alliance have experts of equal or superior credibility to counter their arguments? Only you have the answer to that question, with your membership and contributions. Join the Alliance today!