

1 calculated for those existing lines.

2 So it can be done, but we haven't seen
3 a case where it provided additional or
4 particularly useful information, more than what we
5 had obtained by modeling.

6 MR. MILLS: Sir, our sense is that
7 there is a great amount of concern, but the
8 concern, as you've pointed out, is difficult to
9 confirm. And we are wondering -- and we look
10 around to other constituencies, and appropriately
11 enough, in the case of the EMF on this line, we
12 look no further than the U.S. permit on the line
13 that this connects to. And Article 8 of that
14 permit -- and just let me take you through this;
15 bear with me.

16 "Minnesota Power shall investigate any
17 complaints from residents with regards
18 to EMF interference identifiably
19 caused by the operation of the
20 facilities covered. Minnesota Power
21 shall then take appropriate action as
22 necessary to mitigate such situations,
23 and complaints from individuals
24 residing within a radius of the
25 centerline of the transmission line

1 must be resolved. Minnesota Power
2 shall maintain written records of all
3 complaints."

4 Would it be -- it certainly seems to
5 work for that constituency. Can you see anything
6 that would prevent or -- yeah, prevent -- Manitoba
7 Hydro, as we do with air and water and all kinds
8 of other environmental variables, do you see any
9 problem with, as a condition of the licence for
10 this work, and in the face of all of the
11 concern -- and I respect, arguably, in many cases
12 unsubstantiated -- but in the face of all of the
13 concern, would it be -- would you have any
14 difficulty with supporting a licence condition
15 that called for Manitoba Hydro to do a pre and
16 post construction EMF reporting, as you have done
17 on existing lines, you've shared with us, and for
18 similar conditions within the operating licence to
19 be embedded, including a requirement that Hydro
20 mitigate any proven EMF effect of this line?

21 And before you answer that, in the
22 case of the American permit, they established a
23 radius; but all of the information you've provided
24 us with is that the further away you get, the
25 least risk there is. So I'm not sure that even a

1 radius would need to be considered, in light of
2 the fact that distance appears to eliminate EMF.

3 So a simple question: What the United
4 States permit does in requiring the utility to
5 prior measure EMF and then report to any cause or
6 concern, would you see a problem with that? Would
7 it be possible, scientifically, today?

8 MR. BAILEY: A moment, sir -- did you
9 read part of the permit that called for the
10 pre-construction measurements, or did you talk
11 about other activities? I may have misheard you.

12 MR. MILLS: I may have missed that.
13 I'm referring to Article 8 of the Great Northern
14 permit, which requires Minnesota Power to
15 investigate any EMF complaints and to take
16 appropriate action as necessary to mitigate any
17 proven complaints.

18 I am anticipating that in order to
19 substantiate an EMF complaint, we would need a
20 prior construction or baseline to measure against.
21 And I'm asking your scientific advice and help
22 in -- how would we describe that process? How
23 would we put that together?

24 MR. BAILEY: Okay. Thank you for
25 clarifying your question.

1 Certainly what you read out, as a
2 requirement from the permit on the U.S. side of
3 the line, seems to me pretty much standard utility
4 practice. If people have complaints about a
5 facility, in my experience, the utility is to
6 investigate that complaint and deal with it. If
7 that complaint was about EMF, it would be -- the
8 way that you would go about investigating that,
9 specifically, would be to go to the location where
10 that complaint originated, whether it is the
11 landowner or some portion of the right-of-way, and
12 take measurements there to determine if there was
13 anything unexpected.

14 And a pre-measurement may or may not
15 be at all helpful, because that pre-measurement
16 may not have been taken at a location which was
17 close to where the complaint arose, and so
18 therefore would not be helpful; or that there
19 might be site-specific conditions that might make
20 the area where a concern or complaint originated
21 to be different from what a standard
22 pre-construction survey might mean.

23 So, certainly a pre-construction
24 survey can be done, but it wouldn't be something
25 that would be particularly informative in terms of