

MANITOBA CLEAN ENVIRONMENT COMMISSION

BIPOLE III TRANSMISSION PROJECT
PUBLIC HEARING

VOLUME 10

* * * * *

Transcript of Proceedings

Held at the Canad Inn

Portage La Prairie, Manitoba

OCTOBER 24, 2012

* * * * *

APPEARANCES

CLEAN ENVIRONMENT COMMISSION

Terry Sargeant - Chairman
Pat MacKay - Member
Brian Kaplan - Member
Ken Gibbons - Member
Wayne Motheral - Member
Michael Green - Counsel to the Board
Cathy Johnson - Commission Secretary

MANITOBA CONSERVATION AND WATER STEWARDSHIP

Bruce Webb

MANITOBA HYDRO

Douglas Bedford - Counsel
Janet Mayor - Counsel

INDEX OF EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT NO.		PAGE
PTG-1	Hydro presentation	1684
PTG-2	Blaine Pedersen's presentation	1735
PTG-3	Barry Pugh's presentation	1735
PTG-4	Jim Pedersen's presentation	1735
PTG-5	Ray Franzmann's presentation	1735
PTG-6	John Fleury's presentation	1735
PTG-7	Calvin Penner's presentation	1750
PTG-8	Ms. Graafland's presentation	1750
PTG-9	Hydro Land owner brochure	1804
PTG-10	DC lines brochure	1804
PTG-11	EMF brochure	1804
PTG-12	Vickie Pedersen's presentation	1804
PTG-13	Direct current and electric magnetic fields brochure	1806

INDEX OF PROCEEDINGS

Opening remarks by Chairman	1634
Presentation by Manitoba Hydro	
Mr. Gerald Neufeld	1637
Questions by John Souque	1656
Questions by ernie Daniels	1658
Questions by Garland LaLiberte	1664
Questions by Ian Wishart	1669
Presentation by Blaine Pedersen	1685
Presentation by Barry Pugh	1696
Presentation by Jim Pedersen	1701
Presentation by Ray Franzmann	1721
Presentation by John Fleury	1725
Presentation by Calvin Penner	1737
Presentation by Helen and Monique Graafland	1743
Hydro Panel answers	1753
Presentation by Vickie Pedersen	1783
Presentation by Burt de Rocquiny	1793
Presentation by Ted Tkachyk	1800

1 Wednesday October 24, 2012

2 Upon commencing at 9:30 a.m.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies
4 and gentlemen, I'd like to call the proceedings to
5 order. Welcome to our hearing session this
6 morning in Portage la Prairie.

7 My name is Terry Sargeant, I'm the
8 chair of the Manitoba Clean Environment
9 Commission, as well as the chair of this panel.
10 With me as panel members are Patricia MacKay,
11 Wayne Motheral, Ken Gibbons and Brian Kaplan. In
12 addition to the panel there are a number of
13 officials from the Clean Environment Commission,
14 including our Commission secretary, Cathy Johnson,
15 and our administrative assistant, Joyce Mueller,
16 who is by the main entrance.

17 There are also with us this morning a
18 number of officials from Manitoba Hydro, as well
19 as an official from the Department of Conservation
20 and Water Stewardship of the Province of Manitoba.

21 We are here today at the request of
22 the Minister of Conservation and Water Stewardship
23 to conduct public hearings into Manitoba Hydro's
24 proposal for the development of the Bipole III
25 transmission project.

1 Last December, the then Minister of
2 Conservation wrote to the Commission asking that
3 we conduct hearings into this. In specific, he
4 asked us to review and evaluate the environmental
5 impact statement that was prepared by Manitoba
6 Hydro, to review and evaluate Manitoba Hydro's
7 public consultation summary, to recommend whether
8 an Environment Act licence should be issued for
9 the project, and if so, to recommend measures
10 proposed to mitigate any potential adverse
11 economic -- pardon me, environmental,
12 socioeconomic and/or cultural effects resulting
13 from the Bipole III project.

14 The terms of reference also ask that
15 we conduct hearings in communities in the vicinity
16 that the proposed route would follow. So we have
17 held hearings in Northern Manitoba in Gillam,
18 Thompson, The Pas, earlier this week in Dauphin,
19 this morning, today, in Portage la Prairie, and
20 Friday in Niverville. Monday we will return to
21 hearings in Winnipeg where we will have at least
22 another four weeks of hearings.

23 A few notes on housekeeping issues.
24 If you -- if anybody here wishes to make a public
25 presentation and hasn't done so, I would ask that

1 you let Joyce Mueller at the main entrance know of
2 your intentions or your wishes to make a
3 presentation.

4 Cell phones, I'm not too keen on cell
5 phones going off when we're in hearings. So if
6 you have one with you, please turn it on to
7 vibrate, which I will probably do to my own as
8 well.

9 Presentations have a time limit of
10 more or less 15 minutes. I have a couple of cards
11 with me, a five minute and a two minute warning.
12 Within reason, if it's obvious that you're getting
13 close to wrapping up, I won't be extremely strict
14 on that rule.

15 If anybody needs to know, there are
16 washrooms down this hallway. I think that's about
17 it.

18 So this morning we will open with a
19 presentation from Manitoba Hydro which will be a
20 brief overview of the project. Following that,
21 anybody in the audience who wishes to ask
22 questions of Manitoba Hydro about the presentation
23 that we will see in a few moments will be welcome
24 to come and do so. And following that, we have an
25 agenda of, oh, half a dozen or more than that,

1 about eight or ten people who have already
2 indicated to us they wish to make presentations.
3 So the presentations will begin after any
4 questions that any of you may have.

5 So I turn it over to Manitoba Hydro to
6 make the presentation.

7 MR. NEUFELD: Mr. Chairman,
8 Commissioners, ladies and gentlemen, my name is
9 Gerald Neufeld. I work at Manitoba Hydro as a
10 division manager of transmission planning and
11 design. I have been in this role for ten years.
12 And my educational background is that of an
13 electrical engineer, I have a Bachelor of Science
14 in Electrical Engineering from the University of
15 Manitoba. And I have worked at Manitoba Hydro for
16 27 years, and have spent almost my entire career
17 in transmission. Organizationally, I report to
18 the vice-president of transmission.

19 The topics I'd like to review here
20 today include a description of the existing
21 system, the project description as it relates to
22 Bipole III, reliability and the need for Bipole
23 III. We'll touch on the environmental assessment
24 process and also construction planning.

25 So with regard to the existing system,

1 high level in terms of how it works. The largest
2 plants in the Manitoba Hydro fleet include Kettle
3 Generating Station, Long Spruce and Limestone.
4 These three plants are on the lower Nelson and
5 they feed directly into the high voltage DC system
6 which currently comprises of Bipole I and II.
7 Bipole I and II transfer the power down to the
8 south to Dorsey, where it gets converted back to
9 AC, and then it's pushed onto the existing AC
10 transmission system. We also have, in terms of
11 generation, the Winnipeg River plants and
12 Wuskwatim and Jenpeg, Grand Rapids, Laurie River.
13 And these plants all feed into the AC system. And
14 you can see in the green we have the 230 kV AC
15 system, and there's an ability for transfer of
16 power from north to south.

17 So if we lose Dorsey, or if we lose
18 Bipole I and II, we lose the capability of
19 generation from the largest plants that our
20 generators on our fleet, which I indicated earlier
21 were Kettle, Long Spruce and Limestone. That's
22 70 percent of Manitoba Hydro's generation
23 capability. And what we have left are the
24 remaining generators at Kelsey, Wuskwatim, Jenpeg,
25 Winnipeg River, and import capability. And the

1 sum total of the generation that would be
2 available to supply energy in Manitoba would not
3 be enough for the load. And on a day like today,
4 we would probably be expecting, if we lost Dorsey
5 or Bipole I and II, somewhere in the range of
6 about 1000 to 1200 megawatts short. And that's a
7 substantial amount of power.

8 In the existing system we have about
9 over 1800 kilometres of 500 kV high voltage DC
10 transmission, which is represented by Bipole I and
11 II. We have over 200 kilometres of 500 kV AC and,
12 that 500 kV AC comes out of Dorsey. And it swings
13 around to the east side of the province down to
14 the border, where eventually it connects into the
15 Minneapolis system. We have 5000, some 5000
16 kilometres of 230 kV AC. And again, you'll see
17 some of those represented here in green. We have
18 about 1400 kilometres of 138 kV AC and about 2900
19 of 115 kV AC. So we have a lot of transmission,
20 in addition to the various interconnections with
21 our neighbours to Saskatchewan, Ontario, and to
22 the United States.

23 Manitoba Hydro has, in the last 60
24 years, installed approximately 18,500 kilometres
25 of AC transmission lines, which range in voltage

1 from 33 kV up to 500 kV.

2 Since the Environment Act was
3 proclaimed in force on March 31st, 1988, there has
4 been a requirement by Manitoba Hydro for acquiring
5 an Environmental Act licence for any transmission
6 facilities in the range of 115 kV and up. And you
7 can see here on this slide the number of
8 facilities that we have licensed over the last --
9 since that time.

10 We have a licensing and environmental
11 assessment department in the transmission business
12 unit, which is dedicated to doing the
13 environmental assessment work for these projects.
14 There are ten experts, all with a varying range of
15 environmental degrees, and experts who are
16 dedicated to conducting the environmental
17 assessment. And we have successfully developed
18 and managed the high voltage transmission system,
19 including regulatory review and licensing of
20 numerous large scale transmission projects, both
21 in northern and agricultural Manitoba, since
22 enactment of that environmental legislation.

23 During this process we have grown in
24 knowledge about licensing and the EA process, and
25 we have a long history in assessment and

1 development of transmission lines and a successful
2 record of obtaining environmental approvals.

3 The Manitoba Hydro Act: The purpose
4 and objective of this Act, the purposes and
5 objectives of this Act are to provide for the
6 continuance of a supply of power adequate for the
7 needs of the province. So we have an obligation
8 to ensure that the Manitoba Hydro system is built
9 up to a level where, in the event of significant
10 outages and contingencies such as losing Dorsey,
11 we have power in place to remain to meet the needs
12 of the province.

13 And I'd like to spend some time going
14 through why Manitoba needs Bipole III. And what
15 we have here is a graph, which on the top green
16 line shows the load growth in Manitoba Hydro. So
17 this is representative of the energy demand in
18 Manitoba.

19 The blue line represents the energy
20 supply capability in the event we lose Dorsey.
21 And you'll note that there are a number of changes
22 in the bottom line as time advances. And to give
23 you a sense of what those are, I'll go through a
24 few of them just to describe why there are
25 changes.

1 So in about 1995, Brandon units one to
2 four were retired, and that represented a loss of
3 energy supply of 132 megawatts. Some eight to ten
4 years later, Brandon units six and seven were
5 installed, and that increased our capability of
6 supply by 360 megawatts.

7 If we move ahead here, this is
8 Wuskwatim coming on line, and that's some
9 200 megawatts. And the next increase you'll see
10 here is about 2014, is representative of the 300
11 additional megawatts that we would be expecting to
12 import in the event of a loss of Dorsey on the 500
13 kV line from the U.S. And this represents the
14 Riel Station being built just east of Winnipeg,
15 and where we have an alternative injection point
16 into Manitoba as compared to Dorsey.

17 So the problem we have today is a lack
18 of redundancy in the HVDC system and insufficient
19 emergency back-up resources. We have a load
20 serving deficiency under catastrophic
21 contingencies. And as you can see, the deficiency
22 gap continues to grow with time, and we will get
23 to a point in 2017 when Bipole III is planned to
24 be in service that would be 1500 megawatts short.
25 That's about, according to our study on an average

1 per house use, that's about 300,000 homes. So
2 we're vulnerable.

3 We have two Bipole lines existing,
4 Bipoles I and II, that are 900 kilometres long and
5 on the same right-of-way. We have these two lines
6 on the southern Dorsey Station which transmit
7 70 percent of northern hydro generation in
8 Manitoba.

9 So by comparison, Hydro Quebec which
10 is a far larger system than Manitoba Hydro, has
11 their corridors displaced within the province such
12 that only 11 percent of their generation is on one
13 corridor. Brazil, with the Itaipu dam, has no
14 more than 20 percent. Three Gorges in China,
15 which is the biggest plant in the world, some
16 25,000 megawatts, has only 15 percent on any
17 corridor. Again, Dorsey today is 70 percent, and
18 with Bipole III that concentration drops to
19 45 percent. Dorsey has the most eggs in one
20 basket. And having reviewed these other
21 facilities in the world, I can tell that you
22 there's no utility in the world that transmits so
23 much power through one critical facility.

24 We have had many near misses, and I'll
25 get into details on some of these with further

1 slides. September 5th, 1996, there was a
2 downburst one and a half miles north of Dorsey. I
3 can tell you that was really the awakening in
4 terms of the need in Manitoba Hydro to see the
5 drive for Bipole III. And I'll get into those
6 details later.

7 July 17, 2006, there was several
8 storms that collided over Winnipeg and lines
9 tripping all over the place. And then the Elie
10 tornado, which was the first F-5 rated tornado in
11 Manitoba, and a number of other near misses.

12 One other one I might point out here
13 on the list is the flood waters, on January 2011,
14 the flood waters and ice build-up on 117
15 kilometres of DC right-of-way in Northern
16 Manitoba. This is just south of the Kelsey
17 Generating Station, and we had 50 towers and 400
18 guys encased in three feet of ice. There was a
19 lot of shifting and a lot of damage to those
20 towers, and that was certainly a near miss. If
21 some of those towers had collapsed, they could
22 have fallen into the adjacent line and we would
23 have lost both Bipoles.

24 So, to the September 1996 downburst,
25 you can see on this map, if we orientate ourselves

1 here to Dorsey Station, which is just north of
2 Winnipeg near Warren, and line D602F, which is the
3 500 kV line that comes out of Dorsey going down to
4 Minneapolis, runs approximately three kilometres
5 north where it starts to cross over. And where we
6 had a downburst -- and a downburst is a
7 significant forceful wind that comes in a downward
8 direction. It's like having a highly pressurized
9 balloon and you poke the bottom and everything
10 just comes out all at once, and it's sufficient to
11 take down towers. It took 19 towers down, and
12 these were big towers. And those towers down were
13 just in the range of a little over four kilometres
14 north of Dorsey. If that storm had hit Dorsey, we
15 would have been in real trouble. The only reason
16 we were able to get out of trouble on this
17 particular instance is that it was during the
18 shoulder season in September, when the loads are
19 low. So the system instantly went to full import.
20 Also the nearness to good roads, and we had spare
21 towers, and the crews worked night and day to get
22 those downed towers up.

23 The Elie tornado, this happened in
24 June 2007, and the tornado touched down north of
25 the TransCanada Highway and moved slowly southeast

1 where it picked up a tractor trailer before it
2 headed south and severely damaged the town's flour
3 mill causing over a million dollars in damage. It
4 then headed southeast towards Elie, and this was
5 within 25 kilometres of Dorsey, where it destroyed
6 four houses, flipped cars and even tossed one
7 homeowner's Chrysler's Fifth Avenue onto a
8 neighbour's house. The tornado lingered over the
9 same area of Elie for approximately four minutes
10 before it cut sharply south and then rapidly
11 dissipated.

12 At the same time as the Elie tornado,
13 another tornado was touching down close to nearby
14 Oakville. And that tornado was rated as an F-3
15 with winds of 295 kilometres per hour. And it
16 destroyed several outbuildings and many trees. To
17 have an F-5 tornado is a rare occurrence in
18 Manitoba. To have two tornadoes not far from each
19 other is even more rare, and yet it happened.

20 In August 2007, the significant storm
21 hit Dorsey. These pieces of equipment you see
22 here are actually very robust, and if you had the
23 opportunity to see what they looked like, they are
24 probably about three feet high each and about
25 eight to ten inches in diameter. And it really

1 causes one to think how a wind could take
2 equipment like that down, but it did. And we lost
3 a significant amount of power outlet from Dorsey
4 as a result of Bipole I being taken offline.

5 When something like Bipole I comes out
6 of service, which is somewhere around
7 2000 megawatts, instantly a call is made to the
8 Midwest Independent System Operator in the United
9 States, and we enact what's called, or we request
10 an enactment of what's called transmission loading
11 relief. And what that means is that there's a
12 relief provided on the transfer limits on
13 transmission lines. It provides more tolerance to
14 allow greater power flows through in the hopes of
15 being able to keep the two systems intact. Also
16 there was an emergency management call made for --
17 a request for power to offset the power that we
18 lost on Bipole I.

19 So relative to project description, we
20 have for Bipole III, starting in the north, the
21 Keewatinoow Converter Station. And the purpose of
22 this station is to convert from AC to DC. The AC
23 is collected in from the existing plants, Kettle,
24 Long Spruce and Limestone, and it's a facility
25 that will run in parallel with Bipoles I and II.

1 And the northern converter station, the
2 Keewatinoow Converter Station is located some 79
3 kilometres northeast of Gillam.

4 In the south at the Riel Station, just
5 on the east side of Winnipeg, north of Highway
6 Number 1, north of Deacons Corner, will be the
7 termination point for the Bipole line. And the
8 purpose of that plant is to convert the DC power
9 to AC. And functionally, that's called an
10 inverter. In the north it's called a converter.
11 And of course in between connecting the two
12 facilities is the Keewatinoow to Riel DC
13 transmission line, which is about 1384 kilometres
14 long.

15 The intended in-service date, I
16 believe I mentioned earlier, is 2017.

17 These are the types of towers we'll be
18 installing in the north. These are guyed towers,
19 well suited to the type of environment that we
20 find in the north. There are two wires per pole,
21 and it's difficult to see that, but this is one
22 pole and there's two wires in there. And so
23 there's two wires on that pole and two wires on
24 that pole. There's spacer dampers that keep the
25 two separated. We have an example of a spacer

1 damper on the presentation table at the back. And
2 the guys are grouted to concrete to varying
3 depths, depending on the soils. And Bipole III
4 will only have guys in the non agricultural areas.
5 The agricultural areas will have four legged
6 self-supporting towers.

7 Here is an example of a number of
8 different self-supporting towers, and these will
9 have their specific application depending where on
10 the line they are to be located. So, for example,
11 this tower, which has a narrower base footprint
12 than some of the other ones you see here, and is
13 for zero to 2-degree tangent, that is basically
14 what we call a suspension tower. So that's for a
15 very, very small angle on the line. If there's a
16 slightly larger angle on the line, in the range of
17 2 degrees to 7 degrees, we move to this type of
18 tower. And as the strains become greater in
19 larger angle towers, larger angles for the line to
20 be following the right-of-way, we have a 7 degrees
21 to 25-degree medium angle dead end tower. And
22 then here we have another dead end tower, and this
23 is for the heavy angles up to 90 degrees.

24 So the towers will be spotted in the
25 centre of the right-of-way. And north of highway

1 16, the towers will be 33 metres from the edge of
2 the road allowance, and from highway 16 to Riel,
3 it will be 42 metres from the right-of-way. And
4 this is our 500 kV AC line which is going down to
5 Minneapolis.

6 This is a close-up of the tower in
7 agricultural land, and you can see that most of
8 the arable land is preserved. And in Southern
9 Manitoba, these types of towers allow farming to
10 the edge of the structure. And again, just a
11 close-up footprint.

12 With regard to the construction
13 agreement, just a slide comparing Keewatinoow
14 Station to Riel, and the current status of the
15 Keewatinoow Station as well. So at the present
16 point in time, there is access developed, there's
17 a road into the area, but the site is not
18 developed. This is a remote construction location
19 and it will require full scale worker
20 accommodations in the proximity of the proposed
21 converter station.

22 And labour agreements will fall under
23 what we call the Burntwood/Nelson labour
24 agreement. And that agreement sets out hiring
25 preferences, including priority for northern

1 Aboriginal residents, certain wage and benefits in
2 terms of overtime shift turnarounds and such.

3 The Riel Converter Station is
4 partially developed, and the sectionalization
5 component is currently under construction, and the
6 converter site is not. There will be no camp
7 requirements. And the intention with Riel is that
8 there be standard practices for any Manitoba Hydro
9 station that would apply for the terms of
10 contractors and such.

11 This is a simple schematic of how AC
12 electricity gets converted to DC for long distance
13 transmission on the Bipole III line. So what we
14 have are the generating stations in the north.
15 These are the plants in the lower Nelson. AC
16 lines, which we call the collector system, take it
17 to the Keewatinoow Converter Station. At the
18 Keewatinoow Station, as I indicated earlier, it
19 gets converted from AC on this side -- since all
20 our power is generated by AC, which is the general
21 medium in which electrons are created -- it
22 converts to DC and is transported down the line
23 1384 kilometres long. It gets to Riel, it gets
24 converted back to AC. And once it's back into AC,
25 it goes on an AC grid to various customers and

1 follows -- the electrons flow along the lines of
2 the transmission infrastructure we currently have
3 in place.

4 With regard to the environmental
5 assessment process, the study area for Bipole III
6 is represented by what you see in yellow here.
7 That was our starting point, and that represents
8 roughly 20 percent of the Province of Manitoba.
9 The environmental assessment for this project has
10 entailed going through a comprehensive site
11 selection and environmental assessment process.
12 It has included embracing the engagement with the
13 public through four rounds of consultation. It
14 has used the input of public consultation to
15 improve the routing decisions and avoid impacts
16 and effects, all the time building on knowledge
17 that we have developed over the years that we have
18 accumulated in the licensing of projects since
19 legislation in 1988. And we are committed to an
20 assessment, we have committed to an assessment
21 that we have conducted over four years.

22 So the length of the line I have
23 mentioned already. The right-of-way width is 66
24 metres. Some 931 kilometres of the line are on
25 Crown lands, approximately 454 are on private

1 lands, and that represents some 436 private
2 landowners.

3 So some final comments relative to the
4 environmental assessment process is that we start
5 with the broad area, just as you can see here, we
6 start with a broad area, gain information from
7 public consultation, do study work and research,
8 and we fine tune as we go along and we get to a
9 point where we have a final preferred route, which
10 you'll see in green along this line.

11 The four rounds of consultation I
12 spoke of in the last slide is represented by this
13 flow chart, and we worked our way through this
14 over the course of four years, as I had mentioned.
15 And there have been many opportunities to get new
16 information along the way. And we respect that
17 there are a myriad of issues to account for in
18 routing a transmission system of this magnitude.
19 And we believe that we have selected the route
20 with the least impact on the environment and on
21 the communities and residents along the proposed
22 path of the transmission line, and that meets
23 Manitoba Hydro's need for reliability and
24 technical feasibility.

25 The construction planning process

1 associated with this facility, again, you can see
2 the 20 percent area that we have got covered off
3 here and the final preferred route. And if you
4 look closely, if you can see this from the back,
5 we have broken this into construction segments, so
6 we've got N1, N2, N3, N4, those are the northern
7 construction segments. C1, C2, which are the
8 central components, and then we have several
9 southern components as well.

10 We will work with stakeholders and the
11 public during project construction and after to
12 ensure that expectations and commitments are met.

13 And some comments as well with regard
14 to the transmission line construction process.
15 Here again, one starts at a course level with
16 towers that are shown on drawings. Exact tower
17 locations are not committed at the time of design.
18 Fine-tuning in terms of exact tower spotting
19 occurs in the field, taking into account ground
20 constraints and construction logistics, and any
21 additional input from landowners or stakeholders,
22 such as working with Manitoba Infrastructure and
23 Transportation right now to avoid quarries of
24 interest to them by positioning of the towers or a
25 slight deflection of the line if needed. So it's

1 important not to finalize those details too early
2 and too quickly. So the process is similar to
3 what I have described about the environmental
4 assessment process.

5 So the Environmental Protection
6 Program describes how Manitoba Hydro is organized
7 and how we function to deliver timely, effective
8 and comprehensive solutions and mitigation
9 measures to address potential environmental
10 effects. The roles and responsibility are
11 defined.

12 So the site selection process is used
13 to avoid impacts wherever feasible through
14 routing. The Environmental Protection Program
15 provides a framework for the delivery, management
16 and monitoring of the environmental mitigation
17 measures. And the Environmental Protection Plans
18 themselves prescribe what the general protection
19 measures are. They ensure compliance with
20 regulatory requirements and they identify and
21 supply mitigation for specific sensitive sites.

22 Thank you.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Neufeld.
24 I will invite anybody in the audience who has
25 questions of Mr. Neufeld, or other hydro

1 officials, in respect of this general presentation
2 to come forward now and ask those questions if you
3 have them.

4 I should note also that those of you
5 who make presentations, if you have questions
6 arising from your presentation, I will allow you
7 to ask questions of Hydro at that time.

8 So does anybody in the audience have a
9 question of Mr. Neufeld, or other hydro officials
10 at this time?

11 Sir, could you please come forward to
12 the mic on this front table?

13 MR. SOUQUE: I don't really have a
14 question.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Can you please state
16 your name?

17 MR. SOUQUE: John Souque from Haywood.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Go ahead,
19 sir.

20 MR. SOUQUE: I don't really have a
21 question. It's just that I think everybody who
22 knows what's going on agrees that you need Bipole
23 III. The only objective around our area anyway is
24 that of the routing. So that's all my comment is.
25 Thank you.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Sir, is your concern on
2 routing the east versus west side issue?

3 MR. SOUQUE: Yes.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Or is it specific in
5 your area?

6 MR. SOUQUE: No, west versus east
7 side. Like one of your -- on your presentation
8 you said that it was public consultations. Well,
9 there might have been, but in our area I don't
10 know of any. And if there was, it doesn't sound
11 like you were able to listen to what most people
12 in our area want to see.

13 MR. NEUFELD: And I'm sorry, I didn't
14 catch the name of the place you're from?

15 MR. SOUQUE: Haywood, Manitoba, just
16 straight south of here. The line will be going
17 close to our area. Okay. Thank you.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Sir, just on that, and
19 this comes in our terms of reference, the
20 Commission's terms of reference, as well as
21 direction to Hydro, the decision on east versus
22 west, as you are probably well aware, was a
23 political decision.

24 MR. SOUQUE: Yes, I understand that
25 very well.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

2 MR. SOUQUE: Thank you.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

4 Yes, sir, come forward to the mic?

5 MR. DANIELS: Good morning. My name
6 is Ernie Daniels, Long Plain First Nation, former
7 chief and now an elder. We did meet with Manitoba
8 Hydro and the Crown yesterday in Brandon in
9 regards to this Bipole project.

10 I want to say to Manitoba Hydro and
11 the Commission here that the First Nations people
12 are not opposing this project. However, there's
13 four items that we want you to consider as you do
14 due diligence in your hearings and your research.

15 Last summer, my brother Dave, who
16 worked on this project with Swan Lake First
17 Nations a couple of years ago, he picked me up,
18 and my other brother, Irvin, to look at an area.
19 He wanted to make a statement to us. So we went
20 by Indian Gardens where this project is going to
21 go through. Just east of Indian Gardens there is
22 a place where he went and dug up two plants. My
23 brother Dave is deemed to be a renowned person
24 that's practised our traditional medicines, our
25 plants. Anyway, he went there and got these two

1 plants from the bush. And he says to me and to my
2 brother, Ernie, these are the rarest of the rarest
3 plants in Turtle Island, in North America. Those
4 plants were used by our people for our well-being
5 in terms of traditional medicines. And he told me
6 that this is where this Bipole project is going to
7 come through. That bush will be cut and cleared
8 and destroyed, as well as those plants that he
9 held in his hand. And he will be making a
10 statement very shortly regarding that.

11 Second statement I want to make in
12 regards to Bipole, I understand there's going to
13 be some construction. Prior to the coming of the
14 newcomers in our traditional lands, many of our
15 people are buried all over this country, all over
16 this land, 50 to 60 where Number 2 Highway was
17 built by Treherne, Manitoba. This has never been
18 told in public. When they are doing that
19 construction on Number 2 Highway, they dug up the
20 remains of our people. I'm talking about 200, 300
21 people. But it was hushed up, it was never told.
22 That company that built that highway covered it
23 up. There were two people that worked on that
24 project for many years, for many years. They had
25 a guilt, they felt bad what they did. Towards the

1 ends of their lives those two people, they had the
2 decency to talk to some of the elders in Swan Lake
3 and ask for forgiveness.

4 So while you're doing this project,
5 that you people consider those things as you are
6 doing the construction. Because a lot of our
7 people are buried in this country. Even your
8 people, the settlers that came on this country
9 through Yellow Quill Trail that starts from lower
10 Fort Garry and ends up in Denver, Colorado, the
11 Yellow Quill Trail. Your people are buried all
12 along that trail as settlers, as well as our
13 people. Please consider that in your due
14 diligence, in your research.

15 One more statement I want to make, I
16 don't want to take up your time there, sir.

17 Within Treaty 1, there is a clause in
18 Treaty 1, on Treaty 1, there are seven First
19 Nations in Treaty 1, Peguis, Sagkeeng, Fort Alec,
20 Brokenhead, Sandy Bay, Long Plain, Rosseau, and
21 Swan Lake. Those are signatories of Treaty 1.

22 If you look at the text of Treaty 1,
23 there is a provision there for the Portage band.
24 The Portage band is Long Plain, Swan Lake and
25 Sandy Bay. Because at the time of Treaty 1, Long

1 Plain, Swan Lake and Sandy Bay did not exist.
2 There was one chief that signed for us at that
3 time. Because of manipulation, our Portage band
4 was broken up in 1876, at the Long Plain. But
5 within that Treaty 1 text, there is a provision
6 there for the Portage band. We haven't entered
7 negotiations with the Crown to settle that
8 outstanding land entitlement. It is outstanding.
9 But this project that you are talking about may
10 prejudice those discussions. Because that land --
11 your may go through our territory which we haven't
12 settled yet. We have settled our Treaty land
13 entitlement, we have settled our loss of use. Now
14 we're entering into land that we lost due to
15 illegal surrenders, that is where we are now. But
16 we haven't touched that provision within Treaty 1.
17 Our traditional lands could be affected, impacted
18 by this project.

19 The last thing I want to say
20 Mr. Sargeant, when Treaty 1 was signed between
21 your people and our people, anything silent was
22 not on the table, that includes natural resources.
23 Our understanding of our people at the time of
24 Treaty, the newcomers, the settlers, we lent you
25 6 inches of land for agricultural purposes, but we

1 never gave up the right to our natural resources.

2 And you people, Manitoba Hydro or the
3 Crown made your agreements with the northern
4 people already. But there's no agreement that I
5 see in southern First Nations, a master agreement
6 where we can all sit down and say, okay, we can
7 all endorse this project for the benefit of
8 everybody. No. But First Nations, the Supreme
9 Court of Canada had to make a statement to consult
10 and accommodate First Nations people. Even that
11 today just sometimes is lip service. But in terms
12 of natural resources, we still maintain what you
13 are selling in terms of Hydro, that belongs to us,
14 even the fish, even the timber, even the mining
15 that is happening. There are major things that
16 are happening in our lives, pipelines, railroads,
17 highways, now hydro, that encroach our land.

18 As you deliberate, whether the Crown
19 or Hydro or the Commission, please, a word of
20 caution in terms of what I'm saying. We need to
21 be heard, the First Nations, because we've been
22 left out in the cold many, many times.

23 Thank you very much.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Daniels.

25 Mr. Neufeld, is Hydro aware of these

1 particular traditional medicine concerns or the --
2 I know I've read in the EIS the burial ground
3 concerns, but I'm not sure about the traditional
4 medicines in this area.

5 MR. NEUFELD: We have worked with Swan
6 Lake on the Indian Gardens. As to the exact
7 details as to what was covered relative to the
8 traditional medicines, I couldn't tell you at this
9 point in time, but I know that we did work with
10 them in looking for input in the general area.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We have
12 another Hydro official that may be able to speak
13 more specifically to this issue.

14 MS. ZEBROWSKI: Dierdre Zebrowski with
15 Manitoba Hydro.

16 We did undertake with Swan Lake First
17 Nation, they had done a traditional knowledge
18 study, and as part of that or subsequent to that
19 we had provided additional funds to Swan Lake to
20 also do further archeological work, as well as an
21 additional botanical study. And I can speak with
22 you further to talk about that a little bit later
23 at the break, if you'd like.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you,
25 Ms. Zebrowski.

1 We'll turn now to the presentations.

2 And the first person we have on our agenda this
3 morning is -- I'm sorry.

4 MR. LALIBERTE: We have more
5 questions. May I come up?

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, you may.

7 MR. LALIBERTE: Thank you
8 Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, panel members.

9 My name is Garland LaLiberte, I'm the
10 former dean of engineering at the University of
11 Manitoba, now retired. And I listened with great
12 interest to your presentation, Mr. Neufeld. I
13 think it was your probably third slide in which
14 you put up, maybe it's the fifth or sixth slide,
15 the Manitoba Hydro Act. It reads:

16 "The purposes and objectives of this
17 Act are to provide for a continuance
18 of a supply of power adequate for the
19 needs of the province..."

20 The Manitoba Hydro Act doesn't stop
21 there. The rest of that sentence that you have
22 put in with three ellipses, it goes on to say:

23 "...and to engage in and promote
24 economy and efficiency in the
25 development, generation, transmission,

1 distribution, supply, and end use of
2 the power."

3 To me, the words that you left out are
4 the key words. My question is, do you really feel
5 that this Bipole III project meets those
6 additional words of the Manitoba Hydro Act?

7 MR. NEUFELD: Well, certainly with
8 regard to what I described on the western corridor
9 and the study area, I would hope that you would
10 agree with me that, first of all, on the economic
11 side, that high voltage DC system is definitely
12 the preferred type of technology as compared to
13 AC. So, in my mind, that would fall into
14 promoting economy, and also efficiency as it
15 relates to tendering the contracting of the work,
16 it's all done on a tender basis. And so the
17 attempt always is to get the best price and best
18 value for the work that's done.

19 MR. LALIBERTE: What about efficiency?

20 MR. NEUFELD: Well, efficiency, I
21 would go back to the losses, the losses on the DC
22 system are significantly less than on an AC
23 system. So that makes that technology more
24 efficient.

25 MR. LALIBERTE: Are those losses a

1 factor in the compatibility of the Bipole III line
2 with the existing system, or in fact are they a
3 reason that the Bipole III system is essentially
4 isolated from the existing system when it comes to
5 the possibility of making the new line integrated
6 and operational within the existing system?

7 MR. NEUFELD: Okay. So Bipole III
8 will be fully integrated into the existing system.
9 It's going to be part of the connection at the
10 northern collector. And with regard to Kettle,
11 Long Spruce and Limestone, electrons flowing
12 into -- and I would describe it as a hopper, and
13 the hopper gets filled with electrons from these
14 plants. And then we have three lines that come
15 out of the bottom of that hopper, it's Bipole I,
16 Bipole II and Bipole III. So depending on how
17 many valve groups might be out on any particular
18 line, there will be roughly an equivalent sharing
19 of that power.

20 So if you're familiar with the
21 electrical engineering term of I squared R losses,
22 the I squared R losses actually drop. With the
23 existing system when it's fully loaded, the I
24 squared R losses are roughly 305 megawatts, and
25 those drop by 76 megawatts when Bipole III comes

1 into place.

2 MR. LALIBERTE: Without getting into
3 the engineering of it and the technology of it, is
4 it possible to connect Bipole III into Dorsey in
5 the case of a situation where either Bipole I or
6 Bipole II, or both of them went out?

7 MR. NEUFELD: No, it would not be.
8 We're not -- we're purposely not configuring that
9 way. We want a separate output point so it
10 doesn't make our system vulnerable.

11 THE WITNESS: So you don't have the
12 option of using the same conversion capacity in
13 the south end for the existing system, and the new
14 terminal for Bipole III, you don't have the
15 flexibility of connections on this end, depending
16 on which lines go out?

17 MR. NEUFELD: Okay. So we're getting
18 into some technical details here, and I'm not sure
19 how familiar you are with the TransGrid Solutions
20 studies. The harmonic residence of the Bipole III
21 line is such that it would not work with the
22 existing converters at Dorsey.

23 MR. LALIBERTE: Okay. That's what I
24 know and that's what I wanted to hear. So there
25 is an incompatibility essentially?

1 MR. NEUFELD: That is correct.

2 MR. LALIBERTE: Okay. I'd like to
3 take it to one more question, if I could,
4 Mr. Chair.

5 This one relates to the weather
6 activity that you put on the screen. The examples
7 that you gave were all in the settled area of the
8 province. Is there any other area of the
9 province, or are there any other mitigation
10 measures that could have been taken to deal with
11 the situation where you are bringing the new line
12 through the area, through basically what is known
13 to many people as tornado alley?

14 MR. NEUFELD: Okay. There was one
15 weather event I described which wasn't in the
16 general proximity of Dorsey, and that's the
17 freezing on the Nelson near Kelsey, which I would
18 say would be equally as -- well, it would be
19 equally as detrimental as the loss of facilities
20 at or near Dorsey.

21 MR. LALIBERTE: That's correct.
22 That's one, but the vast majority of the examples
23 you gave were in the area where the new line runs.
24 And it seems to me that you should question
25 whether there are any mitigation, any mitigation

1 measures you could have taken? Like, for example,
2 going underground in parts where things are very
3 vulnerable. Did you contemplate that?

4 MR. NEUFELD: Yes, we did. And we
5 discounted it for a number of technical reasons,
6 including cost.

7 MR. LALIBERTE: Okay. Thank you very
8 much, and thank you Chair and panel.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you,
10 Mr. Laliberte. Mr. Wishart?

11 MR. WISHART: Thank you, Mr. Sargeant.
12 I just have a few points that I'd like to clarify
13 here. I'm Ian Wishart, I am the MLA here in
14 Portage and also a local resident.

15 When you were talking about you
16 needing for location for Bipole III, could you
17 cover a little bit about the criteria you used to
18 determine what is the proper route that you were
19 looking for? What kind of separation were you
20 trying to get from Bipoles I and II?

21 MR. NEUFELD: From a --

22 MR. WISHART: From a safety point of
23 view, I assume, and in that terms of Hydro
24 reliability?

25 MR. NEUFELD: Really our criteria

1 wasn't so much in safety as it was in a weather
2 event causing a common outage on the Bipole I and
3 II corridor, as well as the Bipole III corridor.
4 So we wanted a separation of at least 50
5 kilometres.

6 MR. WISHART: And you couldn't achieve
7 that in any of the Interlake routes?

8 MR. NEUFELD: Not to the satisfaction
9 of what we were looking for, no.

10 MR. WISHART: You quoted quite a few
11 numbers regarding the additional capacity that you
12 needed to achieve. Can we assume from that that
13 once Bipole III is complete, there will be a need
14 for additional lines in the future?

15 MR. NEUFELD: Yes, absolutely. I
16 mean, the 1500 megawatts, the piece that I didn't
17 get into on that reliability slide is if we go to
18 2019, we lose another unit at Brandon, and that's
19 another I believe 100 megawatts off. So that
20 1500-megawatt shortfall in 2017, gets larger in
21 2019, just by virtue of losing that additional
22 Brandon unit. So that will make it 1600. Plus
23 the reality of this province is that we have
24 continual load growth, and there has been a number
25 of different numbers cited in terms of how much

1 it's growing, but if we can assume conservatively
2 it's going to be 60 megawatts per year, that's
3 another 120 megawatts. So we are looking at 1800
4 megawatts. That's close to the capability of
5 Bipole III. And with continued load growth, our
6 projections are that the Bipole III line will
7 likely be adequate as a reliability alternative to
8 Bipole I and II into the mid 2020's.

9 MR. WISHART: Would it be fair to
10 conjecture, given that you ran the two previous
11 lines adjacent to one another, that the intention
12 is to do something similar with Bipole III, run
13 any further lines in association with them?

14 MR. NEUFELD: I would say it's too
15 early to tell.

16 MR. WISHART: But you did do that with
17 I and II?

18 MR. NEUFELD: We did that with I and
19 II. Those were different circumstances, it was
20 built at a much earlier time period. And at that
21 point in time, there was an expectation that
22 Conawapa would be coming into the horizon. And of
23 course, it never did. And so there was an intent
24 earlier on to have a displaced corridor separate
25 from Bipole I and II, but because of a variety of

1 economic reasons, that never happened.

2 MR. WISHART: But it is a possibility?

3 MR. NEUFELD: I believe that's

4 correct.

5 MR. WISHART: The lesson learned from
6 Bipole I and II and the weather events you did
7 have would suggest that you may have put them too
8 close together at some points, right? Because one
9 tower could fall onto another. You wouldn't
10 obviously do that again?

11 MR. NEUFELD: That wouldn't be the
12 intent, that is correct.

13 MR. WISHART: So likely any corridor
14 would be actually wider than the existing ones, if
15 the two were in association?

16 MR. MAZUR: My name is Ron Mazur, I
17 work for Manitoba Hydro. I'd like to add to what
18 Mr. Neufeld said.

19 Where we would run the next
20 north/south line, as he said, is undetermined. We
21 do learn from past practice also and past
22 mistakes.

23 MR. WISHART: We hope we all do.

24 MR. MAZUR: And if another line is
25 built, and at this day it's unknown, definitely we

1 wouldn't put it on the same corridor. So it
2 wouldn't be necessarily a wider right-of-way, it
3 would be a separate corridor. The geography in
4 Manitoba is such that if we're forced to build a
5 line, let's say on the west side, I think we would
6 try and maximize the separation.

7 We have done several studies, and you
8 asked earlier about the Interlake, we have done
9 several studies looking at the various effects of
10 separation for tornadoes, ice and wind. And on
11 the Interlake, for example, compared to the west
12 route, it's five times less effective in terms of
13 reliability on the system. So going forward, I
14 think most of our decisions are going to be geared
15 by a lot of technical analysis. And although
16 there's always constraints by other factors,
17 there's numerous other factors in choosing the
18 line, certainly that kind of analysis will be one
19 of them. Thank you.

20 MR. WISHART: Okay. And I appreciate
21 those comments. If I might take them a little
22 further then, you're suggesting that if there was
23 a need for another Bipole line, and Mr. Neufeld's
24 comments suggested that by 2015 we might be
25 looking at that, if I have the date correct, you

1 might not follow the same route at all, you might
2 use one of the other routes that you had proposed?

3 MR. MAZUR: I guess I am saying at
4 this time we would go through a routing process,
5 just as we had done for Bipole III, and determine
6 what might be the best available route with
7 respect to reliability and all the other factors
8 that are under consideration.

9 MR. NEUFELD: And one comment I would
10 add as well is that it would be too early at this
11 point in time to predetermine that that next line
12 would be a Bipole line, it may not be.

13 MR. WISHART: Moving on, I guess. In
14 your labour agreements, you mentioned the
15 Burntwood/Nelson labour agreement. I had a
16 preliminary look at that. And one would hope that
17 whatever is done here would be to the greatest
18 benefits of Manitobans, which includes hiring as
19 much local labour and Manitoba firms as possible.
20 So any construction on the Bipole line would be
21 open to all Manitoba companies with no
22 restrictions?

23 MR. NEUFELD: No, I didn't say that.
24 The Burntwood/Nelson agreement --

25 MR. WISHART: Applies in the north?

1 MR. NEUFELD: -- applies in the north.

2 In the south, I'm not sure if we have determined
3 for all line segments. Perhaps Mr. Penner could
4 provide some enlightenment on that?

5 MR. WISHART: That would be fine.

6 MR. PENNER: Good morning. My name is
7 Glen Penner. We have -- for Bipole the project
8 has split into eight line segments for
9 construction, and those eight line segments will
10 be worked under what's known as the transmission
11 line agreement, which was developed in 2009.

12 MR. WISHART: I'm not familiar with
13 that agreement I must admit. Are there any
14 conditions on firms bidding on portions thereof?

15 MR. PENNER: The transmission line
16 agreement requires any firms bidding on the work,
17 it becomes part of our tender package, and as part
18 of that, firms that are bidding on the work
19 must -- they can bring their supervisors and I
20 guess their management staff, but must hire
21 through the unions similar to the BNA. And in our
22 tender specs we will have local and Manitoba
23 hiring preferences.

24 MR. WISHART: So they must be a member
25 of -- they must have their membership, must be

1 part of a union to bid?

2 MR. PENNER: No, they don't have to
3 have -- sorry, I should back up. For workers to
4 work on Bipole, they will have to work under the
5 transmission line agreement. The contractors will
6 have to sign with the unions, just like the BNA,
7 and they will be a unionized project under the
8 project for the duration of the project. And the
9 workers on the line will either fall into IBEW or
10 the operating engineers.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Penner, is it not
12 the case that if a company that traditionally
13 doesn't have unionized employees bids on and wins
14 a contract, that it doesn't matter that they are
15 non union, but they have to, once they get into
16 that contract, then associate with unionized
17 workers?

18 MR. PENNER: Yeah.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: So they are not
20 precluded from bidding on the contract?

21 MR. PENNER: That's correct. It's a
22 project agreement. So they would sign on, the
23 company would sign with the union, and for the
24 duration of that contract their employees would
25 have to belong to either IBEW or the operating

1 engineers.

2 MR. WISHART: But only for the
3 duration of the contract?

4 MR. PENNER: Only for the duration of
5 the contract. They would be free to withdraw from
6 the union after that contract.

7 MR. WISHART: You are aware, of
8 course, that there is a legal challenge underway
9 of these types of conditions on contract bids, to
10 the province, not to you. You are aware of that?

11 MR. PENNER: I'm aware that there is a
12 legal challenge in regards to the TLA and the BNA.

13 MR. WISHART: And you're not concerned
14 that that may be extended to include you?

15 MR. PENNER: I'm sorry, could you
16 clarify that question?

17 MR. WISHART: You're not concerned
18 that the legal challenge will be extended to
19 include Manitoba Hydro?

20 MR. PENNER: I was under the
21 impression that the --

22 MS. MAYOR: Janet Mayor from Manitoba
23 Hydro. Manitoba Hydro has been included in the
24 litigation as a party.

25 MR. WISHART: Oh, they have. Okay.

1 MS. MAYOR: Yes.

2 MR. WISHART: My mistake. Thank you.
3 So you are already under legal challenge on this
4 issue?

5 MR. PENNER: That's what confused me
6 with your question.

7 MR. WISHART: Okay. Moving on.
8 Having a number of constituents that are part of
9 the farm community, they are quite concerned about
10 the impact. And I know you did show several
11 slides that showed the impact on agricultural
12 operations. However, I did note that none of the
13 slides you showed, showed row crop operations.
14 Are you familiar with row crop operations?

15 MR. NEUFELD: I have some familiarity
16 with that, but I would have to take that as an
17 undertaking.

18 MR. WISHART: Well, I think you
19 should, because the impact is far greater than
20 anything you showed in that. Plus there is some
21 of the region that you are planning in the route
22 that includes irrigation systems, and the
23 compatibility of a tower with an irrigation
24 system, to say the least, leaves a lot to your
25 imagination. You haven't considered impacts in

1 that regard?

2 MR. MCGARRY: Good morning,
3 Mr. Chairman, panel, and Mr. Wishart, and
4 participants, and ladies and gentlemen. I'm Pat
5 McGarry of Manitoba Hydro. Since I have said all
6 that, I have probably forgotten half your question
7 but I'll try anyway.

8 Irrigation was certainly considered.
9 There was very a serious attempt to avoid known
10 irrigation, or operating irrigation in about a 90
11 kilometre section of Manitoba between Highway 16
12 and around Carman.

13 MR. WISHART: So you have managed to
14 avoid the impacts, or you are just minimizing the
15 impacts?

16 MR. MCGARRY: I believe our Ag
17 consultant is here today too, and he can correct
18 me if I'm wrong, but I believe whatever we knew
19 was there, we avoided it. Now, that's not to say
20 that since that time in 2010, 2011, that other
21 irrigation could have been developed, or we know
22 there's moveable pivots out there as well.

23 MR. WISHART: And that was a follow-up
24 question. Is the height of the cable such that
25 these moveable pivots, which are very common these

1 days, or laterals, can be towed under them?

2 MR. MCGARRY: We have people here who
3 can speak specifically to clearance, but the
4 clearance -- our designer is here, maybe we will
5 get him to clarify -- I'll give you a rough idea.
6 If you want an exact number, he can provide it.
7 But minimum sag, or minimum clearance is around 35
8 to 40 feet under maximum operating conditions.

9 MR. WISHART: So a pivot which
10 averages under 20 would be able to be towed
11 underneath without any restrictions?

12 MR. MCGARRY: I'm not familiar with
13 the size of the towable pivots, but if you say
14 20 feet, then yes.

15 MR. WISHART: They vary but that is a
16 good rule of thumb. So you have no restrictions
17 on the towing of these things, movement of these
18 things under these lines?

19 MR. MCGARRY: No. But I mean if an
20 operator or a producer is using augers or any
21 other type of implement that has some height to
22 it, they should always be aware, and if they are
23 not sure, to contact Manitoba Hydro about
24 clearance.

25 MR. WISHART: Carrying that a little

1 further, there are quite a few buried water lines
2 as well. That's not a concern from your point of
3 view, we can continue doing that?

4 MR. MCGARRY: I'm not sure, how do you
5 mean the buried water lines in terms of --

6 MR. WISHART: Well, they are in the
7 ground. Other than being directly under a tower,
8 I see no reason why they should be a problem. Do
9 you see any reason why they should be a problem?

10 MR. MCGARRY: We, at least our group
11 has not anticipated buried pipelines other than
12 for tower foundations at this point.

13 MR. WISHART: And you have obviously
14 managed to avoid all gas lines?

15 MR. MCGARRY: That I couldn't speak to
16 you, but the property department would obviously
17 be aware of locations when they are acquiring
18 easement for Bipole III.

19 MR. WISHART: And, Pat, I know you are
20 aware of the nature of row crops. Would it be
21 fair to say that the impact of a tower in a field
22 with row crops is greater?

23 MR. MCGARRY: Is greater than?

24 MR. WISHART: Greater than the ones
25 that were shown here, which were all standard

1 field crops?

2 MR. MCGARRY: Well, I guess it depends
3 on how you look at it. For instance, the
4 compensation is -- well, first of all back it up.
5 We have identified, yes, there are effects of
6 putting towers on agricultural land. The method
7 of compensation is to account for the highest use
8 of that land. So, for instance, compensation for
9 row crop would be higher than cereal crop and
10 higher than pasture.

11 MR. WISHART: Therefore, one might
12 construe from your statement that the impact is
13 greater?

14 MR. MCGARRY: It's considered that
15 way, simply because of the fact the value of the
16 crop, when we take it out with the tower, has a
17 higher value than for other types of land use.

18 MR. WISHART: Thank you very much,
19 Mr. Chairman.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Wishart.
21 Does anybody else have any questions they wish to
22 put to Hydro at this time?

23 Blaine Pedersen is the first one on
24 our list. Mr. Pedersen, if we were to take a
25 break for 15 minutes right now, would that be a

1 problem, or would you rather go before the break?

2 MR. B. PEDERSEN: That's fine.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: We'll break for about
4 15 minutes and Mr. Pedersen will be up right after
5 the break.

6 (Proceedings recessed at 10:45 a.m.
7 and reconvened at 10:55 a.m.)

8 THE CHAIRMAN: In scheduling things
9 for this morning, we didn't allow time for the
10 question period, which was a mistake on our part.
11 So we are running a little behind our schedule.
12 We have a half a dozen people scheduled to appear
13 before lunch. We may not get to all of you.

14 I would note that those who are making
15 presentations, part of our procedures require that
16 we ask you to affirm that in your testimony you
17 will only speak the truth. Some of you may wonder
18 why we didn't ask this of Hydro officials this
19 morning. This question came up the other day in
20 Dauphin. It is because they were -- there's
21 nothing subterfuge or underground about it. All
22 of the people who have testified so far this
23 morning, or given evidence so far this morning,
24 did make an affirmation during our hearings in
25 Winnipeg a few weeks ago. And we do it only the

1 one time for the entire eight or nine weeks of our
2 hearings.

3 Later today we may have other Hydro
4 people respond to some concerns. And if they
5 haven't affirmed, they will then be asked to
6 affirm.

7 So Mr. Blaine Pedersen, please?

8 MS. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, while
9 Mr. Pedersen is taking his chair, I'd like to
10 enter the Hydro presentation as PTG number 1.
11 Thank you.

12 (EXHIBIT PTG-1: Hydro presentation)

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

14 Mr. Pedersen, I'll ask the Commission secretary to
15 make the affirmation.

16 MS. JOHNSON: Could you please state
17 your name for the record?

18 MR. B. PEDERSEN: Blaine Pederson --

19 MS. JOHNSON: Mr. Pederson, we'd just
20 like to make you aware that it is an offence in
21 Manitoba to knowingly mislead this Commission. Do
22 you promise to tell only the truth during
23 proceedings before this Commission?

24 MR. B. PEDERSEN: -- I do.

25 Blaine Pederson: Sworn.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir, go
2 ahead.

3 MR. B. PEDERSEN: Thank you,
4 Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. My
5 name, as I have said, is Blaine Pedersen, and I am
6 the member of the legislative assembly from
7 Midland, which covers south central Manitoba.

8 I want to thank you for the
9 opportunity to present today. I will keep my
10 remarks on the proposed route only, and the
11 effects it will have on landowners, homeowners and
12 their families, and the environment.

13 The municipality of Grey and South
14 Norfolk are contained within my constituency,
15 however, I have had considerable dialogue with
16 landowners in the neighboring municipalities of
17 North Norfolk, Portage la Prairie, Westbourne,
18 McDonald, Ritchot and others. The area
19 encompassing these municipalities contains some of
20 the best farmland, the most intensive agriculture,
21 and the densest population for a rural area in
22 Manitoba.

23 I have maintained communication with
24 landowners throughout Southern Manitoba, as well
25 as concerned citizens throughout Manitoba. I have

1 a mailing list of some 350 homes. I have held
2 public meetings. I have attended and participated
3 in community meetings with Manitoba Hydro and the
4 legislature. I have visited affected landowners,
5 as well as being available for phone calls. And
6 my Carman office has been a hub for information
7 pertaining to Bipole III. In short, I am well
8 versed with Bipole III landowner issues throughout
9 Southern Manitoba.

10 In my consultation there are four
11 primary areas of concern: One being route; two is
12 lack of technical answers; three is the proposed
13 compensation; four is liability.

14 And while your committee cannot and
15 will not address the political interference in
16 Manitoba Hydro's route planning, the proposed
17 route raises many questions. By my count and my
18 count only, the route crosses nine rail lines,
19 nine major highways, including the TransCanada
20 twice and Highway 75. Numerous provincial grid
21 roads are also crossed. This does not bode well
22 for safety, reliability, and increases access to
23 the line by the general public.

24 The route also takes numerous twists
25 and turns, trying to avoid homes, yard sites, et

1 cetera, throughout Southern Manitoba. This not
2 only affects costs, but I ask, is there a
3 reliability issue involved in this?

4 The Commission needs to explain why
5 the detours around sections three, four, five and
6 six, township eight, range five, west one,
7 transmission lines and intensive agriculture do
8 not mix. The agricultural technical report --
9 which I have printed -- in November 2011, goes
10 into great detail on the effects this proposed
11 transmission line will have on the agricultural
12 industry. Issues such as lower land values,
13 aerial spraying, liability insurance costs, weed
14 control, overlap of farming operations are all
15 discussed at length. However, on page 68 of the
16 report, the solution to these issues is and I
17 quote:

18 "Provide compensation based on a one
19 time payment."

20 This is not acceptable, and your committee must
21 include this in your examination as there is
22 long-term socioeconomic implications at risk here
23 should you approve the route as presented.

24 The report also discusses irrigation
25 at great length. And my colleague also brought

1 that up here just a few minutes ago. But we are
2 on the cusp of a major expansion, an irrigation on
3 the sandy soils in this area. This expansion is
4 based on increasing land values, strong commodity
5 prices, and technical advances in ag practices.
6 Retention ponds are being developed as a source of
7 water.

8 The report highlights the risk of high
9 voltage lines in close contact, not only with
10 irrigation pivots, but also the increased
11 conductivity when fertilizer is mixed in the water
12 as it is applied. What cost does agriculture and
13 food production have to pay as a result of this
14 transmission line? The CEC will have to decide, a
15 robust agricultural industry supplying raw
16 materials for further processing, or a Hydro
17 transmission line?

18 There are many types of livestock
19 operations, hog and dairy intensive operations,
20 beef cattle on pasture and feed yard operations.
21 I have heard concerns regarding the impact of the
22 transmission line on caribou, moose and elk. The
23 CEC must also address the long-term concerns of
24 farms whose livestock will be permanently located
25 under this proposed line.

1 With the selection of this route, many
2 questions from affected landowners have been
3 raised. Magnetic fields are a primary example.
4 And I am not an electrical engineer, so I raise
5 these questions seeking clear, informed answers.

6 It is incumbent upon the CEC to
7 address these concerns using technical expertise
8 away from Manitoba Hydro. A few examples, the
9 dairy farm located on sections 188, west one, will
10 be within several hundred metres of this line.
11 This dairy, he has already dealt with tingle
12 voltage in their barn, which has had a tremendous
13 impact on milk production with negative financial
14 consequences. What assurances do they have that
15 this line will have no long-term effect on their
16 operation?

17 As the line passes through the middle
18 of crop land, questions have been raised about
19 spontaneous combustion coming from dust from
20 agricultural equipment and the clouds of chaff
21 from combines passing under the line. This fall
22 was an excellent case in point, extremely dry
23 conditions producing a lot of static electricity.
24 What is the effect of having a 500 kV line
25 directly overhead of these operations? Will

1 farmers have to take precautions under these
2 conditions? How does the CEC evaluate these
3 concerns? Is there a magnetic field created as a
4 train passes under the line, or as semis pass
5 under the line, or an irrigation pivot passes
6 under the line on the trails and highways
7 aforementioned? How will the CEC address these
8 questions?

9 The route passes within 230 metres of
10 the residents on 285, west one, within 216 metres
11 of the residents on 587, west one. Is this an
12 acceptable distance, separation distance? A
13 resident on 185 west has a cochlear implant. What
14 factors do the CEC use for determining these and
15 other health concerns from living so close to a
16 line of this magnitude over a long term?

17 Simply accepting Manitoba Hydro's
18 mantra, and I quote, "don't worry, be happy, we'll
19 give you one time compensation" is not good
20 enough. The CEC must address these concerns.

21 The local environment will be affected
22 as a result of this transmission line. As we all
23 know, Manitoba's weather is anything but constant.
24 The Red River is known for its ability to flood
25 large tracks of valley land during the spring

1 melt. Does the transmission line in a flood area
2 pose a danger to people, animals, wildlife, even
3 the motoring public? What about localized
4 flooding across Southern Manitoba, will there be
5 need for special precautions taken in proximity to
6 this line during these events? How will this be
7 addressed in your report?

8 Shelter belts will be removed if this
9 route is approved. Section 288, west one, section
10 587, west one, section 584, west one are just
11 three of the many examples of this. What is the
12 environmental cost of removing these shelter belts
13 which protect the land from wind erosion and aid
14 in the absorption of greenhouse gases?

15 The residents on 288, west one, came
16 from Germany a few years back to escape what they
17 refer to as the industrial crush. They found a
18 small quiet hobby farm, and are now faced with
19 having their shelter belt completely removed,
20 leaving their house, small stock, and themselves
21 facing this Hydro line. Their comment to me was,
22 this is why we left Germany. Should they decide
23 to give up and sell, will Manitoba Hydro
24 compensate them for their loss in the property
25 value? These are the social issues that the CEC

1 must address.

2 My last topic of concern is that of
3 compensation and liability. Many of the
4 landowners do not want this line across their
5 property for reasons I have already outlined. The
6 amount of compensation being offered is not the
7 issue. There are many multi-million dollar
8 operations involved, so the amount of compensation
9 being offered is miniscule when compared to the
10 overall size of these operations.

11 However, the liability factor is real.
12 Landowners will have to purchase additional
13 insurance to protect themselves, not only from
14 accidents with structures with their own equipment
15 and employees, but also from accidents by the
16 general public on their land. As Manitoba Hydro's
17 only leasing the land, albeit in perpetuity, the
18 landowner is liable for any structural damage
19 occurring on their land. So if a landowner is
20 adamant about not signing a lease with Manitoba
21 Hydro, are they now facing expropriation?
22 Manitoba Hydro has refused to answer this. The
23 CEC must address this as part of your report
24 because this causes a great deal of angst amongst
25 landowners. This is a huge social issue. Should

1 this project be approved and landowners and
2 Manitoba Hydro cannot agree on compensation, are
3 landowners just going to be pushed aside and
4 forced to face the personal and financial
5 consequences on their own? I look forward to your
6 response.

7 Summing up, Mr. Chairman and members
8 of the committee, it is my sincere hope that you
9 will take seriously your role to address the
10 social and environmental concerns which I and many
11 others have raised.

12 I have included many questions for you
13 to answer, and I have tried to remain non
14 political in addressing these concerns. I
15 continue to be disappointed with the non answers
16 from the current government and I remain wary of
17 anything Manitoba Hydro has to say.

18 Your committee needs to be thorough
19 and travel the route, meeting firsthand the
20 affected families throughout Southern Manitoba,
21 and see the negative impact that this proposed
22 line is having on the environment, on food
23 production, and on the people affected. I have
24 done this and you should too. Your committee
25 needs to be responsible and do a complete and

1 honest assessment on the impacts of Bipole III
2 throughout Southern Manitoba.

3 Mr. Chairman, I wish you would have
4 been with me when I drove into a farm yard about
5 two years ago. A young mother was outside
6 watching over her three children. As I introduced
7 myself and explained why I was there, the tears
8 came in her eyes. She pointed to the west side of
9 her yard. She said they are going to take out
10 that entire bush and my children will have to grow
11 up under that line. Thank you.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you,
13 Mr. Pedersen. You have posed a number of
14 questions in this presentation this morning. I
15 don't know that I'll ask Manitoba Hydro to respond
16 to them today, because it might be hard to pull
17 them all out, but we will certainly look at your
18 presentation and determine which ones we need to
19 pursue at the appropriate time. When we return to
20 Winnipeg for our hearings, actually next week, we
21 will have presentations at different times from
22 the different experts that Manitoba Hydro engaged
23 in preparing the Environmental Impact Statement.
24 So when agricultural issues are on the table, we
25 will certainly look at these questions and ask

1 many, if not all of them, of Manitoba Hydro.
2 Before I excuse you, I'll see if any of my panel
3 members or colleagues have any questions or
4 clarification of you? It doesn't appear so.

5 Just in respect of your suggestion
6 that we tour the route, I agree with you that
7 would certainly be very informative, but it does
8 pose problems under administrative law, which we
9 operate under, in that we have to take a whole
10 entourage of Manitoba Hydro and other participants
11 along with us so that we don't appear -- so that
12 there can never be any suggestion that we are
13 biased if we go out alone and do our own
14 investigations in that regard.

15 I would also note you did suggest that
16 we should have our independent consultants look at
17 certain issues. And we do do that.

18 MR. B. PEDERSEN: Thank you,
19 Mr. Chairman. I have spent a lot of time on this
20 and I am very familiar with the landowner issues.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: That was obvious from
22 your presentation. And thank you for coming out
23 this morning.

24 Next on our agenda is Barry Pugh.

25 MR. PUGH: Good morning, Mr. Chairman

1 plan.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, sir. I
3 will ask the Commission secretary to affirm.

4 MS. JOHNSON: Could you please state
5 your name for the record?

6 MR. PUGH: Barry Pugh.

7 Barry Pugh: Sworn.

8 MR. PUGH: Good morning. My name is
9 Barry Pugh and I farm with my brother William 11
10 miles west of Portage la Prairie. We operate a
11 pedigreed seed farm. In July of 2010 we learned
12 that Bipole III was proposed to be built across
13 our land, affecting three miles of our farm.
14 Two miles of the line are proposed to travel
15 between ourselves and our neighbours, and the
16 third mile will bisect a full square section of
17 ours. This transmission line will pass within one
18 half mile west of our farmyard.

19 Being a pedigree seed farm, we
20 concentrate on a uniform weed control system
21 consisting of crop rotation, tillage, crop
22 competition and herbicide application. Over the
23 years we have excavated stone piles and landscaped
24 stoney headlands to manicure unobstructed sections
25 of farmland thereby increasing efficiency. Now

1 Manitoba Hydro and the Manitoba Government intend
2 to place ten or eleven towers in our fields,
3 re-creating our weed and obstacle problem, and
4 multiplying it many times over for generations to
5 come.

6 The placement of these towers will
7 change many aspects in the way we farm, none of
8 them for the better. These structures will force
9 us to increase our insurance liability, thus
10 raising our premiums, should one of our implements
11 make contact with a tower and cause damage.

12 Our GPS aided equipment will be
13 ineffective near these towers as the equipment
14 will need to be steered manually to avoid contact.

15 Tillage operations will become less
16 efficient from missing and overlapping, adding to
17 soil compaction as the tractors turn to avoid the
18 towers.

19 Seeding operations are greatly
20 affected with missing and overlapping, costing us
21 time and money.

22 The application of herbicides and
23 fungicides are seriously affected. As the
24 applicator turns to avoid the structures, the
25 varying speed of the spray booms and outer wings

1 will under apply and over apply chemicals. The
2 area under and around the structures will need
3 special attention, costing extra time and money to
4 keep clean. Since the ground applicator cannot
5 spray inside or close to the tower footprint, the
6 weeds will need to be hand sprayed multiple times
7 per growing season. If control is not achieved,
8 weed contamination of the surrounding area will
9 occur, as weed seeds float and blow around.
10 Aerial applicators have indicated they will not
11 fly near the structures, leaving many producers
12 without a necessary service.

13 Swathing procedures will be extended
14 as we have to dodge these structures. Combining
15 around these towers and under the lines introduces
16 an unknown hazard. How much danger is the
17 operator exposed to on a dusty day with low
18 humidity? What is the chance of static electric
19 arc developing between the lowest point of the
20 line and the highest point of the combine?

21 According to the Manitoba Hydro map,
22 as I see it, Bipole III passes over at least 12
23 railway lines and 15 highways, creating many
24 potential sites for major tragedies should a
25 tornado bring the transmission line to the ground.

1 With increasing truck traffic, what is the chance
2 of a static electric arc should a steady flow of
3 semi truck trailer units pass under the lines?

4 The southern portion of the proposed
5 transmission line passes through some of the most
6 productive farmland in the world. Food is
7 produced in the most cost effective way, and the
8 produce is of the greatest quality.

9 In a world that combats poverty and
10 famine, disease and death due to food shortages,
11 it is almost criminal that the Selinger government
12 proposed to eliminate the use of the soil that
13 feeds us for so little relative cost. The
14 footprint and surrounding area of each Bipole III
15 tower will be wasted land that could be feeding
16 people.

17 I know that cost of the project is
18 outside the scope of this hearing, but cost
19 directly affects community health, livelihoods,
20 and social health of every Manitoban. The last
21 cost estimate I heard from Manitoba Hydro was
22 \$3.28 billion, a number that most of us can't even
23 imagine. The Manitoba Government wants to steal
24 that money away from other projects that could
25 improve our lifestyle, like the upgrading of roads

1 and highways, building and staffing hospitals, the
2 list goes on. This mammoth project is set to
3 burden us with higher Hydro rates in order to
4 subsidize our American friends.

5 In summary, the western route of
6 Bipole III is a waste of time and money. The
7 proposal has already put a great amount of stress
8 on landowners, their neighbours, and Hydro
9 employees, and will cause more social tension in
10 the years to follow. I urge the Clean Environment
11 Commission to heed the points of concern of the
12 Manitoba citizens and recommend the project be
13 shelved until a sensible route and a profitable
14 purpose can be found. Thank you.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Pugh.
16 Any questions? There are none. Thank you very
17 much for your presentation this morning.

18 Jim Pedersen?

19 MR. J. PEDERSEN: Good morning,
20 Mr. Chairman.

21 MS. JOHNSON: Could you please state
22 your name for the record?

23 MR. J. PEDERSEN: Jim Pedersen.

24 MS. JOHNSON: We just want to make you
25 aware that it is an offence in Manitoba to

1 knowingly mislead this Commission. Do you promise
2 to tell only the truth during proceedings before
3 this Commission?

4 MR. J. PEDERSEN: Yes, I will.

5 Jim Pederson: Sworn.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir.

7 MR. J. PEDERSEN: You're dealing with
8 the Pedersens today.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: I think we have another
10 one scheduled this afternoon too.

11 MR. J. PEDERSEN: That's my wife, and
12 she is very, very concerned about the health
13 issues with our next generation. But you can
14 probably see that I may be towards the end of my
15 farming career and -- well, we have some other
16 ones coming.

17 Mr. Chairman, what I'll do is read my
18 presentation. If there is any questions after,
19 that is fine. Mr. Chairman, I will be addressing
20 our concerns within your Commission's scope and
21 some issues I feel should be mentioned may be out
22 of your mandate.

23 Our farm is located approximately
24 4 miles east of Elm Creek, established 94 years
25 ago, 1918. I am a third generation, our son is

1 the fourth generation, is also farming, and we
2 have five little grandsons, and odds are at least
3 one or more will farm.

4 We are intensive crop managers,
5 specializing in cash and special crops, i.e. corn,
6 soybeans sunflowers. We just harvested our 40th
7 corn crop. The land is conducive to vegetable
8 production also if we or the next generation
9 wishes to pursue this endeavour.

10 The proposed Bipole III line would be
11 located on the half mile line in the middle of the
12 section, completing dissecting our farm in half.
13 The line would be located 180 metres from the main
14 yard, 150 metres or less from the edge of the
15 Hydro right-of-way of the yard -- to the yard.
16 Travel under or around the line would be at least
17 once or possibly several times a day. Being that
18 close, whether it's you crop checking or going out
19 to work in the field or whatever.

20 Our main concerns are the Internet
21 service, affect on the GPS, RTK, a satellite
22 service that we have, liability insurance,
23 drainage on the home section that we own, 4-8-4,
24 shelter belts located on the half mile line on
25 section 5-8-4, we own a three-quarter section

1 there. We have a land mass of approximately 15,
2 16 quarters, all touching each other, running
3 about three miles in from north to south, and
4 about mile and three quarters running east to
5 west. Additional inputs, that's another concern,
6 additional input costs, inconvenience and working
7 around poles. And human stress is probably one
8 thing that really concerns -- I have a concern
9 about.

10 Internet, we all take for granted high
11 speed Internet access. A lot of rural areas have
12 poor service, i.e., dial-up. We have a line of
13 sight high speed service off a tower northeast
14 about 8 miles towards Fannystelle. This power
15 line would dissect that line of sight. How does
16 the EMF affect this? Possibly the answer might
17 be, too bad buddy, choose another source.

18 GPS and RTK guidance systems that we
19 use on the farm, satellite service is from Omaha,
20 Nebraska. And how will the EMF affect our use?
21 Two-way radios used from home base to mobile
22 equipment, this is an expensive technology, the
23 RTK and the GPS, and I have had to sign cheques
24 from ten to \$25,000 per unit to establish this
25 guidance system. I am not convinced, or have been

1 reassured by Hydro officials that everything is
2 okay. I won't accept the answer, oh, sorry, or
3 better yet, it must be your equipment because
4 nobody else is having the same problem.

5 Liability insurance: I understand we
6 would be required to handle a minimum of
7 \$5 million insurance, maybe even more. We would
8 be foolish not to. Additional cost in today's
9 dollars is \$176 on our farm. If you add my son's
10 part of the farm, you could probably double that
11 figure. That's on an annual fee, additional
12 annual fee. I didn't ask for this additional
13 yearly expense in perpetuity. Another one of the
14 reasons why Manitoba Hydro has to implement a
15 yearly inflation indexed remuneration fee with all
16 landowners.

17 Drainage: The proposed hydro line on
18 the half mile would go right on our own -- right
19 over our own private drainage ditch. The home
20 section, 4-8-4, slopes to the east with a 7-foot
21 drop on the mile. My dad and I have run all our
22 lateral drains from adjacent fields on this
23 section, to the centre of the section, and located
24 on our main drain, then which runs in an easterly
25 direction. The water flows east to the Red River

1 on this half mile line. There is no way I will
2 accept towers in the middle of our vital drain for
3 this section 4-8-4.

4 And I've got two pictures there which
5 show a westerly view and an easterly view, and
6 they are marked for your examination. You can see
7 that's the situation we have, we've got how we
8 move our water, how we manage our land.

9 Shelter belts: This is a subject
10 close to my heart. I am not a tree hugger per se.
11 We have spent our whole career strategically
12 placing shelter belts, leaving natural bush where
13 possible, all with the aim of preventing soil
14 erosion. We farm on a sandy, Alsipi sand soil,
15 it's what we call a black sand with a clay
16 underlay, and sloping out into an Osborne and Red
17 River clay base, or soil. All with the aim of
18 preventing soil erosion, slowing the wind from
19 those 5-mile sweeps in the winter time, trying to
20 create a warm environment for our crop, or
21 possibly vegetable production in the future,
22 leaving the land in better shape for the next
23 generation, being stewards of the land. And that
24 has always been a passion of mine. I want to
25 leave the land better than I received it from my

1 father. And I have a picture there showing that
2 newly established shelter belt. And the Manitoba
3 Hydro, if allowed, will be revving up their
4 bulldozers and tearing this new three quarter mile
5 shelter belt planted in 2006. The shelter belt on
6 5-8-4 was put on the half mile line by PFRA, under
7 our guidance, to help protect our farm yard from
8 snow issues in the winter.

9 You're probably asking why it took 40
10 years of farming before I planted the shelter
11 belt, but we didn't own the land so we couldn't
12 plant it. After we purchased it, we put the
13 shelter belt on.

14 I am very passionate about this issue
15 and will fight this to the last drop of my blood.
16 I'm very serious about that.

17 Additional input costs: I can see a
18 real problem here, overlapping of crop inputs,
19 precision farming techniques. Reviewing Manitoba
20 Hydro's agricultural technical report, I quote:

21 "Poles on farmers land, costs go up
22 for weed control, extra seed,
23 fertilizer, chemical, with decreased
24 yield of 10 percent." .

25 Using 2012 crop values, about 750 to a

1 thousand dollars per acre gross revenue, the cost
2 per structure would be closer to -- they had a
3 calculation of 200 and some dollars, but is
4 probably closer in reality to 2012 figures, about
5 \$450 per structure, compared to the example that
6 they had in their technical report, plus all the
7 infrastructure damage to drain, trees, crops and
8 soil restoration in construction of this project.

9 Another reason for yearly compensation
10 by Manitoba Hydro -- and I would like to invite
11 Mr. Neufeld out if he wants to come with me and
12 try and set a precision guidance system next to
13 poles with row crop equipment. That's not an easy
14 job.

15 Picture C shows Highway 13 in the
16 background, and also shows the prairie trail,
17 which is the municipal road allowance that travels
18 east from Number 13 Highway for two distinct
19 miles. And you can see, it's not a well travelled
20 road because it's all full of grass. The only
21 ones that use it are landowners that are adjacent
22 to it. It's rough and bumpy and nobody wants to
23 use it.

24 For two distinct miles on the north
25 side of 6-8-4 and 5-8-4, passing along the

1 municipal right-of-way on mile three on the north
2 side of 4-8-4, and hydro comes to Crown land,
3 which is the 11(a) drain, proceeding to the next
4 ten to 15 miles on top of one of the dykes.
5 That's -- I'm proposing changing it from the
6 middle of my section here. No buildings within
7 half a mile of the line, no compensation for
8 payment on Crown land, only landowners' traffic on
9 the first three miles east of the Number 13
10 Highway would be local landowners. No projected
11 streetlights were going to be put up out there, so
12 they don't have to worry about anything extending
13 up into their line.

14 Where was Hydro the day they did their
15 ground proofing? I read that in the agricultural
16 report. I wondered where in the heck were they
17 that day? Well, I won't say where they were.

18 There were many more issues like
19 decreasing land values, health issues working
20 around these lines, but one issue I would like to
21 address is my own human stress on this situation.
22 When Manitoba Hydro decided to build an
23 unrealistic expensive line down through the
24 heartland of Manitoba across private land like
25 ours, with little regard for our working

1 environment and our food production, with an
2 attitude of be quiet and get out of the way, this
3 issue is too important, we've got to get this
4 hydro line in place.

5 At the open houses I attended, I felt
6 Hydro seemed to be very vague on the health
7 concerns associated with working around these
8 structures. It is very frustrating and
9 intimidating when Hydro crews show up in August of
10 2012, GPSing and flagging all legal markers with
11 red tape, this is where the line is going. And I
12 think some of the red tape was on one of those
13 pictures that we had there. September 2012,
14 Manitoba Hydro showed up, or the contract land
15 managers are out wanting to sign up landowners'
16 easement rights. Small cash payments, the candy.

17 When we were approached we said, by
18 the landowners -- by the land managers, pardon
19 me -- that we had nothing to discuss because the
20 protocol was for the CEC to have their hearings
21 first, we thought. The answer by the land
22 manager to my wife in that telephone call was,
23 "Oh, well, it's pretty well 100 percent assured
24 anyways."

25 What credibility does this give the

1 CEC in my mind? I really thought about that.
2 Like is this just a done deal? Are we just
3 sitting here for nothing? Am I here just wasting
4 my time? Should I just shut up and let Manitoba
5 Hydro walk all over me, let them destroy
6 everything we have worked for in our lifetime?

7 I guess in conclusion, I would -- I've
8 got to look at it positively, Mr. Chairman, and I
9 sincerely, and I mean that, I sincerely hope that
10 this Commission will formulate some very good
11 productive advice for the Minister, and I wish you
12 well in this. But it is frustrating for us as
13 landowners. Thank you very much.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you,
15 Mr. Pedersen. I have two or three questions. One
16 is fairly basic. What is RTK?

17 MR. J. PEDERSEN: Real time kinetics,
18 it's a sub-inch guidance system.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Another question
20 I have is, we talked about the shelter belt along
21 the half mile line.

22 MR. J. PEDERSEN: Yeah.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Are they going to take
24 it out completely or just where the towers are?

25 MR. J. PEDERSEN: I don't know. I

1 haven't talked to them, I haven't talked to them.

2 But I have seen other hydro lines, and I would
3 suspect that you don't want trees growing up 25,
4 30 feet. And I think you said, what was the line
5 height, 37 feet or something like that?

6 THE CHAIRMAN: 40 feet was it,
7 Mr. McGarry?

8 MR. J. PEDERSEN: Something like that.
9 So I don't see those trees -- and then plus the
10 fact, do trees grow underneath the hydro line,
11 stunting possibly -- I would suspect that if they
12 are moving up and down here, they'd want to take
13 them out, but I haven't talked to them.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: And then when you spoke
15 about, I think it was your picture C where you
16 talk about the Prairie Trail, what you're
17 suggesting here -- or let me ask you, is what
18 you're suggesting here that there is another route
19 that would be more or less the same distance for
20 Manitoba Hydro, but that would avoid farmland for
21 quite a few kilometres?

22 MR. J. PEDERSEN: Yes. Yes, it would.
23 Like to me putting -- in our section here, 4-8-4,
24 for example, where the line would go right through
25 the middle of our home section, we'd have to work

1 around it. We are wondering about putting it a
2 half a mile north, and it's further away from our
3 yard, we don't get the sound, the noise, but also
4 just the fact that we're working around drainage
5 on our property. And yes, this Prairie Trail,
6 you've got 99 feet of municipal right-of-way right
7 there that's not being used. And it extends for
8 2 miles, the first 2 miles from Number 13 Highway
9 east.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: And then it would
11 connect with some Crown land, is that what you're
12 saying?

13 MR. J. PEDERSEN: No, it would connect
14 with another unit, the road on the north side of
15 4-8-4, which is there is a drainage ditch there
16 beside the right-of-way, or part way into our
17 land. And then going from there it connects into
18 11A drain, which has two dyke roads and it's quite
19 a wide structure. And following 11A drain, and
20 there's not much traffic on that road either
21 going, just the local people are using, or
22 landowners, local landowners.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
24 Mr. Gibbons?

25 MR. GIBBONS: Yes. A question for

1 clarification, if I might. Actually, I have two
2 questions, one regards drainage. Could you
3 perhaps explain a little bit more what the concern
4 is about the impacts of the line regarding the
5 drainage issues that you have indicated here? Is
6 it the case that there will be some kind of
7 interference with those drainage lines? I'm
8 not -- I need to be a little clearer on that.

9 MR. J. PEDERSEN: Okay. When we make
10 our -- my father and I have always ran our lateral
11 drains to the centre of the section, and we have a
12 private ditch which would be running the full mile
13 running east. And by placement of these poles in
14 there, we'd have to kind of ziggy zaggy around
15 these poles with our drainage work. And then
16 again, it gets into a situation where, like you've
17 got a ditch and you're coming around a pole, but
18 you've got -- where do you plant? You know,
19 you've got to come around with your planters and
20 so on. Like we're dealing with row crop equipment
21 here, we're not dealing with air seeders and so
22 on, air seeders for fertilizer, but planters.

23 MR. GIBBONS: So the expectation is
24 that the base of the towers will impede?

25 MR. J. PEDERSEN: Yes.

1 MR. GIBBONS: The second question is,
2 I'm not sure if it's for Hydro or for you or for
3 the other speakers. I've heard some very
4 interesting questions from all of the people that
5 have been coming forward so far. The one that --
6 we have heard this before, even in Winnipeg, we
7 have heard it here, we've heard it elsewhere, and
8 we know that the GPS concerns have been raised,
9 not just in agricultural land, but in mining
10 interests and so on.

11 MR. J. PEDERSEN: Yes.

12 MR. GIBBONS: Is there -- and I don't
13 know if Hydro can speak to this as well -- but
14 from your own experience and your knowledge of
15 others who might have agricultural land near
16 existing lines, what is the concern about the GPS?
17 Is there some indication that GPS devices are not
18 working in proximity to these lines? I will just
19 open this question up a little bit, if I could
20 hear a little bit more on that? Because we have
21 heard this, and it sounds like it is a real
22 concern for people. I'm just not sure if this is
23 based on experience, either personal or from
24 knowing other people who had issues?

25 MR. J. PEDERSEN: At the open houses

1 that concern was expressed quite often. And I
2 don't think we have a real good handle on the
3 answer. And in Hydro's case, I think that we have
4 to do some more research on that one there as to
5 the situations where will it affect or not. And
6 you've got electric, electronic -- EMF field,
7 electromagnetic field. And I'm saying any time
8 you have something like that, possibly -- when you
9 have RTK you've got a reference point and you are
10 sending a signal to your mobile unit. And would
11 that be affected? You also get a satellite signal
12 also, but you have a land correction facility. So
13 is that going to affect? You know, to be honest
14 with you, I don't know. But, you know, we've got
15 this technology here, we have to be careful, not
16 only just because I live right beside it, but will
17 somebody else be affected by it too? So that's a
18 real concern. It is a concern. So it's been
19 expressed many times. So, hey, look, we'd better
20 have a look at this before we explore -- or before
21 we build our line.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. McGarry, are you
23 able to offer some answers on this?

24 MR. MCGARRY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Good
25 morning, Mr. Pedersen. We have spoken many times

1 over the past few years. We heard a lot about GPS
2 signals and interference, or potential
3 interference, in our public consultation in rounds
4 three and four. And I think we have responded to
5 that. In round four we produced a brochure, which
6 I have here in front of me, and which I'll share
7 with Mr. Pedersen and anybody else who wants it --
8 specifically looking at GPS interference with
9 modern farm based GPS systems, that specifically
10 does talk about RTK and potential interference.
11 And we had our expert develop this from Exponent
12 Consultants. It wasn't Hydro who produced this
13 information or reviewed it. Dr. Bill Bailey, whom
14 you saw in the first week of this hearing, was
15 responsible for generating this material. In his
16 opinion, what's in the brochure is that there is a
17 low likelihood of interference with RTK GPS
18 systems and other GPS, including wireless
19 Internet. So I would encourage those who are
20 interested to read that.

21 We also conducted two independent
22 studies, which are part of the record, on
23 interference with farm GPS self-guiding systems.
24 One was done by Pollock & Wright, a well known
25 survey company here in Manitoba.

1 With those reports on the record, I
2 don't have them in front of me, but they generally
3 did not find trouble with -- actual systems that a
4 local producer might use were tested, a number of
5 them, on Bipoles I and II lines, to determine if
6 there was perceivable interference or effect on
7 the operation of those systems. They did not find
8 any specific effect. And again, it's on the
9 record, and we'll certainly make that available to
10 Mr. Pedersen and others.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. McGarry, just
12 remind me, in Northern Manitoba you moved a line
13 near Wabowden because of some concerns from the
14 mining industry. Was that a GPS issue or was that
15 something else?

16 MR. MCGARRY: That was to do with
17 aerial geophysical surveys, electromagnetic
18 surveys where there is a potential for
19 interference because they were measuring at
20 similar currents or similar frequencies as DC. So
21 they are the same system, they are DC operating
22 systems for geophysical assessment. We have a DC
23 line.

24 In this case you have transmission
25 equipment that's DC. The GPS are operating on

1 very high frequencies well above DC, which is
2 essentially zero hertz, and GPS signals in the
3 megahertz range. So again, Exponent reviewed it,
4 since I'm certainly not the expert here, and
5 produced material to describe all that.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

7 MR. MOTHERAL: Mine is more a comment,
8 Mr. Pedersen. I can personally relate to all
9 these concerns you have, and whether it's
10 comforting or not, they will certainly be brought
11 up in our next few weeks of meetings with Manitoba
12 Hydro.

13 I still enjoy going out to the farm
14 and running my tractor, because now I can fold my
15 arms and watch it go down the field. So I am a
16 past farmer, so I can relate to all that. Thank
17 you.

18 MR. J. PEDERSEN: And read the
19 newspaper while you are there.

20 MR. MOTHERAL: Yes.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kaplan?

22 MR. KAPLAN: I'm wondering, just for
23 clarification, Mr. McGarry, while you were up
24 front, I'm not sure I heard correctly, but did you
25 say based on Mr. Bailey's report and the material

1 you say you have there, that there is a low
2 likelihood of interference as far as GPS, or no
3 interference?

4 MR. MCGARRY: Just give me a second
5 here, Mr. Kaplan.

6 MR. KAPLAN: Sure.

7 MR. MCGARRY: I will just quote from
8 the material that Dr. Bailey produced. This is
9 specific to RTK GPS systems.

10 "Since the frequency bands of these
11 systems are far higher than the radio
12 noise frequency produced by a DC
13 transmission line, signal interference
14 is unlikely to occur."

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much,
16 Mr. Pedersen. Did you have a comment as well,
17 Mr. Neufeld?

18 MR. NEUFELD: I thought I could
19 perhaps just expand on Mr. Kaplan's question with
20 regard to the low likelihood. In these RTK
21 systems, though, the way they work is that they
22 connect to about three or four different
23 satellites concurrently. And when equipment comes
24 nearby the steel towers, there may be some
25 interference on one of those connections, but

1 there is two or three remaining. So when we talk
2 about a weakened system, that's what it is, but
3 there's fallback. So you get into shadows with
4 the one satellite, but there are remaining
5 satellites that pick up the rest of the
6 positioning signals.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: And do they need all
8 four satellites or --

9 MR. NEUFELD: No.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Is one or two
11 sufficient?

12 MR. NEUFELD: Well, you'd need two for
13 sure.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Two for sure, okay.

15 Next on our agenda then is Ray
16 Franzmann.

17 MR. FRANZMANN: Good morning.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, sir, I'll
19 ask the Commission secretary to affirm you.

20 MS. JOHNSON: Could you please state
21 your name for the record?

22 MR. FRANZMANN: Raymond Franzmann.

23 MS. JOHNSON: We'd just like to make
24 you aware that it is an offence in Manitoba to
25 knowingly mislead this Commission. Do you promise

1 to tell only the truth during proceedings before
2 this Commission?

3 MR. FRANZMANN: I do.

4 Raymond Franzmann: Sworn.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir.

6 MR. FRANZMANN: Thank you,
7 Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to make a
8 presentation here today on the Bipole III
9 transmission line. My name is Ray Franzmann, and
10 I'm a municipal councillor for and representing
11 the Rural Municipality of Grey.

12 The proposed Bipole III route will
13 pass along the southern edge of the municipality
14 for approximately 30 miles. Access to this route
15 will be done through municipal roads, some
16 all-weather, some not. Council is concerned that
17 during the construction phase there will be extra
18 demands placed on municipal resources to keep
19 these roads open and in passable condition, above
20 normal maintenance. After construction is
21 complete and during spraying applications of
22 agricultural crops, there will be an increase in
23 road traffic due to the reduction of aerial
24 spraying in those fields along the route. Because
25 of this increase, there will be extra costs in

1 maintaining these roads.

2 Municipalities by law, unlike
3 Provincial and Federal Governments, cannot deficit
4 finance, and must file annual balanced budgets to
5 the Provincial Government for approval.
6 Municipalities generate their revenues by taxing
7 properties through assessment. Unlike pipelines,
8 hydro transmission lines cannot be assessed for
9 municipal tax levy.

10 Rural development is key for the
11 community and municipal economic health in
12 maintaining existing municipal services as these
13 costs rise.

14 Council is concerned that the area
15 around the route will become a dead zone to
16 development, agriculture or other. The perception
17 of health issues and loss of property value will
18 be enough to stop development in and around this
19 line, which brings us to our concern on the effect
20 this line will have on property values. Lower
21 property values translates into lower assessment,
22 which equals lower taxes collected. Lower revenue
23 from this area will require higher taxes to be
24 levied on those remaining areas not affected.
25 Lower property values will take time to identify,

1 as sales of property don't happen right away, can
2 take years, even generations for farmland. By
3 then the municipality will have no recourse to go
4 back on Manitoba Hydro other than litigations,
5 which may not be very practical for the dollars
6 involved.

7 Given these concerns, council has had
8 discussions on compensation with Manitoba Hydro
9 representatives back when the three possible line
10 routes were proposed. Compensation would be
11 delivered to the Community Development Initiative
12 Fund, with some conditions on how this money is
13 spent. It was also indicated that compensation
14 payments would end in ten years. Both of these
15 conditions are not acceptable. Delivery of
16 compensation through this program does not answer
17 the municipality's long-term concern on higher
18 infrastructure maintenance cost, property value
19 loss, and loss of rural development potential.

20 It is council's recommendation to the
21 Commission that compensation must be for the life
22 of the project, and with no conditions on how this
23 money is spent. Otherwise, we call the Commission
24 to recommend that all Bipole transmission lines be
25 changed to a yearly grant in lieu of taxes like is

1 done for hydro substations. And that's the end of
2 my --

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you,
4 Mr. Franzmann. Just on your very last point,
5 currently for hydro substations, you get an annual
6 grant in lieu?

7 MR. FRANZMANN: That's right.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any
9 questions?

10 MS. MacKAY: The question about the
11 tax issue, you must have hydro lines, other hydro
12 lines through your area already. Is there
13 evidence that the property values are lower for
14 those properties than for properties not on hydro
15 lines?

16 MR. FRANZMANN: I have never -- you'd
17 really have to do an analysis of property sales to
18 see if that is the case or not. I haven't done
19 anything in that nature, no. So I couldn't really
20 answer that.

21 MS. MacKAY: Thank you.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you,
23 Mr. Franzmann. Next is John Fleury.

24 MS. JOHNSON: Could you please state
25 your name for the record?

1 MR. FLEURY: John Fleury.

2 MS. JOHNSON: Mr. Fleury, we want to
3 make you aware that it is an offence in Manitoba
4 to knowingly mislead this Commission. Do you
5 promise to tell only the truth during proceedings
6 before this Commission?

7 MR. FLEURY: Yes, I do.

8 John Fleury: Sworn.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir.

10 MR. FLEURY: Good afternoon, my name
11 is John Fleury and I am an elected board member
12 for the Manitoba Metis Federation southwest
13 region. I am also a Metis harvester, and I have
14 been hunting, fishing and gathering since I was a
15 child. These Metis traditions have been passed on
16 to me from my parents and grandparents, and I
17 continue to pass them on to my children and
18 grandchildren today. So while I live in
19 southwestern Manitoba, I, along with many other
20 harvesters in the southwest region, go north to
21 Riding Mountain, as well as to the Swan River area
22 for our annual moose and elk hunt. This is a
23 deeply entrenched tradition of our community. We
24 do this not just because that is where the moose
25 and elk are, we do it because these areas are

1 where our immediate and extended families are, and
2 it is how we maintain our connection to our
3 traditional territory.

4 Our hunting traditions in this
5 territory bring our families, our communities
6 together each year. Our community is not limited
7 to site specific settlements, towns, or villages.
8 We are one community throughout this territory
9 numbering in the tens of thousands.

10 Our constitutionally protected rights
11 throughout our community are recognized by the
12 Provincial Court of Manitoba in R versus Goodon,
13 where Judge Coombs stated:

14 "46: The Metis community of Western
15 Canada has its own distinctive
16 identity. As the Metis of this region
17 were a creature of the fur trade and
18 as they were compelled to be mobile in
19 order to maintain their collective
20 livelihood, the Metis community was
21 more extensive than, for instance, the
22 Metis community described at Sault
23 Ste. Marie in Powley. The Metis
24 created a large interrelated community
25 that included numerous settlements

1 located in present-day southwestern
2 Manitoba, into Saskatchewan and
3 including the northern Midwest United
4 States.

5 47: This area was one community as
6 the same people and their families
7 used this entire territory as their
8 homes, living off the land, and only
9 periodically settling at a distinct
10 location when it met their purposes."

11 More recently the Manitoba Government
12 has recognized part of our traditional territory
13 and our harvesting rights throughout this
14 territory. It has also recognized our Metis laws
15 of the hunt and our right to regulate and have a
16 say over our collectively held harvesting rights
17 in this territory.

18 So while much of our community's
19 traditional land base was taken from us through
20 fraudulent land grants, processes initiated under
21 the Manitoba Act, and then under the Dominion
22 Lands Act, we have never stopped using our
23 traditional territory to sustain our culture,
24 families and community.

25 In particular, our community's long

1 standing reliance on the west side corridor of the
2 province for harvesting is well known. We refer
3 to it as the large animal bread basket for the
4 Manitoba Metis community.

5 As a part of my presentation I have
6 attached a map that generally outlines this area.

7 Unfortunately, despite our significant
8 populations within this region and intense
9 reliance on it, the Crown proceeded to direct
10 Manitoban Hydro to route Bipole III through this
11 west side corridor without any consideration of
12 our rights, or interests, or way of life.

13 Naturally, what is now being proposed in this
14 territory matters very much to the Manitoba Metis
15 and we are not supportive of what Manitoba Hydro
16 is currently proposing. The Manitoba Metis have
17 an important role to play as the stewards and
18 users of this territory, but have been largely
19 ignored by Manitoba Hydro as well as the Crown to
20 date.

21 So you may be asking, why are we so
22 concerned about Bipole III and Manitoba Hydro's
23 lack of meaningful mitigation plans? The answer
24 lies in the map I provided. When you look at the
25 area that was recognized in our harvesting

1 agreement, it might look quite large. It's
2 approximately 700,000 square kilometres in size.
3 But when you factor in where the moose range is,
4 where we already have moose hunting closures, and
5 how much Crown land has already been disturbed in
6 the bread basket, you can see that Metis options
7 for moose hunting are increasingly limited.
8 Moreover our bread basket does not just provide
9 for the significant Metis population that lives in
10 the west side corridor, it also provides for our
11 families in the southwest region, as well as other
12 regions. We are already being forced to go
13 further north and apply increasing pressures on
14 other areas of the bread basket.

15 Yet, despite all these factors coming
16 together, Manitoba Hydro is proposing a route that
17 cuts a new linear corridor through the heart of
18 this area with little to no real baseline data or
19 solid mitigation plans in place.

20 For our community, this is
21 significant. We don't have any other options.
22 This is the area that has sustained us for
23 generations and it is under threat. We recognize
24 that with our rights come responsibilities. That
25 is why we have agreed to the moose closures.

1 However, our willingness to act responsibly should
2 not be taken advantage of by Manitoba Hydro or the
3 Crown by adding one more cut to the wound with
4 proceeding with Bipole III, without guarantees,
5 sufficient protections and accommodations in place
6 before the project is approved.

7 The MMF's experts are going to talk
8 more about the gaps in Manitoba Hydro's EIS and
9 the types of re-routing and heightened protections
10 that are needed, but is not acceptable that the
11 remaining exercise of our constitutional rights
12 are sacrificed to avoid costs to Manitoba Hydro or
13 avoid a landowner having to see a transmission
14 line out of their window. And our experts will
15 deal with these discussion items in Winnipeg at
16 your sessions.

17 There has not been a fair
18 consideration and balancing of the impacts on
19 Aboriginal rights and other interests in relation
20 to this project. Manitoba Hydro acknowledges this
21 because they say they aren't the Crown and they
22 don't have to undertake any procedural aspects of
23 the Crown's duty to consult.

24 On the other side, the Manitoba
25 Government has not meaningfully consulted with us,

1 and because of the deficiencies within the EIS
2 about impacts on the Metis community, the Crown
3 does not have sufficient information in order to
4 make a reasonable decision.

5 Further, discussions with respect to
6 re-routing go on without us, without any
7 consideration of how we use the land and the
8 impacts of our rights. This is unacceptable.
9 What are our options? Threaten to hunt in closed
10 areas, protest to get people's attention, go to
11 court, threaten protest? One thing is for sure,
12 we will not potentially harm the recovery of moose
13 populations in the bread basket to prove a point.
14 That is not in anyone's interest, including our
15 own as stewards of the land. But because we take
16 this principled position, we should not be taken
17 advantage of by the Manitoba Government and its
18 agent.

19 Instead of resorting to court or
20 protests at this time, we are here at the Clean
21 Environment Commission to raise these issues. We
22 believe in the important roles of the Commission.
23 We are making active use of the process available,
24 but the process needs to hear us and address our
25 concerns, not just rubber stamp Manitoba Hydro's

1 plan.

2 We are deeply afraid that when you
3 combine this new linear corridor with the other
4 disturbances that will arise from Bipole III's
5 construction on the west side, a perfect storm
6 will ensue in the bread basket, where the increase
7 of the moose populations will be delayed or be
8 permanently affected because of Manitoba Hydro's
9 choices and lack of planning.

10 We are already seeing the increased
11 congestion in the area is limiting harvesting
12 opportunities and forcing harvesters to push into
13 other areas, putting new strains on populations
14 that could lead to additional closures like GHA12.

15 To date we have found Manitoba Hydro's
16 responses to our concerns insincere and not
17 credible. Essentially, in response to a series of
18 our information requests, they answer in three
19 ways. They use the site selection environmental
20 assessment as the rationale for everything, but we
21 know the SSEA was flawed when it comes to
22 integrating real Aboriginal traditional knowledge
23 into the route selection. First, Manitoba Hydro
24 relies on an ATK study that uses artificial
25 Aboriginal communities and does not include

1 representative samplings of the legitimate rights
2 bearing community that did engage in that process.

3 Second, we know Manitoba Hydro has
4 already picked and settled on its route before
5 many of the self-directed studies from actual
6 rights bearing Aboriginal communities were
7 received. Hiding behind a flawed assessment that
8 did not meaningfully consider Aboriginal rights
9 can not insulate Manitoba Hydro's route from
10 scrutiny.

11 They essentially argue that since
12 there were many access routes in this corridor of
13 the province already, what's the harm of one more?
14 From the MMF's perspective, this is a callous
15 response. It's essentially arguing that, well, we
16 see your boat is already under water, flooding you
17 shouldn't be problem. We do not accept that this
18 is an acceptable response to serious concerns.

19 They say that any concerns about
20 impacts on moose harvesting or Metis harvesters
21 are the responsibility of Manitoba Conservation as
22 the responsible management authority, and Manitoba
23 Hydro does not need to concern itself with these
24 issues. Manitoba Hydro is the proponent asking
25 for the authorization from the Crown. It is their

1 responsibility. That's like a mining company
2 saying, we want to use water from the lake for a
3 tailing pond, but since we use the water, it is
4 the government's responsibility, they need to
5 figure out how to limit the damage from the
6 tailing pond. This wouldn't fly in other
7 environmental situations, it shouldn't here
8 either.

9 I hope my presentation has been
10 helpful in explaining some of the MMF's concerns.
11 As I indicated the MMF experts will detail these
12 things in greater technical detail, but I hope my
13 presentation was helpful in framing the issue and
14 explaining the real, on the ground impacts Bipole
15 III have on the Manitoba Metis community,
16 generally, and us living in southwestern Manitoba
17 specifically. Thank you.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Fleury.
19 Questions? No questions of clarification.

20 Thank you very much for your
21 presentation this morning.

22 MR. FLEURY: Thank you, ladies and
23 gentlemen.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: We're almost back on
25 schedule. We have one more scheduled for the

1 morning. I think we'll take him now and just
2 delay the lunch break a few minutes. Doug
3 Faurschou? Is Doug Faurschou here?

4 Well, I guess that puts us bang on,
5 back on schedule then. We'll take a break now for
6 one hour and reconvene at 1:00 p.m.

7 MS. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, just
8 before we go, I would just like to put these
9 presentations on record before we forget.
10 Mr. Blaine Pedersen's presentation will be number
11 2, Mr. Pugh's number 3, Jim Pedersen, number 4,
12 Mr. Franzmann, number 5, and Mr. Fleury's is
13 number 6.

14 (EXHIBIT PTG-2: Blaine Pedersen's
15 presentation)

16 (EXHIBIT PTG-3: Barry Pugh's
17 presentation)

18 (EXHIBIT PTG-4: Jim Pedersen's
19 presentation)

20 (EXHIBIT PTG-5: Ray Franzmann's
21 presentation)

22 (EXHIBIT PTG-6: John Fleury's
23 presentation)

24 (Proceedings recessed at 12:00 p.m.
25 and reconvened at 1:00 P.M.)

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll come back
2 to order. We have three or four people scheduled
3 for this afternoon. I'd also note that just at
4 the start of the lunch break, I asked Manitoba
5 Hydro officials if they could address some of the
6 concerns that were raised this morning in respect
7 of the agricultural concerns. I'm sure they won't
8 be able to address all of them in great detail but
9 I asked them to address some of them, particularly
10 some of the common ones that are of a general
11 theme. So we will have that presentation or
12 response after we have heard from all of those who
13 wish to make presentations this afternoon,
14 assuming that they are all here.

15 First on our agenda for after lunch is
16 Calvin Penner. Mr. Penner would you come up to
17 the front, please? We require that you affirm to
18 tell the truth so I'll ask the commission
19 secretary to take care of that.

20 MS. JOHNSON: Could you please state
21 your name for the record.

22 MR. C. PENNER: It's Calvin Penner.

23 MS. JOHNSON: Mr. Penner, we'd just
24 like to make you aware that it is an offence in
25 Manitoba to knowingly mislead this commission. So

1 do you promise to tell only the truth during
2 proceedings before this commission?

3 MR. C. PENNER: I will.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir.

5 MR. C. PENNER: Thank you. Hi. As
6 has been stated, my name is Cal Penner and I farm
7 south and east of Elm Creek. Bipole III is
8 proposed to come across my farm on which I have
9 lived for over 50 years.

10 Thank you for hearing my presentation.

11 My fear is however that this process
12 is only a formality that is slowing down the
13 inevitable. This inevitability was confirmed to
14 me by the person who came to our farm to ask us to
15 sign the right-of-way agreement. He asked us to
16 sign before this commission had even started, let
17 alone come to a conclusion. He told us that we
18 might as well sign and get on with the inevitable.
19 So you have to understand that what we are doing
20 today and this whole process is something that I
21 view with deep suspicion.

22 Still I want to take this time to tell
23 you about how I feel about this Bipole line that
24 will come across my farm.

25 Webster's dictionary defines the word

1 "bully" and I will quote and you can decide if it
2 applies in this situation: A person who hurts,
3 frightens, tyrannizes or browbeats those who are
4 smaller or weaker."

5 I have owned this farm for many years.
6 Now I am being told by someone who is bigger and
7 stronger than I that they can take away my
8 property rights and in all reality, there is
9 nothing I can do about it. Manitoba Hydro and the
10 Government of Manitoba can force me to do whatever
11 they want. I feel I am being bullied. Now in
12 life as in a school yard, we are trying to stop
13 bullying. Well, I say to this commission, stop it
14 here. I think that some of the same principles
15 apply in this situation as do in school yards. If
16 you look at a playground bully, you will find that
17 they are this way because someone has bullied them
18 and so on and so on. Someone has to break the
19 cycle of bullying. I hope it can be this
20 commission.

21 Manitoba Hydro was bullied into
22 choosing this more expensive route by the Manitoba
23 government who were, in turn, bullied by the
24 well-funded but poorly informed Eco movement in
25 the U.S. This is usually how the cycle of

1 bullying works. I say stand up to the American
2 Eco bullies who are trying to force us into
3 something that is not logical.

4 Now I would find it more acceptable to
5 come across my farm if I was on a direct route
6 from the generation station to the end user. I
7 can understand that giving up some of my rights
8 for the common good if there is some logic to it.
9 But going to the Saskatchewan border and then back
10 to Winnipeg defies this farmer's logic when by
11 going almost straight south, you would end up at
12 the Ontario border. There have been no good
13 explanations to me for this more expensive route,
14 just a few weak excuses that really don't have
15 much logic.

16 I also feel that I have been lied to
17 in this process so far. We have been told that
18 the lines will definitely be a certain height and
19 then later on to another consultation meeting and
20 had been told no, they will be higher. So it
21 seems to me that the final specifications have not
22 been done. So you can understand my suspicion.

23 As a business owner, I wish I could do
24 what Manitoba Hydro does. They misread a market,
25 lose money and then basically say oops, we screwed

1 up so we have to charge you more, just as they did
2 this last September. I wish I could do this as a
3 farmer. I wish I could say oops, I screwed up, I
4 didn't do proper grain marketing so now you have
5 to pay me because of my poor business practices.
6 Only in the world of government and Crown
7 corporations does this happen. I wonder if this
8 is as good as the highly paid executive and civil
9 servants can do. They do not take a pay cut like
10 I have to when I make a poor decision.

11 So this does not give me any
12 confidence in the sales projections that have been
13 done to try and justify Bipole III. I'm afraid
14 that there will be many large rate increases as we
15 are forced to pay for the huge mistake of the
16 Bipole route that is being proposed.

17 What makes this even more unpalatable
18 is that I will have to farm around the power line
19 that I am certain will cost me much more in hydro
20 rates. I think that compensation for land owners
21 should include free hydro. I am certain that with
22 all the new natural gas reserves that are being
23 found, there will be hydro generation from these
24 natural gas lines that will keep hydro rates down
25 globally or North America for the users of this

1 type of electricity. There are also new
2 technologies that will be developed to make coal
3 electrical generation much cleaner. These do not
4 bode well for Manitoba Hydro sales. We all know
5 that Manitobans will have to pay much more for
6 their hydro. At least pick the more direct, less
7 expensive route.

8 Another concern I have as a farmer is
9 the liability I have with a huge power line that I
10 don't want going across my farm. I am liable for
11 any damage that I do to this line, the line that I
12 don't want. I hope never to have an accident with
13 the line or poles with a line that I don't want.
14 Accidents do happen, however, and I can see that I
15 will have to bear all of the liability with the
16 current agreement. In the event of a catastrophic
17 accident, I or my insurance company would be
18 forced to pay for the loss of use for Hydro as
19 well as repair costs. There would also likely be
20 loss of life costs. These would bankrupt me.

21 I would like to propose that the
22 liability be shared with Manitoba Hydro. I would
23 propose that they look after their repair and loss
24 of use costs and I would look after my repair and
25 loss of use costs. Did I mention this is

1 something I did not ask for, yet there will be
2 costs that I will have to pay for.

3 The compensation should be similar in
4 my mind to what cell phone companies are doing.
5 They pay a negotiated monthly rental for each
6 tower and after five years, there is the right
7 between parties to cancel the agreement or renew
8 the agreement.

9 I feel that the costs and risks of
10 Bipole III and the proposed route far exceed any
11 benefits to me or my fellow landowners. Please
12 reconsider the route and the compensation.

13 I just had a new grandson on Saturday.
14 I'm afraid he will be the one who will be forced
15 to pay for the cost of the big mistake called
16 Bipole III. What will I tell him when he sees the
17 line on what will then be his farm? What will I
18 tell him when he sees what could be very well
19 cheaper rates in the U.S. with the natural gas
20 generated electricity? What will I tell him when
21 he asks me why I let this happen?

22 Thank you.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Penner.

24 Any questions?

25 Thank you very much for your

1 presentation today and thank you for coming out.

2 Next on the agenda are Helen and
3 Monique Graafland. I'll ask the commission
4 secretary to affirm you both.

5 MS. JOHNSON: Could you please state
6 your names for the record.

7 MS. M. GRAAFLAND: My name is Monique
8 Graafland and this is my mom Helen Graafland.

9 MS. JOHNSON: Ladies, are you aware
10 that it is an offence in Manitoba to knowingly
11 mislead this commission?

12 MS. M. GRAAFLAND: Yes.

13 MS. JOHNSON: Do you promise to tell
14 only the truth during proceedings before this
15 commission?

16 MS. M. GRAAFLAND: Yes.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: You may go ahead. And
18 just maybe lift the mike up a little. You have to
19 speak fairly closer into that mike.

20 MS. M. GRAAFLAND: Can you hear me
21 okay like this?

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

23 MS. M. GRAAFLAND: First of all,
24 thanks for giving us a chance to speak today.
25 We've actively opposed Bipole III west side for

1 several years already, which indicates how
2 seriously we take this matter. Many a tear has
3 been shed and precious hours of sleep have been
4 lost over this.

5 A few years ago, an oil pump station
6 was built about half a mile from our home. We had
7 our reservations but didn't see it as too big of a
8 threat. However, the pumps are running often and
9 are noisy. If I had to imagine the noisy, huge
10 Bipole lines only 200 metres from our house, I'd
11 go mad, and I am not exaggerating. I have
12 struggled many years with mental health issues and
13 this would be the proverbial straw on the camel's
14 back. We also have a natural gas line running
15 right beside the oil pipeline.

16 Besides the horrible environmental
17 impact there are enough studies out there that
18 show that magnetic fields can alter a person's
19 brain chemistry with long-term exposure. One of
20 the studies I read states,

21 "The Pineal Gland is a magneto
22 sensitive organ, what means that it is
23 sensitive to electromagnetic fields.
24 It is sensitive to electromagnetic
25 waves from computer monitors, cellular

1 phones, microwave ovens, high voltage
2 lines, etc. Electromagnetic fields
3 suppress the activity of the Pineal
4 Gland and reduce melatonin production.
5 The electromagnetic fields also affect
6 serotonin."

7 I work the night shift as a nurse in
8 long-term care and I know how important the
9 hormone melatonin is for someone's well-being.
10 Shift work disrupts the proper production of
11 melatonin because it is regulated by daylight.
12 And my serotonin supply isn't great to begin with.
13 Melatonin is associated with blood pressure issues
14 and Alzheimer's disease, and seeing that my
15 parents are elderly, this is not a good thing.

16 We came to this country over 20 years
17 ago looking for peace and quiet, to be able to
18 enjoy nature. My parents sold their land about 10
19 years ago, were able to build a new home and are
20 thoroughly enjoying the birds and nature in their
21 retirement. But now our home and well-being, the
22 bird sanctuary and the surrounding landscape is
23 being threatened.

24 We have satellite TV and Internet
25 which is not compatible with Bipole lines.

1 Selling our property is not an option
2 because no one wants to buy a house so close to a
3 Bipole line. Our home, while dear to our hearts,
4 has become worthless as far as real estate is
5 concerned.

6 If this was the only route Bipole III
7 could take, if it was a logical decision, we
8 probably wouldn't fight with such determination.
9 But that is the whole issue here. Engineers have
10 studied every possible option since the 1980s and
11 know Bipole III on the east side of the province
12 is the best option. There are virtually no farms,
13 no businesses, no homesteads in its path on the
14 east side. And as far as caribou go, there are
15 more caribou herds in western Manitoban than east.

16 I was recently in Newfoundland in
17 Gross Morne Park, a world heritage UNESCO site
18 with many moose and caribou in the park. And
19 guess what, there are hydro lines throughout the
20 park. The wildlife doesn't seem to care, they
21 migrate back and forth. They don't have to live
22 right beside these lines.

23 Another issue that bothers us is the
24 fact that we have hundreds, if not thousands of
25 geese passing by our property each spring and

1 fall. Quite often they stay for weeks on end,
2 which makes sense because we are right in the
3 Mississippi Flyway. Bipole III would disrupt
4 these poor birds' trek each spring and fall
5 because the line would be running from west to
6 east and the birds fly north and south. There is
7 also a substantial risk for birds to get killed by
8 the lines and poles, and I can't even begin to
9 picture this.

10 Having said that, and as much as we
11 love our animals and nature, I believe a proper
12 government would put its citizens and their
13 well-being first. What blows my mind is that
14 certain Americans seem to have a say in where the
15 Bipole line should be placed and it's not even
16 their province or their country. The excuse that
17 has been used by our government that the Americans
18 need our power supply is simply not true anymore.
19 They are switching many of their old plans to
20 purchase our hydro power to cheaper power supplies
21 in their own country. Just watch the debates
22 currently going on in the States and you hear this
23 time and again.

24 On the financial level, a west side
25 Bipole III would be a burden to our economy. Our

1 businesses and families will all pay much higher
2 electricity bills from here on in just to pay for
3 the extra length of a west side line. It could
4 easily be an extra billion dollars and that may be
5 a conservative estimate. Many farms will have
6 direct costs as a result of the line crossing the
7 best land in the province because their machinery
8 cannot function properly in the vicinity of these
9 Bipole towers and lines. There could be no aerial
10 spraying in the vicinity of the line because it's
11 illegal to fly under powerlines. There will be
12 fields affected that might not have the line right
13 on their fields but they might be right next door.
14 These adverse effects will be far and wide.

15 Dairy farmers living nearby may see
16 their milk production drop and a number of
17 miscarriages go up. If people without a farming
18 background don't think this is a big deal, it will
19 hit home when there is a shortage of grain, milk,
20 vegetables and meat. Farmers today are trying to
21 maximize production. It is a high risk occupation
22 where some factors are beyond their control.
23 Having to work around transmission towers that
24 have been forced upon them and that pose safety
25 risks for them is unacceptable and needs to be

1 stopped.

2 Hydro tells us that they can find no
3 proof it will interfere with farming. However,
4 they are completely unable to show us proof that
5 it may not and cannot guarantee us that there will
6 never be any adverse effects. There simply has
7 not been enough studies done over a long enough
8 period of time to prove anything one way or
9 another. What has been proven is that you can
10 light up a light bulb by holding it while standing
11 under the Bipole lines and that is disturbing.

12 I'm appealing to you today to
13 recommend a change in the routing of Bipole III.
14 To affect so many families in such a negative way
15 by coming through such a densely populated part of
16 our province and through our best farming
17 communities is simply wrong. I hope everyone
18 present here understands that we fight because our
19 home is being threatened. A home should be a
20 person's safe haven where one can relax and
21 recharge and be safe. The Bipole III west route
22 would change all that.

23 We will continue to pray that God will
24 end this nightmare soon. It is good to know He is
25 more powerful than all of us combined. Thank you.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you,
2 Ms. Graafland. Questions? Thank you very much
3 for your presentation today. Thanks for coming
4 out.

5 There are two other people on our
6 agenda but I'm not sure if they are here at this
7 time. Is Mr. Faurschou here? And how about
8 Vickie Pedersen, is she here yet? She was
9 scheduled for about 2:30.

10 Is Hydro ready to respond to some of
11 the issues that have been brought up today?

12 MR. BEDFORD: We are if you can give
13 us about five minutes and I'll find my witnesses.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So about five
15 minutes we'll hear from Manitoba Hydro in response
16 to some of the issues that have been brought up
17 during today, this morning and this afternoon.

18 MS. JOHNSON: While we're waiting, we
19 will put Mr. Penner's presentation on file as
20 number seven and Ms. Graafland's as number eight.

21 (EXHIBIT PTG-7: MR. PENNER'S
22 PRESENTATION)

23 (EXHIBIT PTG-8: MS. GRAAFLAND'S
24 PRESENTATION)

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

1 MS. MAYOR: Mr. Sargeant, in answer to
2 some of the questions that were posed this morning
3 and early afternoon, there were three Manitoba
4 Hydro brochures and we have put some at the back
5 table. We have got some here to file with the
6 commission secretary. While we're gathering our
7 witnesses in the next five or 10 minutes, perhaps
8 we can have those filed, allow individuals an
9 opportunity to review them. And then we're more
10 than happy as well as providing some of the
11 specific answers to the questions that were asked
12 this morning, if there are any additional ones, we
13 might be able to deal with them that way.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

15 MS. MAYOR: So there's three
16 particular filings. One is called the Bipole III
17 Landowner Compensation Information brochure. The
18 second one is called the Bipole III Alternating
19 Current Electric and Magnetic Fields. And the
20 third one is called the DC Lines and Electronic
21 Devices brochure. So those are at the back and
22 I'll also provide the commission secretary with
23 copies right now.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: While we're waiting for
25 Manitoba Hydro to set up, we did have a question

1 for both Mr. Penner and Ms. Graafland.

2 Mr. Penner, could you come to the
3 front? I think you acknowledged that in your
4 presentation, and I'm going to ask the same
5 question of Ms. Graafland, in your presentation,
6 you said that somebody from Hydro came to your
7 property and talked about signing agreements. And
8 you mentioned that this was even before the Clean
9 Environment Commission review and they just said,
10 well, why not get on with it; is that correct?
11 That it would be, how did you put it?

12 MR. PENNER: Inevitable.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. So they have been
14 to visit you in respect of getting an agreement
15 across your fields?

16 MR. PENNER: Yes, they have. I don't
17 remember the exact date, I can't remember exactly
18 when this commission was supposed to start but it
19 was a number of days before this one had been
20 started, it had been announced. They weren't from
21 Manitoba Hydro, they were representing Manitoba
22 Hydro. They were from Alberta, Evolve Land,
23 whatever. I can't remember, but the Evolve
24 company. The young person who was there, he was
25 from Alberta, and he had asked me to sign it. He

1 had two legal contracts there that I can sign and
2 I chose not to.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.

4 Ms. Graafland, did somebody from Manitoba Hydro or
5 Evolve contact you?

6 MS. M. GRAAFLAND: No. (inaudible)

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Just for the record,
8 she has responded that as her parents no longer
9 own farmland, they wouldn't have been contacted in
10 this respect. Thank you.

11 We've got quite a crowd up here. Are
12 we ready to go? Okay. Now, how will you do this?
13 Mr. Bedford, I'll let you handle it.

14 MR. BEDFORD: To respond to the
15 question you were in the process of asking, Mr.
16 Sargeant, I think to make things efficient, I will
17 direct particular questions arising out of some of
18 the concerns that we have all heard today to
19 particular witnesses for the sake of efficiency as
20 I said.

21 Before I begin to do that, a number of
22 persons have come forward and I have certainly
23 heard them. They are concerned that their private
24 insurance rates will go up. I would like to defer
25 a response to that specific topic to next week.

1 Manitoba Hydro has an insurance department and I
2 wish to review with members of our insurance staff
3 the circumstances in which the company would
4 subrogate and try and recover damage to these
5 towers. I know that our insurance operates
6 somewhat differently than conventional insurance.
7 But rather than have me stumble through that, as I
8 say, I'd like to review that with members of our
9 insurance staff and provide a comprehensive and
10 correct answer. And I expect that we can do that
11 next week.

12 I can also remind the commissioners
13 that we are slated next week to provide
14 presentations that we have prepared and to respond
15 to questions specifically on agriculture and also
16 on our compensation policy, but I understand we'll
17 try and address this afternoon at a general level
18 some of the compensation issues. And we're
19 certainly going to try and respond to some of the
20 concerns that farmers in particular have raised
21 about the construction of the line and their
22 concerns about how it's going to affect their
23 property.

24 So turning to the panel that's before
25 you, and I believe all the witnesses were affirmed

1 in Winnipeg during the first week of the hearing?

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

3 MR. BEDFORD: So I'm going to ask
4 Mr. Dyck first to deal, if you can please, Mr.
5 Dyck, with the concerns several farmers raised
6 that the construction and operation of this line
7 will result in the loss of shelter belts that
8 farmers, for quite obvious and good reasons, have
9 planted and maintained on their properties. Could
10 you please tell us a little bit, with assistance
11 from Mr. Penner if need be, how shelter belts are
12 affected and what mitigation measures Manitoba
13 Hydro intends to apply with respect to removal
14 and/or replacement of shelter belts.

15 MR. DYCK: Yes. The shelter belts or
16 some shelter belts certainly will be affected if
17 they either are crossed in a perpendicular fashion
18 or if they are overlapping the shelter belt in a
19 longitudinal direction. Those would be removed if
20 they happen to fall within the right-of-way unless
21 of course they are a low growth type of vegetation
22 on the outskirts of the right-of-way that could be
23 accommodated for.

24 In terms of mitigation, shelter belts
25 can be replaced. Again, low growth vegetation

1 shelter belts can be replaced on the right-of-way
2 itself; whereas tall-growing shelter belts would
3 be replaced or could be replaced at the owner's
4 request or agreement in an offset fashion parallel
5 to the right-of-way, but outside of the
6 right-of-way.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Can we just have some
8 clarification? Go ahead, Wayne.

9 MR. MOTHERAL: In the presentation by
10 Mr. Pedersen, he did show us some pictures. And
11 of course one picture was of a very young shelter
12 belt, five, six years old that's maybe about four
13 to five feet high. Is it necessary to remove that
14 complete shelter belt if a line is going exactly
15 over top of it?

16 MR. PENNER: Again, what Mr. Dyck
17 said, it would depend on the vegetation. So if
18 it's low growth brush or shrub, it would not be
19 necessary. If it's trees that we expect would
20 grow into the lines eventually, we would take it
21 out at the stage of construction.

22 MR. MOTHERAL: Would there be any
23 program at all? How do I put this? You do have a
24 program to keep vegetation down in existing lines
25 up north, the problem trees, et cetera, et cetera.

1 Could these not be trimmed every 10 years or so,
2 that they would not be a problem afterwards? I'm
3 just asking this question as for maintenance.

4 MR. PENNER: It becomes a large
5 maintenance problem given the length of lines that
6 Manitoba Hydro maintains throughout the system.
7 It would be better to plant low growth shrubs or
8 move the shelter belt off the right-of-way. I was
9 going to add to what Mr. Dyck said was that if we
10 do come in, to take a shelter belt out that we
11 would be offering to replant that shelter belt
12 outside the right-of-way or a low growth shrub of
13 some sort.

14 MR. MOTHERAL: Would that have to be
15 outside the right-of-way also or could you plant
16 the low growth shrubs within the right-of-way?

17 MR. PENNER: I think we'd be amenable
18 to low growth shrubs within the right-of-way.

19 MR. MOTHERAL: At what height would
20 you say you can allow them to grow without
21 maintenance?

22 MR. PENNER: I think the numbers are
23 around 12 to 15 feet.

24 MR. MOTHERAL: Thank you.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: How wide is the

1 right-of-way going to be when it's crossing
2 farmland? I thought you are really only taking up
3 the footprint that the tower stands on?

4 MR. PENNER: We will be taking
5 easement on the 66 metres wide. But as far as a
6 ground impact, it would only be the footprint of
7 the tower.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: So when you say putting
9 a shelter belt outside the right-of-way, that
10 would be 33 metres away from where it might be
11 right now?

12 MR. PENNER: If it wasn't low growth
13 shrubs, a full height tree type right-of-way would
14 have to be outside the right-of-way, outside the
15 centre line of the tower by 33 metres, yes.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: But you could replant
17 it immediately under the tower line if it's
18 15-foot brush or --

19 MR. PENNER: That's correct.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.

21 MR. GIBBONS: Just a further
22 clarification. In the picture that was referred
23 to, the photo referred to earlier, that growth was
24 the result of six years of growth and it was only
25 five to eight feet tall. If you clear out a

1 shelter belt of that sort and replant, are you
2 replanting something that's already five to
3 eight feet tall or is it something smaller? Given
4 the rates of growth, I'm thinking that there could
5 be a number of years where there could be problems
6 with soil erosion if what is replanted is even
7 lower than say five feet. So clarification on
8 that?

9 MR. PENNER: That shelter belt is
10 relatively new and I think we could replace that
11 shelter belt with something of a similar size,
12 yes.

13 MR. GIBBONS: Okay.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bedford? Sorry, we
15 had one more question from a panelist I missed
16 here.

17 MR. KAPLAN: Again, if I could just
18 continue with the shelter belt for one more
19 question to clarify. I'm not a farmer. How long
20 does it take for a shelter belt to grow to the
21 height in the photograph and even higher? Give me
22 a rough estimate.

23 MR. DYCK: It would depend on the
24 species, so it's totally dependant upon the
25 species. If you planted a Poplar species, for

1 example, it would grow very quickly. In a manner
2 of a couple of years, you would have that growth
3 and more. But if you plant some other shrub types
4 that are slower growing, that would take longer.

5 MR. MOTHERAL: One more shelter belt
6 question. There is a sag to that line and the
7 problem will be with trees would be in the lower
8 end of the line. Is there a chance that the trees
9 could go higher as you get closer to the poles?

10 MR. PENNER: No.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: They are doing that in
12 some place in New England, aren't they? As you go
13 outside the curve, they get sort of progressively
14 higher brush underneath the lines?

15 MR. NEUFELD: Well, that is correct.
16 So the issue in New England is you've got very
17 concentrated population densities in that area and
18 you have a much higher concentration of
19 transmission corridors within the utility area.
20 And so if we can imagine the number of personnel
21 that would be required to be retained for
22 rights-of-way clearing in an area like that as
23 compared to our line, which is 1,384 kilometres
24 long plus Bipole I and II, each 900 kilometres
25 plus all the other 230 kV infrastructures, it's a

1 very different problem.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bedford.

3 MR. BEDFORD: Mr. Penner, we have had
4 some concerns expressed that these high voltage
5 towers are going to interfere with drainage
6 ditches that farmers have developed on their
7 property and they are required to maintain. You
8 heard the concern this morning. Can you give us
9 some comments on the placement of the towers and
10 our expectations as to how we can accommodate the
11 drainage problems, the situation that farmers
12 have?

13 MR. PENNER: Sure. So yes, where a
14 transmission line would run parallel to a drainage
15 ditch, our structure is again on average 400 to
16 500 metres apart. Those structures would be a
17 cast in place pile foundation that could be in the
18 order of eight metres apart. So conceivably water
19 should have no problem flowing down that drainage
20 ditch. In fact, we have a number of transmission
21 lines throughout Southern Manitoba that would be
22 along these types of drains.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Could a tower stand
24 right on top of a drain? Could the drains run
25 between the feet of the tower?

1 MR. PENNER: You know, the picture
2 that was shown this morning, there would be no
3 concern at all. It all depends on the size of the
4 drain. And a large municipal drain is a
5 significant ditch in comparison and so it can also
6 vary depending on the size of that drain.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

8 MR. BEDFORD: And again, Mr. Penner --

9 MR. MOTHERAL: I have one more
10 drainage question, I'm sorry. When you place the
11 tower in the existing drain, albeit a small drain,
12 not a major municipal drain, the small
13 agricultural individual farmer drain, is it the
14 farmer's responsibility to keep the weeds or et
15 cetera out of that particular area to allow the
16 water to continue flowing?

17 MR. PENNER: Yes.

18 MR. MOTHERAL: Would there be
19 consideration of any compensation say on a
20 year-to-year or every other year to have Hydro
21 compensate to have that cleaned out?

22 MR. PENNER: I understand that that
23 part of the compensation is part of that, it's
24 built into that. So that's considered in the
25 compensation package for the structure payment.

1 MR. BEDFORD: And again, Mr. Penner,
2 we have heard from a representative from one of
3 the affected rural municipalities and he had quite
4 a legitimate concern that during construction with
5 the equipment and workers that Manitoba Hydro
6 brings to his particular rural municipality, there
7 will be much more use of the roads in the
8 municipality. More use of roads obviously leads
9 to more wear and tear and the obligation to
10 maintain and repair such roads. Please comment
11 for us on what the practice is of Manitoba Hydro
12 when you construct these towers and string these
13 conductors and have to use local roads.

14 MR. PENNER: Yes. So during the
15 construction phase, there will be larger vehicles
16 travelling these municipal roads. And a typical
17 practice for Manitoba Hydro to require the
18 contractor to maintain and ensure that the roads
19 are left in as good a condition as they were
20 before we were there. So any kind of damage that
21 would be done to roads or that could be done to
22 roads would be repaired. And as well, we do
23 follow requirements for all the highways for
24 weight restrictions and all of that sort of stuff.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Questions on that?

1 Mr. Bedford.

2 MR. BEDFORD: Mr. Mazur, I recollect
3 that there was a question asked during a
4 presentation this morning as to whether or not,
5 given that there will have to be a number of angle
6 towers for this west route and that the west route
7 does twist and turn throughout its length, whether
8 the fact of more angle towers and more twisting
9 and turning causes enhanced concerns about the
10 reliability of Manitoba Hydro system.

11 MR. MAZUR: Mr. Chair and
12 commissioners, the simple answer is no. As was
13 presented this morning, there are a variety of
14 towers available for Manitoban Hydro to use. And
15 the specific purpose, angle towers are built with
16 stronger ability to withstand the forces when the
17 line turns. There are dead-end towers that also
18 minimize any impacts on the transmission line. So
19 essentially the entire line, all the towers are
20 built to reliability level and expected failure of
21 one in 150 years. So other than, you know, cost
22 implications for the various towers, there really
23 is no reliability concern.

24 MR. BEDFORD: And either Mr. Mazur or
25 Mr. Neufeld, someone this morning observed the

1 obvious. We experience flooding sometimes over
2 the course of each spring in Southern Manitoba.
3 Sometimes because the Red River overflows its
4 banks, sometimes because the Assiniboine River
5 overflows its banks. Could you comment, please,
6 on the concept of planning a new high voltage line
7 in an area that is prone to flooding?

8 MR. NEUFELD: So the biggest safety
9 concern we have in the flood plain is with regard
10 to maintaining appropriate safe levels of
11 electrical clearance. And we all need to think
12 back only to 1997 to realize that Manitoba Hydro
13 had significant transmission lines out of the
14 Letellier area that were right in the middle of
15 the flood plain. Boats were driving around them.
16 And these lines are built to well beyond minimum
17 acceptable Canadian standards association
18 clearances. And certainly the same will be done
19 for Bipole III.

20 So the simple answer to the question
21 is we have no concerns about those clearances in
22 the flood plain.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Questions?

24 Mr. Bedford.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: This is a bit

1 far-fetched. But in a flood season, if a tower
2 were to come down for whatever reason and a DC
3 line were in the water, what kind of danger might
4 that pose?

5 MR. NEUFELD: So the typical
6 electrical clearing time is about 55 milliseconds.
7 So if there is a short to ground, the protection
8 equipment that is monitoring that line will
9 operate and activate the trip mechanism on the
10 high voltage circuit breaker so that the whole
11 thing clears within about 55 milliseconds.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: By clearing, you mean
13 it shuts down?

14 MR. NEUFELD: It's dead.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

16 MR. BEDFORD: Mr. Joyal, we heard a
17 concern expressed about cochlear implants and
18 whether or not there are problems for those who
19 have such implants, if they are living near a line
20 such as Bipole III? Could you comment, please?

21 MR. JOYAL: The issue of a cochlear
22 implant was presented to us from an individual
23 during round four. From that, we took it to our
24 specialist, Dr. Bailey. He did some research and
25 then called it in. We then responded to the

1 individual with a letter based on our findings on
2 no effects on a cochlear implant.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: None whatsoever, thank
4 you.

5 MR. BEDFORD: Again, Mr. Joyal, we
6 learned this morning, some of us, that a family
7 had been attracted to Manitoba and had moved to
8 rural Manitoba because they were attracted to the
9 aesthetics, wide open spaces and enjoyment some
10 people have of living in a rural environment. And
11 I know the particular example that was given
12 called to mind a recollection of some work that
13 you had done in public consultations with respect
14 to Bipole III. So please, without identifying the
15 particular family in question by name, can you
16 please tell us all your recollections of your
17 engagement with that particular family?

18 MR. JOYAL: During round four of the
19 consultation process, this individual or this
20 family had come to us to discuss the preliminary
21 preferred route at the time at the landowner
22 information centre. From there, their explanation
23 of their quarter section, they requested that we
24 send specialists, predominantly birds and
25 vegetation, to their home to take a look which we

1 then followed through. From their feedback and
2 other feedback in the area with regard especially
3 to fences and shelter belts in the area, a slight
4 adjustment was made from the preliminary preferred
5 route to the final preferred route slightly east
6 of where it was originally located on the half
7 mile line.

8 MR. BEDFORD: Mr. Joyal, we had at
9 least one individual today question what Manitoba
10 Hydro will do if in particular cases landowners
11 simply are unable to negotiate an easement with
12 Manitoba Hydro. And I understand that that
13 question was frequently asked during public
14 consultations. If you can please tell us all what
15 answer was given during those public consultations
16 which obviously will be the same answer that we
17 are responding with today.

18 MR. JOYAL: As it was discussed during
19 round four and throughout the EACP environmental
20 assessment consultation process, it is Manitoba
21 Hydro's intention to negotiate with each
22 individual landowner along the final preferred
23 route and reach an amicable agreement between
24 Manitoba Hydro and the landowner. But with
25 regards to the Act and the province, Manitoba

1 Hydro does have the authority to expropriate if
2 deemed necessary.

3 MR. BEDFORD: Mr. Neufeld, if I'm
4 capturing this correctly, one individual this
5 morning wondered about working on his fields, I
6 think particularly during harvest when it can be
7 very dusty, and he added circumstances of low
8 humidity. And then as I understand his concern,
9 he wondered whether that would increase concerns
10 about farmers operating underneath or in the near
11 vicinity of the Bipole III line, dust, low
12 humidity, combined with the proximity of the
13 Bipole III line. Can you comment, please?

14 MR. NEUFELD: So what we'd be looking
15 at is the types of weather conditions where small
16 particulate matter would be airborne and fairly
17 still. So in other words, the other dimension is
18 there likely wouldn't be any wind. And my
19 response is that we have thousands of kilometres
20 of line installed in Manitoba. Bipole III, by
21 comparison to Bipole II, has an additional full
22 metre of clearance, so it's even more than Bipole
23 I and II. We have agricultural activity beneath
24 Bipole I and II in the areas north of Winnipeg.
25 Never any experiences of any concern. Similarly

1 with a number of the AC lines, the 230 kV lines,
2 the 500 kV AC line down to Minneapolis, we far
3 exceed the CSA standard as I mentioned earlier and
4 we have built in substantial amounts of clearance
5 to ensure there's no flash over, even with the
6 largest combine harvesting below the line.

7 MR. MOTHERAL: It brings me to one of
8 the presentations this morning of a light bulb
9 being lit up underneath a power line. Can you
10 talk about that?

11 MR. NEUFELD: I'm not sure what test
12 was carried out to cause the light bulb to light
13 up. I can tell you with greatest assurance that
14 if it was an incandescent bulb, the filament
15 inside that incandescent bulb would not have lit
16 up. It needs a direct connection. We also know
17 there is a phosphor coating around the inside of
18 the glass that's encapsulated within the bulb. I
19 have never tried it myself. I have seen funny
20 things happen to fluorescent bulbs sometimes but I
21 think it's a phenomena different than the DC
22 fields which, as we have heard from Mr. Bailey,
23 are very low at the ground level.

24 MR. MOTHERAL: It was stated earlier
25 on in presentations about one of the disasters

1 that Manitoba Hydro encounters is fires, and how
2 there is a loss of power, is that correct, and
3 there's smoke. Can the same thing happen with the
4 dust? If there's a huge amount of dust in a dust
5 storm or whether it's in an evening of no wind and
6 there's 15 combines going and you can't see your
7 hand in front of your face, would there be the
8 same kind of power loss?

9 MR. NEUFELD: So the phenomena in a
10 forest fire is that of the air becoming deionized,
11 so there's a flashover from one pole to the next.
12 And I believe what you're asking is can that same
13 phenomena happen with multiple combines in a very
14 still environment with lots of dust in the air
15 also occur? It's never happened in our history.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kaplan.

17 MR. KAPLAN: Even though Mr. Joyal
18 helped me in our last visit out in the rural areas
19 to get on Wi-Fi with his special number, I find I
20 have to ask Mr. Joyal a simple question that
21 concerns me. And that is many of the people who
22 have spoken to the commission in our travels have
23 commented about Hydro's influence and power and
24 many of them feeling that Hydro has too much power
25 and too much influence as far as they are

1 concerned.

2 But my question to you, Mr. Joyal,
3 based on your answer to landowners who can't
4 negotiate with Manitoba Hydro and the end result,
5 your response, and let me just clarify, was that
6 Manitoba Hydro can expropriate. Is there any
7 further middle ground for some of these folks who
8 say, look, it's just not fair to me, I can't
9 finalize anything?

10 MR. JOYAL: In Manitoba Hydro's
11 history, expropriation is incredibly rare. There
12 can usually always be a level ground, as you put
13 it, to compensate the landowner and it's an
14 amicable agreement between both parties. But it's
15 not their intention to expropriate, it's Manitoba
16 Hydro's intention not to expropriate, but it does
17 have the authority if it is needed.

18 I don't know if I answered that how
19 you want it, Mr. Kaplan.

20 MR. KAPLAN: I'm just asking you for a
21 clarification, Mr. Joyal. Let me just continue
22 perhaps with another quick question. Hydro has
23 always impressed me this way, that they always are
24 accessible to numbers. So my question to you is
25 over the past X amount of time, take as much time

1 as you'd like, but what's the percentage of
2 matters expropriated in all of the dealings as far
3 as trying to negotiate a settlement?

4 MR. JOYAL: I can see if I can get it
5 by end of day or when we return to either
6 Niverville or Winnipeg.

7 MR. KAPLAN: Fair enough.

8 MR. NEUFELD: Perhaps there's
9 something I could add to that. As I have
10 indicated earlier, I have worked in transmission
11 for almost 27 years. For the better part of those
12 tenures, property department reported to me. So I
13 would have been aware of expropriations and there
14 were none that took place during the time of my
15 tenure.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gibbons?

17 MR. GIBBONS: Further along those same
18 lines, the thought occurred to me in the context
19 of the term middle ground, that there might be
20 provision for, for example, mediation. Is
21 mediation something that can be used by citizens
22 who have concerns that they rightly or wrongly
23 feel they are not being properly treated?

24 MR. JOYAL: I'm going to have to
25 respectfully pass that onto our compensation

1 individuals when we get back to Winnipeg.

2 MR. GIBBONS: Okay.

3 MR. BEDFORD: I think I could say,
4 Commissioner Gibbons, that we would certainly in
5 the legal department recommend any particular
6 cases that we look at mediation before
7 expropriation. And in response to Commissioner
8 Kaplan's question, it's one I have also asked.
9 And the answer is either zero or one. And I'm a
10 little embarrassed that I can't land on whether
11 it's the one. But I'm told if it is one, it was
12 with respect to a wind farm situation. And I am
13 not sure that we actually had to complete the
14 expropriation process. I know we had to commence
15 it, I'm not sure it ultimately was necessary to
16 complete it. And I'll try and get confirmation so
17 I can clarify whether zero or one in the company's
18 history.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have more
20 questions, Mr. Bedford?

21 MR. BEDFORD: I don't. We have
22 exhausted the list, but it was a personal list
23 that I made listening to presentations this
24 morning. Commissioners may have other areas and
25 other lists that we could try and respond to if

1 you have your own questions.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: I have two or three.
3 Somebody mentioned this morning increased
4 conductivity when fertilizer is mixed with water
5 as it is applied. Is that a concern? I mean does
6 anybody know that? Perhaps if you can get that
7 response next week then?

8 MR. NEUFELD: If the ground is dry, it
9 won't be as conductive as if the ground is wet.
10 And in terms of the laws of electricity, it's
11 pretty much that simple.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: But how does fertilizer
13 application affect conductivity? Does anybody
14 know that? Perhaps one of your agricultural
15 experts that appear next week, we might ask them
16 to see if they can provide something on that.

17 How about livestock living underneath
18 a Bipole or any transmission line? Is that a
19 concern?

20 MR. JOYAL: It was a concern that was
21 raised throughout the EACP. And I believe that
22 Dr. Bailey did touch on it in his presentation and
23 in his technical report which supports the EIS.

24 MR. NEUFELD: Might I add, to get into
25 some specifics here, I believe the concern that

1 was expressed was related to milk production and
2 some of the tingle voltages.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: That was actually my
4 next question. What is tingle voltage and does it
5 have any effect on milk production?

6 MR. NEUFELD: I do believe tingle
7 voltages do have an effect on milk production and
8 that happens as a result of alternating current
9 systems, not the direct current systems. So in
10 the alternating current systems, these are the low
11 voltage systems. If you can visualize feeders
12 going in to serve farm areas, and there are three
13 phases in the system and various farm yards are
14 fed off each phase. And every attempt is made to
15 balance out the loading on each of those three
16 phases such that there is no residual current. As
17 you can imagine, that would be fairly difficult to
18 do. And so there may be a time some residual
19 voltage. And that current flows into the ground
20 on the AC system. And if it's in a proximity
21 where there is certain types of equipment in farm
22 yards that causes the tingle voltages to occur
23 where a cow's feet will be at one voltage
24 potential and at perhaps a couple of volts
25 difference will be the machinery that they attach

1 to the cow for milking, that will result in some
2 discomfort for the cow. But this is a phenomena
3 on the AC system and it's very rare.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. It was
5 asked whether or not there is a magnetic field
6 created as trains or large vehicles pass under a
7 DC line. Is that of any concern?

8 MR. JOYAL: I believe in your
9 information request package, the initial
10 submission 007B is a letter provided by Dr. Bailey
11 to Mr. Rosschuk outlining that concern itself,
12 thereby stating that there is no concern with
13 regards to the potential.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Is there a
15 limit as to how close a residence or other farm
16 buildings or other buildings period can be to the
17 transmission line? We have heard today figures of
18 houses within 230 metres or another one I think
19 was 175 or 155 or something.

20 MR. MAZUR: I don't have that number
21 in my head but I guess we can get it for you.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you. I
23 have one more question. Evolve, what is or who is
24 Evolve? We've heard about it today, we heard
25 about it last week in The Pas.

1 MR. JOYAL: They are the land
2 acquisition agents that were acquired by Manitoba
3 Hydro.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: They probably didn't
5 take any sensitivity training about the CEC.

6 MR. JOYAL: I'd have to check with our
7 property department.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
9 Mr. Bedford?

10 MR. BEDFORD: I expect during the
11 presentation next week from the property
12 department, that they will specifically explain
13 why an Alberta consulting firm, firstly why is it
14 Alberta, not Manitoba, and why were they out in
15 the field before these hearings were completed and
16 before your recommendations were tendered. I
17 think it's a sensible question to be asking of my
18 client. I know there's an answer to it but the
19 answer comes better from a witness than from
20 counsel.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I think a
22 couple of the commissioners have more questions.
23 Mr. Motheral?

24 MR. MOTHERAL: Yes. I experience bad
25 Internet service and I know in the frustration of

1 many rural people, I don't understand really how
2 these waves work but there are towers put up and
3 there has to be a direct access line to these
4 towers. Is there a possibility the transmission
5 line, if it happened to be exactly in the line of
6 that site, would they disturb the Internet service
7 and would Hydro have any mitigation involved with
8 that?

9 MR. JOYAL: As discussed in the DC
10 electronic brochure that you have just received,
11 which has been at the back and filed with the EIS,
12 there is no anticipated effect with Internet. If
13 a tower were to be placed in that exact location
14 that interfered with the line of site, adjustment
15 of the receiver could easily be considered.

16 MR. GIBBONS: Yes. And I realize the
17 answer to this would have to be generic, you can't
18 speak of individual cases, but several people now
19 have raised the question of liability. And the
20 point was made earlier about insurance and I know
21 we're going to hear more about that later. But is
22 the general principle that people have been
23 referring to in fact the case? That the liability
24 for damage to the towers on, in this case,
25 agricultural land solely rests with the individual

1 landowner or is there some sharing of the sort
2 that at least one of the people had requested?

3 MR. BEDFORD: I think the answer to
4 landowners is I'm informed that our experience at
5 Hydro is we absorb that cost and we don't try and
6 recover it against individual landowners or their
7 particular insurers. My hesitation in simply
8 telling you that that works all the time, is I'm
9 cautioned that there are particular circumstances
10 perhaps where the company or our insurer does
11 choose to exercise subrogation rights. So as I
12 said earlier, I'd like an accurate and
13 comprehensive answer, and that's why I deferred it
14 till next week. But generally speaking, I am
15 informed, and having worked in the legal
16 department for a decade, I know that we don't
17 generally pursue citizens for damage to our
18 property, but we do on occasion. We also own
19 Centra Gas. We have far more frequent
20 interruptions of gas service because people don't
21 phone first to understand where the buried gas
22 pipelines are and there have been circumstances
23 where we have pursued careless contractors who
24 didn't phone and who damaged buried gas pipelines.
25 And so I'd like to be thorough, comprehensive and

1 clear and that will give people some comfort today
2 but it's not thorough and it's not comprehensive.

3 MR. GIBBONS: Thank you.

4 MR. MOTHERAL: Then is that to say
5 then, is it just a myth then that when farmers
6 burn poles by a fire getting away, that farmers
7 don't pay for that? Or I shouldn't say just
8 farmers, any individuals?

9 MR. BEDFORD: Well, that's why I want
10 to check with our insurers because as I said, I
11 gather there are some circumstances, Commissioner
12 Motheral, where either our insurers choose to
13 subrogate or the company does. And I suppose one
14 of the weighing factors might well be how careless
15 and ill-advised was the activity that lead to the
16 damage.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Joyal?

18 MR. JOYAL: Sorry, I just have one
19 clarification. With regards to the information
20 request that I had noted before 007B, that is in
21 the TAC request not in the CEC information
22 request.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. This may be
24 my last question, I'm not sure, for today. One of
25 the presenters this morning suggested using an

1 unused municipal road allowance. Is that ever
2 considered?

3 MR. JOYAL: We'd have to look deeper
4 into that specific, but with regards to figure 27
5 and 28 of the EACP technical report, I don't
6 believe that that request was brought to our
7 attention during round four.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you. That
9 concludes your questions, Mr. Bedford?

10 MR. BEDFORD: Yes.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very
12 much. I'd like to thank the Hydro officials who
13 put this together fairly quickly at my request.

14 I know when I spoke with the Hydro
15 officials at lunch time, I said that we didn't
16 need full exhaustive answers on all of the things
17 brought forward this morning but if they could
18 address a number of them, that might be helpful to
19 a number of you in the room today.

20 There will be an opportunity, it was
21 mentioned two or three times today, that Manitoba
22 Hydro will be presenting witnesses next week who
23 have expertise in this area and in fact did a lot
24 of the work for Manitoba Hydro in these regards,
25 and some of these issues may be pursued further

1 next week. So I hope that's been of some benefit
2 to a number of you in the room today.

3 I'll return now to our presentation
4 schedule. And I just ask, is Vickie Pedersen in
5 the room yet? Are you ready to go,
6 Mrs. Pedersen.?

7 MS. V. PEDERSEN: Yes I am.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Would you please come
9 up to the table at the front.

10 MS. V. PEDERSEN: Mr. Chairman.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Could you just wait a
12 moment please, Mrs. Pedersen. We have a practice
13 that we ask presenters and witnesses to affirm
14 that they will speak the truth so I'll ask the
15 commission secretary to take care of that right
16 now.

17 MS. JOHNSON: Could you please state
18 your name for the record?

19 MS. V. PEDERSEN: My name is
20 Mrs. Vickie Pedersen.

21 MS. JOHNSON: Mrs. Pedersen, we just
22 wanted to let you know that it is an offence in
23 Manitoba to knowingly mislead this commission.
24 And do you promise to tell only the truth during
25 proceedings before this commission?

1 MS. V. PEDERSEN: I do.

2 MS. JOHNSON: Thank you.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Pedersen, could
4 you just speak more closely to the mike. You need
5 to have that mike fairly close to you for all of
6 us to hear. Go ahead.

7 MS. V. PEDERSEN: Okay. Mr. Chairman,
8 fellow members of the CEO, my name is Vickie
9 Pedersen. I am a landowner and a farm partner
10 with my husband southeast of Elm Creek. Our
11 farmland is prime agricultural land in the Red
12 River Valley with the majority of our production
13 in row crops and special crops. My husband has
14 used good farming practices which have been
15 environmentally friendly all 44 years of his
16 farming career.

17 This transmission line goes against
18 such practices. Bipole III is scheduled to pass
19 through the centre of our home section as well as
20 an adjacent section affecting 1 3/4 miles on both
21 sides of the transmission line. This affects us
22 and our farm operation in many ways. Two of my
23 concerns are health and safety issues and the
24 devaluation of land values and the compensation.

25 My health and safety concerns:

1 Regardless where these towers are placed in a
2 field, they create an obstacle course for the
3 farmer. Farm implements range from 30 to 90 feet
4 wide, being operated by landowners, hired help,
5 custom operators and aerial applicators, some not
6 as experienced as others. There is a much higher
7 risk of hitting a tower in a field than if it were
8 placed on a road allowance, doing damage to the
9 tower and machinery as well as personal injury to
10 the operator. Also the height of combines,
11 augers, tractors and high boy sprayers also
12 decreases the distance between the actual power
13 line and the farm operator, making them that much
14 closer to the electromagnetic field.

15 This distance further decreases when
16 the summer heat causes the lines to sag. With the
17 engineering of farm equipment that bigger is
18 better, Hydro has no guarantee that the height of
19 farm machinery or the invention of a new piece
20 will not exceed their considered safe zone.

21 With a 30-foot implement to either go
22 underneath the line or to turn around near a high
23 voltage 500 kV HVDC tower, a farmer would come
24 into close vicinity of the EMF 175 times on one
25 side of the line per mile. That's 350 times on

1 both sides. During a crop year, a minimum of
2 seven operations take place, fertilizing,
3 harrowing, seeding, spraying, row crop
4 cultivating, combining and cultivating. Multiply
5 this by 350 equals 2,450 times in one crop year
6 alone a human is exposed to EMF and the risk of
7 hitting a tower. In addition, our approaches are
8 at the half mile lines. We would be driving
9 directly underneath the line, moving machinery to
10 and from the field as well as many trips back and
11 forth to the yard with grain trucks.

12 Besides being harmful, one mile of
13 nicely established shelter belts which, for your
14 information, took six years to establish which we
15 planted with PFRA to stop wind erosion would be
16 destroyed and a half mile drain necessary to carry
17 excess water east to the 11A drain would be
18 ruined.

19 The north edge of our farm is only 180
20 metres from the half mile proposed route and the
21 road north separating the two sections is the main
22 route travelled to several of our fields. Even
23 though there are no known effects of the DC line
24 on health issues today, but that could very well
25 change in the future. Regardless whether it is an

1 AC or DC high voltage electric current, current
2 passing through a line is dangerous.

3 Between the risk of hitting a tower
4 and the influence of EMF, it must surely have some
5 adverse effects on one's health over decades of
6 farming, whether it is us, our son, or our
7 grandsons. In general, people are fearful of
8 hydro lines and avoid them from a reason.

9 The stress of just thinking about this
10 line on our land has been overwhelming, the stress
11 of having to contend with farming around it will
12 be enormous.

13 My concern on land devaluation and
14 compensation. On a distance of 1 3/4 miles, the
15 seven, possibly eight Bipole III towers, according
16 to the Nielson & Associates, would reduce
17 productive area by 86.1 square metres per tower,
18 lower yields by 10 percent and the additional
19 costs of weed control and the inconvenience of
20 working up and around the towers by 18 percent.
21 This would be an annual additional cost to the
22 landowner.

23 The one-time compensation offered by
24 Hydro is totally inadequate as no compensation is
25 included for these extra losses and expenditures

1 for the consecutive years to follow. Considering
2 that the revenue from our crop on that land this
3 last year grossed \$750 per acre, that is a
4 substantial loss for us, especially when we, as
5 Manitobans, know that the hydro produced is for
6 the benefit of Americans. Hydro pays an annual
7 compensation to the Aboriginal people, we should
8 be entitled to the same.

9 In the past eight years, the land
10 prices per acre in our area have tripled and
11 continue to rise. Taking prime agricultural land
12 out of production is a waste, especially when we
13 grow the higher priced crops of soybeans, corn,
14 sunflowers and canola.

15 My husband and I are close to the
16 retirement stage of our lives where either renting
17 out our land or selling it is an option. Having
18 the transmission line through the centre of our
19 land would be a deterrent and unappealing to
20 potential renters and buyers, thus not being able
21 to attain its full value.

22 Considering that the demand for this
23 transmission line is no longer a priority as it
24 was previously, we, the landowners, would be
25 financially impacted not only by the yearly yield

1 losses, additional costs of working around the
2 towers, weed control, but also by the huge
3 increases in hydro rates to pay for the exorbitant
4 cost of building this line.

5 As landowners, it should be our
6 decision whether Hydro is allowed to construct the
7 line on our land. And should we allow it, we
8 should at least have the opportunity to negotiate
9 the prices and terms, not being told this is the
10 price, take it or leave it. Hydro's attempt for
11 us to sign an agreement for this project before it
12 was 100 percent approved was very offensive.
13 Regardless of how much Hydro offers, my husband
14 and I do not want these towers on our land.

15 In the Nielson report "The final
16 preferred route attempts to minimize the
17 disruption of people and the natural environment
18 within the context of technical and cost
19 implications." I recommend that Hydro does a
20 realistic comparison to re-evaluate the unoccupied
21 bush land on the east side route versus the
22 privately owned productive land of individual
23 landowners on the west side route. Hydro's
24 so-called preferred route affects many individuals
25 and land owners and their families and future

1 generations in my area alone. Does Hydro consider
2 that minimizing disruption of people? Other
3 routes have been suggested that would least
4 disrupt and inconvenience the many acres of prime
5 agricultural land instead of the proposed
6 so-called preferred route. It is obvious that the
7 cost implications have never been a concern to
8 Hydro as the estimate costs over the past two
9 years have only risen dramatically, when a reverse
10 decision to change the route to a shorter and more
11 economical route has never been an option.

12 In closing, as a landowner and
13 concerned citizen, I am very unhappy with Hydro's
14 and the provincial government's attitude and
15 approach to this whole project of Bipole III and
16 the blind eye and deaf ear they have given to me,
17 my husband, and all other concerned citizens
18 affected by it.

19 I appreciate this time the CEE has
20 given me to make this presentation and I thank
21 them for listening to my concerns.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you,
23 Mrs. Pedersen. It was in your husband's
24 presentation this morning, he noted that you had
25 been approached by a land manager who made some

1 comment about it's pretty well 100 percent assured
2 anyways?

3 MS. V. PEDERSEN: That's correct. He
4 phoned and wanted to make an appointment to come
5 and go over the contract and for us to sign it.
6 And I told him that until this project was
7 completely a go-ahead hundred percent, we were not
8 willing to talk to him. And he replied to me
9 that, well, it's a pretty assured go-ahead
10 anyways, it's pretty much assured. And then to
11 top that one off, because he couldn't come and
12 talk to us, then he sends out the contracts in the
13 mail. Like that's one slap on the face after
14 another.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Do you know if this was
16 somebody from Evolve or was it somebody with
17 Manitoba Hydro?

18 MS. V. PEDERSEN: I'm not really sure
19 on that. I couldn't really say. But whoever it
20 was looking after the contracts I guess.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr.
22 Gibbons?

23 MR. GIBBONS: In the discussion that
24 you had with this individual, was there any
25 reference to the idea that the line might be

1 adjusted in some way to consider your concerns?

2 MS. V. PEDERSEN: No.

3 MR. GIBBONS: That was never put on
4 the table?

5 MS. V. PEDERSEN: No, none at all.

6 MR. GIBBONS: Thank you.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much,
8 Mrs. Pedersen. Thank you for your presentation.

9 MS. V. PEDERSEN: Thank you very much
10 for listening to me.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Is Mr. Faurschou here
12 yet? I understand he's going to try to be here
13 sometime this afternoon. I guess not. Is there
14 anyone else in the audience who wishes to make a
15 presentation? Please come forward, sir. I'll
16 just ask the commission secretary to affirm your
17 evidence.

18 MS. JOHNSON: Could you please state
19 your name for the record.

20 MR. de ROCQUIGNY: Burt de Rocquigny.

21 MS. JOHNSON: Mr. de Rocquigny, we
22 just want to make you aware that it is an offence
23 in Manitoba to knowingly mislead this commission.
24 And do you promise to tell only the truth during
25 proceedings before this commission?

1 MR. de ROCQUIGNY: Yes, I do.

2 MS. JOHNSON: Thank you.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir.

4 MR. de ROCQUIGNY: Well, I'd like to
5 comment on the remark that panel Hydro had said
6 earlier about tingle, well we call it stray
7 voltage on the dairy farm. My brothers own a
8 dairy farm. They built a new barn in '05 and they
9 had a three phase line in. And we have heard
10 stories of having stray voltage in dairy farms,
11 this and that. And Hydro had promised them that
12 they followed all procedures by welding every
13 rebar and every stall together to make a good
14 ground, and if they had any problems again with
15 stray voltage, that it was going to be assessed
16 and taken care of.

17 Well, two or three years into the
18 operation of the new barn, they are having
19 problems with cows coming into the milking
20 parlour. They were shaking so bad that they
21 wouldn't not quite fall to their knees, but
22 anyways, it turned out that they had stray
23 voltage. And stray voltage was so bad that once
24 they managed to get Hydro in to assess the
25 problem, that they even shut down the pole at the

1 road. That's how much -- I can't tell you the
2 figures of what the stray voltage was coming
3 through the yard, but there was enough there to
4 create a problem in the dairy barn. It turned out
5 they grounded our barns so good that that barn
6 ended up being the main ground for the line going
7 along number 2 highway which is one and a quarter
8 mile north of the farm.

9 So this Bipole III line is passing
10 about I would say three to 400 feet south of their
11 manure holding tank, just south of the farm. So
12 with the loss of trust that they had -- okay,
13 going back to the stray voltage, Hydro did come
14 back and did regulate things. But it took a lot
15 of convincing. You'd have to talk to my brothers
16 about how they went about it, but they managed to
17 get it down. But they did lose two to three years
18 of production. So they lost their trust in Hydro.

19 And now Hydro is coming along and they
20 are putting up this Bipole III just south of their
21 farm and south of mine and within three to
22 400 feet from their holding tank is an upright
23 structure that holds manure. So all the equipment
24 needed to work around for cleaning and whatnot.
25 So you know, it's bad enough that they had to deal

1 with it once, now they've got to deal with it
2 again. So that's one thing.

3 And the other one I want to talk about
4 is liability. We're supposed to be liable for
5 those towers on our property. Now before I keep
6 on this, the line is going through seven quarter
7 sections of our property. And the first quarter
8 section, the line is actually turning 90 degrees
9 from the north going south, going east. And on
10 this compensation that Evolve is handing out, and
11 it is Evolve that's approaching us, they are only
12 being compensated on one side of that quarter
13 section and it's actually hitting the north to
14 south and the east to west side. So they are only
15 going to get compensated on one side. Anyways,
16 now we're going to be liable for those towers.

17 I used to have a hog barn. And at the
18 end of my days on the hog barn business, it is
19 hard to find an insurance company to want to
20 properly insure the hog barn. Now these insurance
21 companies, are they going to be treating these
22 hydro towers in the same respect and that we're
23 going to be stuck there with a tower that might be
24 liable to our farm? Who knows. We've got young
25 people working for us, 30, 40 foot equipment, they

1 can accidentally hit it at night. GPS is not 100
2 percent. So anyways, that's what I needed to
3 tell.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. de
5 Rocquigny. Any questions? Mr. Motheral?

6 MR. MOTHERAL: The half compensation,
7 was that because you were along a road allowance?

8 MR. de ROCQUIGNY: No.

9 MR. MOTHERAL: Could you explain that
10 a little bit more?

11 MR. de ROCQUIGNY: You're asking me
12 about the compensation of that quarter section
13 where the line is turning 90 degrees from the
14 north to the south going east?

15 MR. MOTHERAL: I'd probably need a
16 diagram to know what's going on. Maybe Mr. Joyal
17 is getting something out. Maybe he can fix that
18 up.

19 MR. de ROCQUIGNY: Just on the
20 northeast quarter of 2-8-8.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: So the line actually
22 makes two passes across that quarter, one going
23 north/south and then across going east/west?

24 MR. de ROCQUIGNY: Exactly.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: What you're saying is

1 they are only compensating you for one pass?

2 MR. de ROCQUIGNY: One pass.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: That's interesting.

4 MR. de ROCQUIGNY: And furthermore on
5 that, if you look at the map, they are showing
6 that the line is actually going in between the two
7 quarter sections, going north to south. But
8 earlier in the presentation, okay, maybe it's not
9 the same people that were talking about the birds
10 and the wildlife or whatnot, that they move the
11 line away 33 metres to the east. Well, I presume,
12 I could be wrong, I presume that with the quarter
13 section they were talking about. So it's actually
14 not running on the half mile. But he's only
15 getting compensated on one pass.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any
17 questions? You made the point about the insurance
18 and we can't give you an answer today but earlier
19 this afternoon, Mr. Bedford did say that he was
20 going to be making inquiries into the insurance
21 issue. And we expect that the commission will
22 hear sometime next week from Manitoba Hydro as to
23 how the insurance issue will come up. Almost
24 every farmer we've heard from today, probably
25 every farmer we heard from today has brought that

1 issue up, so we will pursue that. Whether we can
2 give you the results you want, I don't know, but
3 we'll certainly try to find out the answers.

4 MR. de ROCQUIGNY: Thank you.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for
6 explaining that stray voltage, tingle voltage. I
7 didn't quite get it. Your explanation helped me
8 understand it a little bit more even though most
9 of these engineering things are a little difficult
10 at times. So thank you, Mr. de Rocquigny.

11 MR. de ROCQUIGNY: You're welcome.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bedford?

13 MR. BEDFORD: Mr. Joyal can probably
14 assist, not with the insurance aspect of the
15 concern, but with respect to only one set of
16 compensation. Although we appear to have an angle
17 and a requirement for double compensation if I can
18 characterize it as such.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Joyal?

20 MR. JOYAL: All right. So I will try
21 to explain based on what you're looking at there.
22 The original routing of the preliminary preferred
23 route was on the half mile line in that section.
24 The final preferred route, however, is actually
25 offset into Mr. de Rocquigny's land north of where

1 it was originally placed during round four.
2 Therefore only one right-of-way would be paid, and
3 it is a continuous path throughout. It's not just
4 a north/south piece and an east/west piece, it is
5 the entire right-of-way throughout there. But the
6 original preliminary preferred route was in the
7 half mile and it would be split between that
8 landowner and the one below, if that helps.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: So Mr. de Rocquigny, or
10 I'm not sure if it was his land or his brother's
11 land, but either case, will be fully compensated
12 for all of the land that's used? So if it's, you
13 know, a half mile one way and a half mile another
14 way, he'll get a mile's worth of compensation?

15 MR. JOYAL: Yes, for the 66 metres
16 throughout the entire area on his property as well
17 as any structure payment and/or structure
18 placement payment would be compensated to him as
19 well. And just to add to the adjustment, based on
20 the feedback in that area, that was another slight
21 adjustment, to move off the half mile line based
22 on shelter belts, fences and proximity to homes.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Are there
24 any other persons in the audience who would like
25 to make a presentation? Yes, sir.

1 MS. JOHNSON: Could you please state
2 your name for the record?

3 MR. TKACHUK: Ted Tkachyk.

4 MS. JOHNSON: Mr. Tkachyk, we would
5 like to make you aware that it is an offence in
6 Manitoba to knowingly mislead this commission. Do
7 you promise to tell only the truth during
8 proceedings before this commission?

9 MR. TKACHYK: Yes.

10 MS. JOHNSON: Thank you.

11 Ted Tkachyk: Sworn

12 MR. TKACHYK: Thank you for letting me
13 speak. Only two points that I'd like to bring up
14 that were somewhat touched upon this morning. If
15 I had a choice of land to buy, whether it was a
16 clear piece of land with no Bipole III on it and a
17 Bipole III transmission line through another piece
18 of land, I believe I'd pay up to 25 percent more
19 for that piece of land without that Bipole III on
20 it. That was touched upon this morning.

21 The other issue is the tree lines, the
22 shelter belts that was brought up this morning.
23 The shelter belts that are directly below the line
24 don't interfere with too much of the land itself.
25 But if you put the shelter belt 33 metres outside

1 the centre of that line, that whole piece of land
2 is wasted. It adds up to quite a few more acres
3 of land that's wasted because you can't get in
4 there to do anything with that land under the
5 poles, between the poles and the shelter belt.
6 That's all I'd like to say.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Actually I'm glad you
8 brought that up because I started to pursue that
9 and then sort of left it when I asked a question
10 about 33 metres a side, because the same thing
11 occurred to me and I should have stated it I
12 guess.

13 MR. TKACHYK: Yeah, I wanted to make
14 that clear.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: You'd lose that 33
16 metres.

17 MR. TKACHYK: That's correct.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: It would be far better
19 to put 15 to 20-foot brush under it rather than
20 move it way off the line.

21 MR. TKACHYK: That's likely always an
22 option.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Penner, did you
24 have some response to this? Is that why you're
25 standing?

1 MR. PENNER: Yes. So the shelter belt
2 I would agree with you that moving it 33 metres
3 right on the edge of the right-of-way would take
4 away additional land for the farmer to go. So
5 what I was trying to say was that a shelter belt
6 would have to be outside the right-of-way but that
7 doesn't mean that we wouldn't move it to that --
8 if it could be placed a distance away, we would
9 look at that as well for you. If it's, you know,
10 a mile away or the half mile away and do it that
11 way rather than right under, that's something that
12 we could address.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: But you could also do
14 it right under as long as it's 15 to 20 feet high?

15 MR. PENNER: That's correct, under
16 15 feet, yeah.

17 MR. TKACHYK: That would not always be
18 an option. There would be several cases where you
19 would have to put it 33 metres because you put it
20 a mile away, that's not any good to the land
21 that's close to where they are worried about it
22 eroding.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think the
24 point that we would like to get across anyway is
25 the commission, without precluding or jumping to

1 our conclusions, but that there should be some
2 reasonable approach to placement of the shelter
3 belts. Is that what you --

4 MR. TKACHYK: Yeah, we haven't seen
5 much reasonable response from Manitoba Hydro yet.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: I won't comment on
7 that, but thank you. That's all you have to say?

8 MR. TKACHYK: Thank you very much.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Sorry, Mr. Gibbons has
10 a question.

11 MR. GIBBONS: Just a quick
12 clarification. This is a hypothetical. But if
13 the shelter belt consisted of this shrub growth
14 under the line, 15 feet high, is that sufficient
15 to provide reasonable wind protection against wind
16 erosion, depending on where it is in relation to
17 the land that you are actually tilling?

18 MR. TKACHYK: Yeah, I think that would
19 be reasonable. If it could stay there underneath
20 with the right shrubs, long-term shrubs and
21 everything else, yes.

22 MR. GIBBONS: Thank you.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Anyone else
24 wishing to make a statement or a presentation?

25 Well, we'll take a short break right now. We

1 won't shut down the hearings just yet. We'll give
2 people an opportunity, others an opportunity to
3 show up or if any of you in the audience change
4 your minds and wish to make a presentation, let us
5 know. Perhaps Mr. Faurschou will show up in the
6 next few minutes. We'll take a break for at least
7 15 minutes.

8 MS. JOHNSON: Could I just put some
9 more exhibits on the record?

10 THE CHAIRMAN: You may.

11 MS. JOHNSON: The Hydro Landowner
12 Compensation brochure will be number nine. The DC
13 Lines brochure number 10, the EMF brochure number
14 11, and Mrs. Pedersen's presentation number 12.

15 (EXHIBIT PTG-9: HYDRO LANDOWNER
16 COMPENSATION BROCHURE)

17
18 (EXHIBIT PTG-10: DC LINES BROCHURE)

19
20 (EXHIBIT PTG-11: EMF BROCHURE)

21
22 (EXHIBIT PTG-12: VICKIE PEDERSEN'S
23 PRESENTATION)

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. So come
25 back in about 15 minutes, please, roughly

1 3:00 o'clock.

2 (Proceedings recessed at 2:45 p.m. and
3 reconvened at 4:40 p.m.)

4 THE CHAIRMAN: I just want to check to
5 see if Mr. Faurschou has arrived or if anyone else
6 wishes to make a presentation? This will be your
7 last opportunity here in Portage la Prairie. So
8 if anyone else wishes to make a presentation,
9 please indicate right now, otherwise we will
10 adjourn the Portage session. We will reconvene
11 Friday morning in Niverville and then next week
12 and for at least four weeks following that, Monday
13 to Friday in Winnipeg, at a number of different
14 locations, Fort Garry Hotel the first week, Fort
15 Garry Place the second week and then the next two
16 weeks at the Convention Centre.

17 Also if anyone wishes to make a
18 written presentation, we accept those and would
19 welcome them from anybody here who may wish to do
20 that. Otherwise I think the commission secretary
21 has some more documents to register.

22 MS. JOHNSON: One more document.
23 Apparently there's one more Hydro brochure on
24 Direct Current and Electric Magnetic Fields and
25 that will be number 13.

1 (EXHIBIT PTG-13: DIRECT CURRENT AND
2 ELECTRIC MAGNETIC FIELDS BROCHURE)

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Anything
4 else we need to deal with this afternoon? Okay.
5 We stand adjourned and we'll see many of you
6 Friday morning in Niverville.

7 (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 4:04 P.M.)

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

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

OFFICIAL EXAMINER'S CERTIFICATE

I, DEBRA KOT, a duly appointed Official Examiner
in the Province of Manitoba, do hereby certify the
foregoing pages are a true and correct transcript
of my Stenotype notes as taken by me at the time
and place hereinbefore stated.

Debra Kot
Official Examiner, Q.B.

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.win2pdf.com>.
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.
This page will not be added after purchasing Win2PDF.