

Wallingford-Ingo, Gail

From: Janet Jordan <janetjordanco@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2019 6:42 PM
To: Wallingford-Ingo, Gail
Subject: Fwd: Followup 1041 Permit 2019-003 Black Hills Energy
Attachments: Exhibit 1.jpg; Exhibit 2.jpg; Valuation Guidelines.pdf; Exhibit 4.jpg; Letter to Commissioners.docx

Sorry, attaching the narrative I missed.

Janet Jordan

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Janet Jordan <janetjordanco@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Dec 3, 2019 at 3:21 PM
Subject: Followup 1041 Permit 2019-003 Black Hills Energy
To: <gailwi@pueblounty.us>

Gail; the attached word document is my narrative and others are exhibits referred to for the Commissioners. I respond to several of their questions asked towards the end of the hearing on the Black Hills 1041 Permit 2019-003.

Please forward this on to the Commissioners as agreed.

Janet Jordan
Penrose Neighbors for a Better Route

December 3, 2019

Commissioners; I am writing to you to followup on specific questions you had at the 11-26-19 hearing regarding Black Hills Energy 1041 permit #2019-003.

First, let me address the contact issue with Fremont County. Exhibit 1 (attached) is the most recent record of contact from Black Hills to the THEN Planning & Zoning Director, Matt Koch, dated 3-23 and 3-26, 2018. Mr. Koch stepped down from his position in November 2018, and the email attached to my presentation at the hearing addresses the time since 2018, of which no contact has been made. For your information, the first original contact to Fremont County (per open records), was from HDR, a Black Hills representative to Matt Koch dated 12-4-17. This was forwarded to Commissioner Tim Payne 12-20-17 as a "heads up".

Second, Exhibit 2 (attached) is correspondence from Commissioner Debbie Bell dated 3-28-18 explaining where Fremont County stands on this matter, and nothing has changed since that date.

I would like clarification on one issue. If Wild Horse Creek is in a 100 year flood plain, how can this be utilized? We have been told numerous times when suggested, that Beaver Creek in Fremont County could NOT be utilized because it is a 100 year flood plain.

Further, distribution line easements have far smaller footprints than a transmission line. So how is there no impact converting a distribution to transmission easement up Wild Horse Creek?

Last year you asked Black Hills to look at alternative routes, including Highway 50. They replied at the hearing they were "not allowed" to utilize the Highway 50 easement. Where is that proof? The CO Department of Transportation website addresses in 2 CCR601-18, State Highway Utility Accommodation Code, "being implemented in an effort to conserve limited public resources, preserve future options and minimize conflicts between highway and utility facilities", they work with the other entities. The existing distribution line on Highway 50 is set to the back (away from the highway). This has left room for additions such as the recent pull off between Swallow and McCullough roads. IF in fact what Black Hills said is true, why not "upgrade" those poles and use the existing footprint?

As to the property de-valuation issue, there are hundreds of articles and studies on this issue. One that combines all factors for impacts on rural lifestyles and includes findings from over 12 different studies and many more review is by Kurt Kielisch, Appraisal Group One, "Valuation Guidelines for Properties with Electric Transmission Lines". I am attaching the PDF for this study (ehibit 3). "in conclusion, it can be stated with a high degree of certainty that there is a significant negative effect ranging from -10% to -30% of property value due to the presence of the high voltage electric transmission line."

A November 26, 2019 article in the Chieftan (Exhibit 4) by Black Hills Energy's Vice President for Southern Colorado, Vance Crocker, touts their renewable energy plans. Why is this not being offered as an alternative as well?

If you have further questions, or need more statistical research, my information is below.

Janet Jordan

Penrose Neighbors for a Better Route

janetjordanco@gmail.com

Exhibit 1

Matt Koch

From: Boutilier, Seth <Seth.Boutilier@blackhillscorp.com>
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2018 10:38 AM
To: Matt Koch
Subject: RE: Canon West Reliability Project
Attachments: BHE - Updated Route Map

Matt

I have attached an email with the latest maps in it. we will have an even better idea of where we need to be here in the next week or so.

Thanks

Seth Boutilier
Project Manager
719-546-6448

From: Matt Koch [mailto:matt.koch@fremontco.com]
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2018 9:17 AM
To: Boutilier, Seth <Seth.Boutilier@blackhillscorp.com>
Subject: Canon West Reliability Project

***** This email is from an EXTERNAL sender *****

Use caution before responding. **DO NOT** open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email. If this email appears to be sent from a BHE employee or department, verify its authenticity before acting or responding. Report suspected phishing messages by forwarding them to **Report Phishing**. Contact the Helpdesk with questions.

Hi Seth,

I am hoping that we can make contact soon to discuss the project through the Penrose area. We are concerned that running along the existing WAPA line has not been fully researched. We were told that they had not been contacted to discuss possible co-locating within the same easement?

Could you give me a call sometime to discuss this.

Thanks,

Matt

Matt Koch - Director
Fremont County Planning and Zoning
615 Macon Ave., Rm 210
Canon City, CO 81212
719-276-7360

This electronic message transmission contains information from Black Hills Corporation, its affiliate or subsidiary, which may be confidential or privileged. The information is intended to be for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware the disclosure, copying, distribution

Karen Olmen

Exhibit 2

From: Karen Olmen <kolmen@bresnan.net>
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2018 6:14 PM
To: Nancie Wright (office@nanciewright.com)
Subject: FW: Black Hills

From: Debbie Bell [mailto:debbie.bell@fremontco.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2018 3:50 PM
To: Karen Olmen <kolmen@bresnan.net>
Subject: Black Hills

Hi Karen,

Nice to see you again Monday night! It was an interesting evening.

I have had the opportunity to sit down and talk with the other Commissioners, our County Manager, and County Attorney. I do have some answers for you; other questions will need to be directed toward your attorney. Here is what I learned.

The Colorado State Constitution grants Black Hills the power to use eminent domain because they are a utility. They are regulated through PUC but are not a government entity; they are a for-profit corporation. That's why they are not subject to open records requests and yet have the potential of eminent domain.

Fremont County has asked Black Hills to not submit an application until all Rights of Way and Easement agreements are in place. Their request will be for a Special Review Use Permit, which is a process that automatically includes a public hearing. That public hearing absolutely will not be a farce; it will be a true hearing with your Commissioners listening hard to all concerns. Because we have the power of designating land use in the county, we have "siting" power, so it is not an automatic approval. Even if they have all ROW and Easement agreements in place, we still can either approve or disapprove of the route itself. We can turn down the entire project. We also can approve it with mitigating conditions such as weed control, access, shared use, roadway improvements, or the like. I don't believe Black Hills would be wise to even try to use the powers of eminent domain until their route is approved, by the Board of Commissioners.

What we cannot answer is your question on fair market value and total replacement costs if eminent domain happens. Those questions will need to be directed to your own attorney.

I really hope this helps. We had a very long conversation, and I now understand the process much more thoroughly. Thank you so much for bringing this to me originally.

Blessings,

Debbie Bell
Fremont County Commissioner
615 Macon Ave., Cañon City CO 81212
719.276.7300

BUSINESS

Exhibit A

Black Hills submits renewables plan

Officials say the objective is to lower customers energy costs

Black Hills Energy submitted a proposal Monday to the Colorado Public Utilities Commission, CPUC, outlining a plan that seeks to lower energy costs for customers by adding up to 200 megawatts (MW) of new, low-cost renewable energy resources to its Southern Colorado system.

As proposed, Black Hills Energy's Renewable Advantage plan would open a competitive solicitation process in December, seeking proposals for new, large-scale renewable energy projects to include wind, solar and battery storage — up to 200 megawatts of energy. While the company has sufficient power resources to meet customers' day-to-day electricity needs, Renewable Advantage is expected to deliver significant customer savings by supplementing existing power supplies with lower cost renewable energy.

Subject to CPUC approval, the addition of up to 200 megawatts of new renewable energy resources would result in approximately 60 percent of the utility's Southern Colorado generation portfolio coming from carbon-free resources by 2023. With the recent addition of the 60 megawatts Busch Ranch II wind project, the company will achieve 30 percent renewables by 2020.

"Our customers have expressed a strong interest in lower energy costs and having their electricity supplied by clean, renewable energy resources," said Vance Crocker, Black Hills Energy's vice president in Southern Colorado. "Our Renewable Advantage plan establishes a clear path for getting this done."

"With abundant wind and solar resources, we believe Pueblo and Southern Colorado have the potential to lead the nation in the adoption of clean energy technologies, while also saving customers money and growing the regional economy,"

added Crocker.

"Expiring federal tax incentives are making renewable energy projects extremely attractive for developers from a cost perspective, so there's never been a better opportunity for our customers to benefit from a plan like Renewable Advantage," said Crocker. "With a proposal of this magnitude, we are taking steps to ensure the economies of scale that seek to significantly reduce power costs."

In order to ensure the lowest cost for customers, Black Hills Energy expects the new renewable energy projects would be sited close to the company's existing customer load center, which includes Pueblo. The opportunity will be open to all bidders, including Southern Colorado-based developers.

According to the plan, bidders will have until Feb. 15 to submit their project proposals, which will then be reviewed by an independent evaluator overseen by the CPUC. Upon successful contracting for

low-cost renewable energy, the company would expect that customers would start seeing savings on their bills as soon as 2022. However, if the final bids do not result in lower power prices for customers, Black Hills Energy stated no procurement would take place.

More information is available at www.blackhillsenergy.com/renewable-advantage.

Black Hills Corporation

Black Hills Corp. (NYSE: BKH) is a customer focused, growth-oriented utility company with a tradition of improving life with energy and a vision to be the energy partner of choice. Based in Rapid City, South Dakota, the company serves 1.27 million natural gas and electric utility customers in eight states: Arkansas, Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, South Dakota and Wyoming. More information is available at www.blackhillsenergy.com.

Valuation Guidelines for Properties with Electric Transmission Lines

By: Kurt C. Kielisch, ASA, IFAS, SR/WA, R/W-AC

Before a discussion can be entered about the perception of electric transmission lines and their effect on property value, it is important to understand what a transmission line is and how it differs from a distribution line.

An electric *transmission* line is an electric line that transports electrical power from one substation to another. These lines are typically 100kV (kilovolts) or larger exceeding one mile in length¹, have large wood or steel support towers over 45ft in height, and often have more than one set of wires (3 wires per circuit plus the static wire). Electric transmission lines do not directly serve electric utility customers: their power is distributed from distribution point to distribution point. Transmission line wires are not insulated and are "bare". Typically, they constructed to have at least 20ft of clearance between the ground elevation and wire at low sag.

An electric *distribution* line is a power line that transports electricity from the substation to the electric utility customers. These lines are of less voltage, typically under 65kV, carried on wood poles of 45ft in height or less and hold one pair of wires. The voltages of these lines are downgraded before the electricity is brought to the customer's residence or commercial building. The focus of this report is on "transmission" lines, not "distribution" lines

Perception = Value

The valuation of properties that have an electric transmission line requires an understanding of the basic principles of Market Value. Market Value is defined, in layman's terms, as the value a property would sell for at a given date considering an open market. (A complete definition of this term is included in the body of the appraisal report.) An open market assumes that the property is available for purchase by the public, being properly marketed for maximum exposure, and that the buyer is well informed, fully knowledgeable and acting in their best interest. Included in this definition is that the buyer has full knowledge of the pros and cons of the property, and then acts with that knowledge in a way that will benefit them. In other words, the value of the property is based on the perception of the buyer. Understanding that perception drives value is the foundation in analyzing the effect that electric transmission lines have on property value.

The key point of the Market Value definition, which gives guidance to answer the "impact" question, is the "willing buyer" part of the equation. In appraising a property the appraiser attempts to reflect the potential buyer of the subject property and estimate their action as to the subject property with all its advantages and disadvantages (knowledgeable buyer). To accurately reflect this buyer, the appraiser must determine the typical profile of such a buyer of the property in question. An example of this

¹ Wis. Stat. 196.491(1)(f)

would be a one bedroom condominium along a lake may indicate a typical buyer to be a retired couple who is looking for a recreational retreat for themselves and their guests. Another example would be a parcel with the best use being a dairy farm; the typical buyer would be a person either currently engaged in dairy farming looking to expand or relocate, or one who desires to enter into this field -- in either case a "dairy farmer." Such an analysis should be obvious, yet often overlooked when appraising properties.

For rural properties that are utilized for agricultural purposes, the most likely buyer would be one who: (1) prefers the rural lifestyle over the urban lifestyle; (2) typically generates their income from working in the agricultural field; (3) would be sensitive to environmental issues that affect the uses of the land and the view shed of the land; and (4) would be sensitive to health and safety issues relating to the land and its use.

It is most likely that such a person, when confronted with an electric transmission line traversing the property, would view such an improvement as aesthetically "ugly," potentially hazardous to their health, disruptive to rural lifestyle and potentially harmful to the use of the land for agricultural purposes.

Research Format

Our research into the impact of electric transmission lines followed several stages. The first was a "literature" study. This study involved investigating, collecting, indexing and reading many of the published articles, news stories and published transcripts relating to the topics of EMFs and stray voltage. Stray voltage was included in this research due to the concern dairy farmers have relating to its presence from high voltage power lines. This research resulted in over 2,500 pages of information collected and analyzed. The purpose of this study was to discover "what is the public's perception of high voltage transmission lines." Overall, the majority of the articles indicated a "fear" of these power lines, citing health concerns as the primary factor. Other concerns included stray voltage issues (mainly with rural publications) and aesthetics. It was clear that most of the information the public receives about these matters is negative. The literature study will follow these "guidelines."

The second part of our study involved researching studies completed on the effects on property value due to the presence of electric transmission lines. This included collecting many of the published research studies on this topic found in the public domain. Additionally, the study reviewed trade journals not available to the public, but available only to real estate professionals. Again, to be fair, some of the studies indicated that there was no measurable effect. However, there were a number of studies (mostly recent) that indicated there was a measurable effect and that effect ranged from a loss of 10% to over 30% of the overall property value. These studies included both improved and vacant land.

Empirical Studies

Below is a sampling of some studies we have reviewed regarding the impact that electric transmission lines have on land value and were utilized to formulate our opinion of value when a property is impacted by a high voltage transmission line.

- *Study of the Impact of a 345kV Electric Transmission Line in Clark County, Town of Hendren.*

(Appraisal Group One, Kurt C. Kielisch, 2006, revised 2009) This study was limited to Hendren Township, Clark County, and covered a five year time period from January 1st, 2002 to June 1st, 2006. This study included 22 land sales of agricultural and recreation land, of which 4 were encumbered with a 345kV electric transmission line having wood H-pole design, 60ft height and 150ft wide easement. The other 18 land sales were considered comparable to the power line encumbered sales. The conclusion of this study was that: (a) the land sales with an electric transmission line sold for 23% less than comparable land sales without a transmission line; and, (b) the more severe the location of the power line the greater was the loss of value.

- *An Impact Study of a 345kV Electric Transmission Line on Rural Property Value in Marathon County - Wisconsin.* (Appraisal Group One, Kurt C. Kielisch, 2006) This study focused on the impact a 345kV line, known as the Arrowhead-Weston line, had on property value. This power line was a 345kV electric transmission line, having steel single poles ranging in height from 110ft to 150ft, single and double circuit lines, having a 120ft wide easement. The study compared sales within a 2 year time period (January 1st, 2004 to December 31st, 2005) in Marathon County, Wisconsin, focusing the area to the Townships of Cassel and Mosinee. This study used 14 land sales, of which 5 were encumbered with the power line and 9 were not. A simple regression technique and matched pair analysis was used to extract the value impact. The study concluded with a finding that when the power line traversed the property along the edge, such as a back fence line, the loss was as low as -15%, and when it bisected a large parcel the loss was as high as -34%. The properties were all raw land sales with either agricultural or residential land use.
- *Transmission Lines and Property Values State of the Science* (Electric Power Research Institute [EPRI], 2003). This study completed by EPRI for the benefit of its electric utility clients reviewed the issue of property values being impacted by electric transmission lines by summarizing research they had on the subject. Essentially they concluded that the results are mixed, some cases showing a loss in value ranging from 7-15% with appraisers who had experience with valuing such properties, to having no effect. Interestingly, it appeared in their survey that appraisers who did not have experience valuing such properties tended to overrate the negative effects.
- *American Transmission Company, Zone 4, Northeast Wisconsin - High Voltage Transmission Line Sales Study* (Rolling & Company, 2005). This study researched the impact that high voltage electrical transmission lines have on property value in the northeast Wisconsin area. They collected information on 682 land sales of which 78 involved lots near a transmission line corridor, but not directly encumbered by the transmission line. Their conclusions were: (a) easement lots sold at about 12% less than lots located over 200ft from the transmission lines; and (b) no clear impact on "proximity" lots those that lie within 200ft from the easement area but are not directly subject to the easement.

- *Properties Near Power Lines and Valuation Issues: Condemnation or Inverse Condemnation* (David Bolton, MAI. Southwestern Legal Foundation. 1993). This study cites a number of studies that prove a loss of property value due to proximity to an electric transmission line and then cites his own study. His own study found that in the Houston area assessed values of properties that adjoined a power line easement had a 12.8% to 30.7% lower assessment than the average homes not on the line, but in the same area. He also found that: (1) many buyers refused to even look at such properties; (2) such properties took at least twice as long to sell; (3) some brokers said such properties can take three times longer and finally sell at a 25% loss of value; and (4) overall homes adjoining transmission line easements took six times longer to sell and experienced a 10% to 30% loss in value.
- *Power Line Perceptions: Their Impact on Value and Market Time* (Cheryl Mitteness and Dr Steve Mooney. ARES Annual Meeting paper. 1998) The authors interviewed homeowners on or near electric transmission lines and found: (1) that in relation to the average impact of overall property value, 33% said 2-3% loss and 50% said a 5% loss or greater; (2) nearly 66% said the power line negatively affected their property value; (3) 83% of real estate appraisers surveyed said the presence of the power lines negatively affected the property values, most saying the loss was 5% or greater.
- *Analysis of Severance Damages* (James Sanders, SRA, 2007) This study completed an analysis of the impact of a transmission line through the middle of the Continental Ranch subdivision outside of the Tucson, Arizona area. This subdivision had a wood H-pole high voltage electric transmission line running through a portion of the subdivision. The author compared the residential lots abutting the easement to ones that were not. All lots abutting the easement were much bigger than the non-easement abutting lots. The author used improved properties for his study and by the use of regression analysis isolated many variables of value for an improved property to remove them from the analysis. In conclusion, through extensive use of the regression technique, the author finds an overall loss to the improved properties abutting the power line easement at -12%. This loss is attributed to both the land and improvements. However, the author notes that the lots are typically twice the size of the non-easement lots. When the size of lots was factored the overall loss to the land only was factored at -40%. It should be noted that the residences were at a distance from the power line.
- *The Peggy Tierney property: A Comparative Study of the Impact of a 69kV Transmission Line v. 345kV/69kV Transmission Line* (Kurt C. Kielisch). This was a brief study on the impact difference, if any, between an existing 69kV transmission line and a new proposed 345kV and 69kV transmission line on the same property. The property was a 3.70 acre residential lake front improved property that had an existing 69kV transmission line crossing the west half of the parcel along the road and required the property owner to cross under the power line to enter the parcel. The 69kV line had an easement width of approximately 100ft, wood H-poles at 50-60ft in height. The new 345kV line was to be placed within the existing easement, more or less, would have 140ft monopoles and carries both a 345kV and 69kV line. The seller attempted to sell the property at its full list price after an experienced lake front home Realtor established the list price from a comparative sales analysis. The home eventually sold for 27% less than the list price and took longer to sell in a relatively strong lake front home market. The buyer cited the pending 345kV line as the principle reason for their low offer.
- A comparative sales analysis to isolate the percentage of loss a residential and/or agricultural

land use property suffers due to the presence of a high voltage electric transmission line (HVTL). This study was found in an appraisal completed by Aari K. Roberts for American Transmission Corporation (ATC) on the Herbert Bolz property located in the Town of Rubicon, Dodge County, Wisconsin. Mr. Roberts compared the sale of a rural agricultural 24 acre land parcel that had an HVTL crossing the property, to three comparable agricultural land sales of comparability that did not have a HVTL. His sales comparison study concluded that the property with a HVTL suffered a 29% loss of value due to the presence of the HVTL. This study was completed in September 2007.

- A sales analysis of the property located at: N8602 CTH D, Town of Deer Creek, Outagamie County, Wisconsin. This is a single family home located on 3.19 acres in the rural area of Outagamie County. The home was a ranch style residence with 1,500sf GLA, attached 2-car garage, 8/3/2 room count, full basement and was in average condition overall. The property also had a 104ft x 52ft pole barn and two other outbuildings. There were two appraisals completed on this property, one by the condemnor (ATC) and one by the property owner. The average Before taking value of the two appraisals was \$221,000. The property was then improved with a 345kV & 138kV electric transmission line having 126ft pole height and was placed along the roadside reaching 68ft into the property. The edge of the easement was in less than 20ft to the residence, however the placement of the pole was as close to the roadway right-of-way as possible. The condemnor American Transmission Company (ATC) purchased the property and installed the transmission line. Then they upgraded the property with new paint, doors, sinks, dishwasher and flooring, plus cleaned the premises and outbuildings. ATC put the property on the market asking \$179,900 a number established by the appraiser for ATC as the After value. It was sold for \$128,500 10 months after ATC purchased it.

The Before taking average value was \$221,000. The property was then improved and upgraded at an expense estimated to be \$8,000-\$10,000, then resold 10 months later with the transmission lines in place for \$92,500 less or 42% less. The only differences between the Before taking market value and After taking sale price were the transmission line and time. A review of the Outagamie County market between November 2008 and September 2009 shows only a small downward trend in rural residential property value, therefore the biggest part of the loss is attributed to the presence and near proximity of the transmission line that being 38%-40%.

- *The Gene Laajala property: A Comparative Study of the Impact of a 161kV Transmission Line v. 345kV/161kV Transmission Line (Kurt C. Kielisch).* This was a brief sales study on the impact difference, between an existing 161kV transmission line and a new 345kV/161kV transmission line on the same property. The property was a 20 acre rural agricultural and residential property that had an existing 161kV transmission line bisecting the parcel along the east side. The 161kV line had an easement width of approximately 120ft, wood H-poles at 50ft± in height. This line was replaced with an upgraded easement comprised of 345kV/161kV line which was to be placed within the existing easement, more or less, and had (2) 110ft and (3) 120ft steel H-poles. The property was appraised in January 2007 with a Before condition value of \$204,500 using the Cost approach and \$185,500 using the Comparable Sale approach, by Ted Morgan, MAI. (The whole property appraised was 40 acres and the 20 acre parcel was portion out of this whole). The ATC appraiser did not appraise the home in the Before condition, but did conclude the Before taking land value was \$44,000 for 20 acres (using his \$2,200/acre conclusion for 40 acres) and the assessed value of the improvements were \$107,600, indicating a \$151,600 Before

value. The property sold and closed in October 2007 for \$120,000. The seller attributes the loss to the new power line, it being larger and more lines. The loss indicated was \$65,500 (using Morgan's Comparable Sales value) or \$31,600 (using ATC's land plus assessed improvement value), indicating a loss range of 35% to 21%.

- *An Impact Study of the Effect of High Voltage Power Lines on Rural Property Value in Southwestern Indiana (Kurt C. Kielisch, Appraisal Group One, 2010).* This study was based in southwest Indiana in Gibson County. It was focused on large agricultural land and the impact of a high voltage transmission lines (HVTL) varying in size from monopole to large steel lattice towers. The study included 32 land sales of which 10 were HVTL sales. The time period was January 1st, 2006 to December 31st, 2009. Adjustments were made for time, location and other utility easements (if any) and the results were graphed to compare the non-HVTL land sales to the HVTL land sales. The study concluded that the power lines negatively impacted the property with an impact range from -5% to -36% with the average impact being -20%.

Other Value Issues

Another issue relating to the presence of the transmission line is potential for the creation of an "utility" corridor. Such a corridor is a where several utility transmission lines are placed, such as gas transmission pipelines and communication lines. Indeed, the State of Wisconsin made it a legislative rule that future placement of such utilities are to be given preference to "existing utility corridors."² An electric transmission line meets the definition in this statute as an existing corridor. This "corridor" concept continues to grow in the perception of the public as such rules become more commonly known. The reality of such an event happening is the placement of the Arrowhead-Weston Power line, which was often placed within an existing utility corridor such as an oil transmission pipeline, smaller electrical transmission lines or abandoned electric transmission line easements. The very power line that is the focus of this analysis is further proof of the corridor effect for it has been expanded, enlarged and added circuits within the existing easement.

Other factors to consider regarding the valuation of HVTL impacted rural properties are agricultural equipment concerns operating under and near the line, health issues of workers in close proximity of the lines, health concerns of farm animals in close proximity of the lines, stray voltage, the concerns of public in relation to electro-magnetic fields, safety issues regarding bare wires of the transmission line and other concerns addressed in the literature study to follow.

In conclusion, it can be stated with a high degree of certainty that there is a significant negative effect ranging from -10% to -30% of property value due to the presence of the high voltage electric transmission line. The actual loss depends on factors of land use, location of the power line and its size.

² Wis. Stats 1.12(6)(a).

Literature Study

HVTL Impacts on Rural and Agricultural Properties

Throughout the nation's rural communities, literature research suggests that the presence of an HVTL easement can have a noticeable impact on both the use and appeal of rural properties and farms. Common concerns include stray voltage, health risks to livestock and cattle, diminished livelihoods and heritage, limited land use, and lessened aesthetic appeal. As the following literature survey will show, many different issues play a role in shaping one's perception of the impact of HVTLs on rural property values.

Stray Voltage

To understand the potential impact of HVTLs on rural land, it's important to discuss a key component in many farmers' apprehension about HVTLs: stray voltage.

Stray voltage is the rural equivalent of the high-profile residential Electromagnetic Field (EMF) factor, but instead of fearing leukemia or brain cancer, farmers fear their animals will become unproductive, ill, and even die.

Whenever energy is transferred, some is lost along the way. If metal buildings are near leaking energy, they can act as a conduit for voltage to find its way to feeding systems, milking systems and stalls.

In their 1995 presentation, "Stray Voltage: The Wisconsin Experience," a team of researchers led by Mark Cook and Daniel Dascho stated that farmers most worry that stray voltage will increase somatic cell count in their animals, make cows nervous, reduce milk production, and increase clinical mastitis.³

"Few issues are more upsetting to dairymen than fighting case after case of clinical mastitis with more and more cows in the sick pen," writes Dr. Winston Ingalls. "It represents extra time to properly handle such cows, lost production, vet calls, treatment products, concern about contaminated milk and an occasional dead or culled cow."⁴

In Cook & Dascho's presentation, they discuss their findings from a non-random sampling study of farms with stray voltage complaints stemming from a nearby substation. Their research team found no significant relationship between cow contact current and distance from the substation or contact currents. However, they also noted that cow contact current depends on many physical factors from on-farm and off-farm electrical power systems. They say, "There are many confounding factors that may outweigh the impacts of stray voltage which makes it difficult to draw conclusions from field studies about its effects on production and animal health."⁵

3 **Stray Voltage: The Wisconsin Experience.** Written for presentation at the 1995 International Meeting by Mark A Cook, Daniel M Dascho, Richard Reines and Dr. Douglas J Reinemann.

4 **Clinical Mastitis.** Winston Ingalls, Ph.D. GoatConnection.com. August 2, 2003.

http://goatconnection.com/articles/publish/article_173.shtml

5 **Stray Voltage: The Wisconsin Experience.** Written for presentation at the 1995 International Meeting by Mark A Cook, Daniel M Dascho, Richard Reines and Dr. Douglas J Reinemann.

In a 2003 study prepared for the NRAES Stray Voltage and Dairy Farms Conference, a research team conducted by the University of Wisconsin-Madison and led by Dr. Douglas J Reinemann studied the effects of stray voltage on cows at four dairy farms over a two-week time period. He and his team found that after the first few days of exposure, cows quickly acclimated to the presence of stray voltage. They also found that stray voltage of 1mA had little effect on the immune system of a cow.⁶

Concerning EMF levels, they noted that "even though man-made signals were larger than the naturally occurring currents, levels are significantly lower than what is considered sufficient earth current strength to develop step potential anywhere near the Public Service Commission 'level of concern.'"⁷

Stray voltage is usually undetectable by humans, and some researchers believe it occurs when electricity escapes a power line or wiring system and emits a secondary current. The problem intensifies with older barns that add automated electrical equipment, "raising ambient levels of current. Soon the cumulative effect of these secondary currents becomes harmful to cows." Though stray voltage can be measured, experts don't know how and why it happens or what conclusive effect (if any) it has on animals.⁸

Despite little concrete evidence, courts have compensated farmers for their losses due to stray voltage when all other factors are eliminated. In 1999 a jury awarded Peterson Bros. Dairy \$700,000 after deciding that stray voltage from an automated feeding system from Maddalena's Dairy Equipment of Petaluma, California slashed the herd's milk output and increased the cow's death rate.⁹

The company's defense attorney called stray voltage "junk science," the Petersons' claim of stray voltage in the milk barn a "harebrained theory" unsupported by electrical engineers, and blamed the herd's health problems on the Petersons' own mismanagement.¹⁰

In a similar case in Wisconsin in 2004, a dairy operation owned by George and Kathy Muth successfully sued Wisconsin Electric Power Co. (now We Energies) for negligence in the maintenance and operation of a distribution system on their farm. They claimed that the system led to stray voltage that injured and killed several of their dairy cows and damaged their milk production. The utility said that the levels of stray voltage were "extremely low" and were levels you could find anywhere.¹¹

6 Dairy Cow Response to the Electrical Environment: A Summary of Research conducted at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Paper presented at the NRAES Stray Voltage and Dairy Farms Conference. Dr. Douglas J. Reinemann. April 2003.

7 Results of the University of Wisconsin Stray Voltage Earth-Current Measurement Experiment. A revised version of a report submitted to the State of Wisconsin Legislature on June 25, 2003. Written by David L. Alumbaugh and Dr. Louise Pellerin.

8 Jury gives \$700,000 to dairy farmers for losses blamed on "stray voltage." Author Unknown. The Associated Press. April 21, 1999.

9 Ibid.

10 Ibid.

11 Power company negligent in dairy suit; Jury awards \$850,000 to couple over effect of stray voltage on cows. Lauria Lynch-German. Milwaukee Journal Sentinel. February 27, 2004.

The farmers said that shortly after moving to their new location, they faced low milk production, excessive illnesses, and deaths of cows.¹² The cows didn't walk right or act normal. They didn't want to go into the barn, inside, or into the stalls. The Muths examined everything from the animals' food to their bedding until consultants told them it could be stray voltage. In one year, they lost 15-18 cows and calves. Autopsies were inconclusive.¹³

After reviewing herd management and nutrition, they hired a consultant who detected stray voltage. Later that year the utility found no stray voltage problems. The farmers further consulted with veterinarians and tested and ruled out all the other factors except for stray voltage.¹⁴

The farmers hired an electrician to upgrade the farm's wiring, but it didn't decrease the stray voltage. After being asked, the utility made some other changes, but this also had no effect. Further consultants still found stray voltage from a conductor on the utility's distribution lines. A couple years later the utility removed a piece of underground electrical equipment and the herd immediately recovered...though the level of stray voltage remained the same.¹⁵

The utility's attorney stated that being able to measure something doesn't make it harmful. He cited several federal and state studies that say the current must be 2 milliamps or higher to adversely affect cattle and said no reading on their farm reached that level.¹⁶

The jury awarded the dairy farm \$850,000 in damages.¹⁷

Stray voltage fears aren't limited to dairy or cattle operations. Max Hempt, a horse farm owner in Pennsylvania, tried to oppose a proposed 9-mile 138kV HVTL because he feared that the line's EMFs caused by stray voltage could cause sterility and death among his horses.¹⁸

Though it's difficult to prove a significant presence of stray voltage, and even more difficult to prove a direct correlation between stray voltage and poor health, courts have awarded farmers sizable judgments to compensate them for damaging stray voltage from nearby power lines.

In 2002, one such case in Iowa made it to the state supreme court where the court upheld a \$700,000 judgment to a dairy farmer who argued that stray voltage from nearby power lines injured his herd. A substation sits less than a quarter mile from his farm. He said he often got electric shocks from the metal buildings on the farm. Also, he said his herd acted oddly, appearing frightened and refusing to enter barns. Milk production also suffered.¹⁹

12 **Jury must decide in voltage complaint; Farm family says stray power harmed dairy herd.** Lauria Lynch-German. Milwaukee Journal Sentinel. February 5, 2004.

13 **Dairy farm owner testifies that stray voltage killed cows in his herd.** Lauria Lynch-German. Milwaukee Journal Sentinel. February 10, 2004.

14 **Jury must decide in voltage complaint; Farm family says stray power harmed dairy herd.** Lauria Lynch-German. Milwaukee Journal Sentinel. February 5, 2004.

15 Ibid.

16 Ibid.

17 **Power company negligent in dairy suit; Jury awards \$850,000 to couple over effect of stray voltage on cows.** Lauria Lynch-German. Milwaukee Journal Sentinel. February 27, 2004.

18 **Farmer Fears Stray Voltage From PP&L 138 kV Line Could Harm His Horses.** Author Unknown. Northeast Power Report. June 24, 1994.

19 **Court upholds stray voltage judgment.** Mike Glover. The Associated Press. October 10, 2002.

The defendant, Interstate Power Co., said that "there's an inherent risk to transmitting electricity" and it shouldn't be vulnerable to such lawsuits unless they were negligent. The court ruled in favor of the dairy farmer, citing the lack of a statute exempting electric utilities from nuisance claims.²⁰

One year later the Wisconsin Supreme Court similarly found "that a utility can be held responsible for harming the health of a dairy herd with stray voltage even though state-recommended voltage tests did not find potentially damaging levels where the animals congregated."²¹

As the preceding case studies show, courts have acknowledged stray voltage and its possible effects. However, to fully understand the apprehension surrounding power lines, one must examine the EMF debate and its fear factor.

EMFs and Fear

In 1990, the EMF debate was so prevalent that members of Congress passed a bill that would limit the public's exposure to EMFs.²² A couple years later, in response to public concern about EMFs, Congress established the EMF-RAPID program in 1992. Its purpose was to coordinate and execute a limited research program to fill information gaps concerning the potential health effects of exposure to EMFs, to achieve credibility with the public that previous research has not earned, and to coordinate and unify federal agencies' public messages about possible EMF effects.²³ The program originally was to receive \$65 million in funding, but total funding is expected to be \$46 million.²⁴

Several years later in 1999, the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences studied the health effects of EMF exposure and found conflicting results. Though they concluded that the evidence is weak linking EMFs to health risks, they also found that the most common health risk was leukemia (mostly appearing in children). They also found a fairly consistent pattern of a small, increased risk of childhood leukemia with increasing exposure. The majority of the panel's voting members voted to acknowledge EMFs as a possible human carcinogen. They concluded that ELF-EMF exposure cannot be recognized as entirely safe because of weak scientific evidence.²⁵

In 2005, UK scientists conducted a case-control study on childhood cancer in relation to distance from high voltage power lines in England and Wales. They found an association between childhood leukemia and proximity of home address at birth to HVTLs. "The apparent risk extends to a greater distance than

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ **Utility liable for stray voltage, high court says.** Don Behm. Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel. June 26, 2003.

²² **Electric Powerlines: Health and Public Policy Implications** – Oversight Hearing before the Subcommittee on General Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs House of Representatives, 101st Congress, second session on electric powerlines: health and public policy implications. March 8, 1990.

²³ **Electric and Magnetic Fields Research Program** by Mr. Mukowski from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. 105th Congress, first session. June 12, 1997.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ **NIEHS Report on Health Effects from Exposure to Power-Line Frequency Electric and Magnetic Fields.** Released by the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences on May 4, 1999.

would have been expected from previous studies” although they have yet to discover an “accepted biological mechanism” to explain their results.²⁶

Though an accepted biological mechanism remains elusive, an early nineties case made it possible to link loss of property value to a fear of EMFs. In the 1993 case, *Criscuola v. Power Authority of the State of New York*, the court found that, “there should be no requirement that the claimant must establish the reasonableness of a fear or perception of danger or of health risks from exposure to high voltage power lines” and “Whether the danger is a scientifically genuine or verifiable fact should be irrelevant to the central issue of its market value impact.”²⁷

Utilities say that landowners should not be able to recover damages or injunctive relief “based on myth, superstition or fear about an alleged health risk that is not supported by substantial scientific or medical evidence.”²⁸

With the EMF debate unresolved, and evidence for both sides of the argument, some communities are reluctant to approve new HVTLS...and may even legally oppose them.

In an effort to preempt public opposition, Public Service Enterprise Group offered hundreds of thousands of dollars to New Jersey towns opposing its proposed HVTL project if the towns dropped all opposition and didn’t comment on the payments. Opponents called them “bribes.” The utility called them “settlements” to help minimize impacts of the project on towns and residents.²⁹

Some towns accepted payment, but the majority did not. Either they said they didn’t have enough time to respond to the offer, or they rejected them as payoffs. One of the opposing mayors, Mayor James Sandham of Montville, said it’s not about the money; “It’s about safety and property values.”³⁰

HVTLS and Property Values

Fear can impact the public’s buying habits. Residential homeowners’ resistance to abutting HVTLS is well documented. Though homeowners may fear negative effects on their community and environment,³¹ their first point of opposition is usually safety, especially if there are many children in the neighborhood. Though the 1979 Wertheimer study linking EMFs to childhood leukemia has long been contested, supported, and contested again, the very existence of a debate about the safety of EMFs sows enough doubt in residents’ minds to justify the fear.³² And that fear can influence the values of nearby homes.^{33 34 35 36}

26 **Childhood cancer in relation to distance from high voltage power lines in England and Wales: a case-control study.** Gerald Draper, Tim Vincent, Mary E Kroll, John Swanson. *British Medical Journal* (bmj.com). June 3, 2005.

27 **‘Criscuola’ – The Sparks Are Still Flying.** Michael Rikon. *New York Law Journal*. April 24, 1996.

28 **High Court Hears Arguments Today on EMF Claims.** Todd Woody. *The Recorder*. June 6, 1996.

29 **Opponents of \$750M N.J. power line project argue towns were paid to drop opposition.** Lawrence Ragonese. The Star-Ledger. January 31, 2010.

30 *Ibid.*

31 **NY Power Line Opponents Win Court Fight.** Associated Press. *New York Post*. February 20, 2009.

32 **Lines in Sand and Sky.** B.Z. Khasru. *Fairfield County Business Journal*. September 3, 2001. Vol. 40 Issue 36, p3, 2p.

33 **Power line plan concerns metro residents.** Melissa Maynarich. *News 9 (Oklahoma)*. July 22, 2008.

When given the choice to purchase two identical homes, one with such health concerns and the other without, most buyers will choose the home without the concern,³⁷ forcing the homeowner to lower their price. Aesthetic impact can also influence a property's value. Many residents don't want to look at HVTLs,³⁸ something they consider to be an "eyesore."³⁹

One of the hardest properties to sell can be one encumbered by an HVTL. Unlike roadway proximity, its effect isn't readily noticeable or measurable. Though homes near HVTLs typically have larger lots (and that can be a benefit), the biggest disadvantage is the fear factor surrounding EMFs.⁴⁰

In the early nineties, when EMFs were just entering the public consciousness, it was difficult to find a measurable price difference between homes close to an HVTL and those that were not.⁴¹ However, two researchers (Hsiang-te Kung & Charles F Seagle) conducted a case study on the impact of power transmission lines on property values and found that such negligible results depended almost entirely on the public's ignorance of EMFs and their related issues. They also found that the amount of potential property loss increased dramatically the more homeowners were aware of the potential health impacts of EMFs.⁴²

The effect of HVTLs on property values has long been a matter of contention with many studies either proving a diminutive effect or none at all. Methodologies differ and different areas of the country register different results. Some markets (ex. high-end homes) are very sensitive to HVTLs whereas others (ex. low-end homes) hardly notice them. The size of the line and the pylons are also a factor. A 69kV power line will have less effect than will a 1,200kV power line. Distance from the easement also matters. Some studies combine homes thousands of feet from HVTLs with those directly encumbered. Research sponsors also may play a factor with many being funded by the utilities themselves.

For example, in a 2007 study funded by a utility, researchers Jennifer Pitts and Thomas Jackson conducted market interviews, literature research and empirical research and reported little (if any) impact of power lines on property values. However, they did note that there is an increasing recent opinion that proximity to power lines has a slight negative effect on property values.⁴³

34 **Power Line Worries Landowners.** Ben Fischer. The Wisconsin State Journal. June 3, 2006.

35 **Lines in Sand and Sky.** B.Z. Khasru. Fairfield County Business Journal. September 3, 2001. Vol. 40 Issue 36, p3, 2p.

36 **Commissioners voice opposition to transmission lines.** David Rupkalvis. The Graham Leader. February 9, 2010.

37 **Real Estate Agents on Property Value Declines.** 4 Realtor opinion letters submitted to residents in the Sunfish, MN area whose properties are being affected by an HVTL.

38 *Ibid.*

39 **Power line plan concerns metro residents.** Melissa Maynarich. News 9 (Oklahoma). July 22, 2008.

40 **High Voltage Transmission Lines, Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF's) And How They Affect Real Estate Prices.** David Blockhus. January 3rd, 2008. <http://siliconvalleyrealestateinfo.com/electric-and-magnetic-fields-emfs-and-how-they-effect-real-estate-prices.html>

41 **Impact of power transmission lines on property values: A case study.** Hsiang-te Kung & Charles F Seagle. Appraisal Journal. Vol. 60, Issue 3, p.413, 6p. July 1992.

42 *Ibid.*

43 **Power lines and property values revisited.** Jennifer M. Pitts & Thomas O. Jackson. Appraisal Journal. Fall, 2007.

Two California appraisers, David Harding and Arthur Gimmy, published a rebuttal to the Pitts-Jackson study that disagreed with their methodology, took issue with their sponsor, addressed omitted information, and failure to conduct before-and-after cost comparisons.⁴⁴

Pitts and Jackson responded to the rebuttal and defended their methodology, saying they purposely limited their literature research to only include empirical, peer-reviewed articles from *The Appraisal Journal* and the American Real Estate Society journals. They acknowledged they conducted the research for "a litigation matter" but did not elaborate on their sponsor.⁴⁵

In a similar case, researchers James A Chalmers and Frank A Voorvaart published a large study spanning nearly 10 years and over 1,200 properties in which they found that an encumbering HVTL had only a small negative effect on the sale price of a residential home. In half of their samples they found consistent negative property values mostly limited to less than 10%, with most between 3%-6%.⁴⁶

They summarized their findings as showing "no evidence of systematic effects of either proximity or visibility of 345-kV (kilovolt) transmission lines on residential real estate values."⁴⁷

They did, however, say that "An opinion supporting HVTLs effects would have to be based on market data particular to the situation in question and could not be presumed or based on casual, anecdotal observation. It is fair to presume that the direction of the effect would in most circumstances be negative, but the existence of a measureable effect and the magnitude of such an effect can only be determined by empirical analysis of actual market transactions."⁴⁸

Appraiser Kerry M. Jorgensen disagreed with the authors' views that paired data analysis and retroactive appraisal were "too unrefined and too subjective to be of much value," and that only through objective statistics could the effect of HVTLs on property value be truly understood. He argued that relying too much on statistics can be dangerous as there could be problems with how the data is compiled and interpreted. For example, he points out that out of their set of 1,286 qualifying sales, only 78 (6%) are directly encumbered by a power line easement, and only 33 (2.6%) more are within 246 feet of a power line easement.⁴⁹

44 Comments on "Property Lines and Property Values Revisited." (Letter to the editor) David M. Harding & Arthur E. Gimmy & Thomas O. Jackson & Jennifer M. Pitts. *Appraisal Journal*. Winter, 2008.

<http://www.entrepreneur.com/tradejournals/article/176131510.html>

45 Ibid.

46 **High-Voltage Transmission Lines: Proximity, Visibility, and Encumbrance Effects.** James A Chalmers and Frank A Voorvaart. *The Appraisal Journal* via the Appraisal Institute website. Volume 77, Issue 3; Summer, 2009; pages 227-246. Reposted by CostBenefit of the Environmental Valuation and Cost-Benefit News blog -

<http://www.envirovaluation.org/index.php/2009/11/09/high-voltage-transmission-lines-proximity-visibility-and-encumbrance-effects>

47 **Power Lines Don't Affect Property Values.** *The Appraisal Journal*. July 30, 2009.

http://www.appraisalinstitute.org/about/news/2009/073009_TAI.aspx

48 **High-Voltage Transmission Lines: Proximity, Visibility, and Encumbrance Effects.** James A. Chalmers, PhD and Frank A. Voorvaart, PhD. *The Appraisal Journal*. Summer 2009. Pgs. 227-245.

49 **Letters to the Editor.** Kerry M. Jorgensen. *Appraisal Journal*. January 1, 2010.

[http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Comments+on+\"high-voltage+transmission+lines:+proximity,+visibility,...-a0220765052](http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Comments+on+\)

The Chalmers-Voorvaart study also attracted the interest of Washington Post Real Estate writer Elizabeth Razzi who wrote that the study was paid for by Northeast Utilities and completed before they proposed a high-voltage transmission grid in New England. She also wrote that both Chalmers and Voorvaart are appraisers and expert witnesses for the power industry.⁵⁰

Several studies have found that, over time, property value damages from nearby HVTLS diminish though properties near the pylons stay permanently damaged no matter the elapsed time.⁵¹ In the first case, though the property owner may grow accustomed to HVTLS and thus think less of them, new potential buyers aren't as sensitized and the diminutive impact is fresh to them.

Realtors usually oppose HVTLS. Nearly all surveyed realtors and appraisers in the Roanoke and New River valleys of Virginia said that close proximity to HVTLS would diminish property values by as much as \$25,000, but mostly for high-end homes. Lower-end homes see little impact.⁵²

Diminished property values can also impact communities. In one case, Delaware residents were worried that a proposed 1,200 megawatt HVTL would depress local property values, thus weakening the local tax base and leading to higher taxes to offset the losses. Kent Sick, author of a 1999 paper on power lines and property values, projects losses from a few percentage points to 53%.⁵³

In Atlanta, a local realty group named Bankston Realty ranked power lines as the number one item that damages resale value, followed closely by busy roads and inferior lot topography. They advise buyers to pay 15% less of the asking price if power lines are present, and they advise sellers to accept it as a logical perception of value.⁵⁴

Evidence suggests that HVTLS affect the health of residents in close proximity to lines 345kV and higher. Evidence also suggests that the power lines have little to no impact on property values because encumbered lots are often larger and more private than unencumbered lots, resulting in no diminution of purchase price. However, most studies did observe longer time on the market for encumbered properties.⁵⁵

Rural Impact

Now that the reader is aware of stray voltage, EMFs, and property values, the reader will have a deeper understanding of the potential effects of HVTLS on rural land throughout the United States.

50 Do High-Voltage Lines Zap Property Values? Elizabeth Razzi. Local Address. August 4, 2009.

http://voices.washingtonpost.com/local-address/2009/08/do_high-voltage_lines_zap_prop.html

51 The Effect of Public Perception on Residential Property Values in Close Proximity to Electricity Distribution Equipment. Sally Sims, B.Sc. Paper presented to the Ph.D. Forum at the Pacific Rim Real Estate Society Conference. January 2002. This is the first part to the study.

52 A Question of Power: Part III – Realtors: High voltage lines lower property values. Leslie Brown. Roanoke Times. 1998. <http://www.vaproperyrights.org/articles/98lineslowervalues.html>

53 Expert: Power lines hurt property value, market research shows sellers lose up to 53 percent. Elizabeth Cooper. Gannett News Service. May 20th, 2006.

54 Atlanta Homes and Resale Value... Power lines are a definite NO. The Bankston Group. July 17, 2008. <http://atlantaintheknow.com/2008/07/17/atlanta-homes-and-resale-value-power-lines-are-a-definite-no/>

55 High Voltage Power Lines Impact On Nearby Property Values. Ben Beasley. Right of Way Magazine. February 1991.

In Goodhue County, Minnesota, an area locally known for protecting agriculture, CapX2020 (a utility consortium) is proposing to build a 345kV HVTL through the county that may be doubled to 690kV. Local landowner Linda Grovender voiced her concern in a 2010 letter to the editor of the Cannon Falls Beacon. She worries that the line, proposed to traverse residential and agricultural lands instead of following existing utility right-of-way, will have an adverse effect on her family's health (due to EMFs), jeopardize agricultural interests, result in lost agricultural productivity, and damage property values.⁵⁶ She wrote that if the proposed 345kV HVTL is doubled to 690kV (as it legally could be) it could have an adverse effect on her family's health, jeopardize agricultural interests, result in lost agricultural productivity, and damage property values.⁵⁷

Elsewhere in Minnesota, Dairyland Power Cooperative (one of the chief members of CapX2020) surveyed rural landowners for their opinion regarding the proposed HVTL in their area. Whether they were crop or dairy farmers, each had several reasons why the proposed line would impact their business. The unnamed respondents shared Grovender's views and said they prefer to use highway corridors and woodlands to avoid impacts to productive agricultural land; protect livestock; avoid interference with large farm equipment, GPS, and navigation systems used in farm machinery; preserve open channels for crop-dusting; protect farm buildings; protect pasture land, tree farms, and timber production.⁵⁸

The Dairyland survey also found that livestock operations are concerned that the HVTL will generate stray voltage, impacting livestock and feedlots. Cattle, horses, and other livestock will not go near transmission lines due to stray voltage. And stray voltage can impact the health of beef cattle and hogs. Farmers also fear potential impacts on dairy operations, poultry, livestock mortality, horse boarding facilities, and herd reproduction.⁵⁹

HVTLs also pose potential technological obstacles. For example, The GPS equipment used in the farm equipment may not be able to steer around transmission poles, potentially making farming around the towers extremely difficult.⁶⁰

One major concern was the routing the HVTLs through the middle of properties or fields. The surveyed farmers quoted many repercussions for bisecting a property. They include: Interrupted irrigation and tile drainage equipment and practices; decreased food production; fragmented existing cropland and dairy operations; diminished lease value; the addition of transmission lines would make it difficult to lease farm land for the top rental price; compacted soil from construction of the HVTLs and access roads; it would take 3–5 years to restore.⁶¹

Across the border in Wisconsin, the state's Department of Agriculture validated many of the Minnesota respondents' concerns when it found that HVTL construction could compact soil, making it difficult to

⁵⁶ **No CAPX2020.** Letter to the Editor by Linda Grovender. The Cannon Falls Beacon. March 23, 2010.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ **SE Twin Cities-Rochester-La Crosse Transmission System Improvement Project Macro-Corridor Study, Appendix A: Summary of Public Comments regarding a proposed HVTL.** Dairyland Farm Cooperative. September 2007.

⁵⁹ **SE Twin Cities-Rochester-La Crosse Transmission System Improvement Project Macro-Corridor Study, Appendix A: Summary of Public Comments regarding a proposed HVTL.** Dairyland Farm Cooperative. September 2007.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

plow and plant those areas, naturally resulting in reduced crop yields. The HVTLs force farmers to change planting patterns to avoid support structures. Since farm land is only as valuable as its ability to yield good crops, rural property values suffer from the limitations and effects of HVTLs on their land.⁶²

Potential compaction, forced building changes, and lower property values equally threaten dairy operations as much as agricultural farmers. Susan and Robert Herckendorf, dairy farmers in the path of the proposed A-W HVTL, are worried that the line could put local dairies out of business.⁶³

In researching the possible negative factors of the then-proposed Arrowhead-Weston HVTL in Wisconsin in 2000, the state's Public Service Commission found that rural property values may decrease from "concern or fear of possible health effects from electric or magnetic fields; The potential noise and visual unattractiveness of the transmission line; Potential interference with farming operations or foreclosure of present or future land uses."⁶⁴ They also found that the value of agricultural property will likely decrease if the pylons inhibit farm operations."⁶⁵ However, they also found that adverse effects appear to diminish over time.⁶⁶

The impact report further states that, on farmland, HVTL installation can remove land from production, interfere with operation of equipment, create safety hazards, and deprive landowners the opportunity to consolidate farmlands or develop the land for another use. The greatest impact on farm property values is likely to occur on intensively managed agricultural lands.⁶⁷

Nearly a decade later in 2009, the Wisconsin Public Service Commission conducted another study on the environmental impacts of transmission lines and found that "in agricultural areas, the number of poles crossing a field may be the most significant measure of impact," and "agricultural values are likely to decrease if the transmission line poles are in a location that inhibits farm operations."⁶⁸ Beyond the impact of pole placement, the PSC found that "the overall aesthetic effect of a transmission line is likely to be negative to most people, especially where proposed lines would cross natural landscapes. The tall steel or wide 'H-frame' structures may seem out of proportion and not compatible with agricultural landscapes or wetlands."⁶⁹ They further explained that "Transmission lines can affect farm operations and increase costs for the farm operator. Potential impacts depend on the transmission line design and the type of farming. Transmission lines can affect field operations, irrigation, aerial spraying, wind breaks, and future land development."⁷⁰

The study further examines how rural HVTL pole placements can affect agricultural land values: They can create problems for turning field machinery and maintaining efficient fieldwork patterns; expose

62 Line could affect farms, property values. Author Unknown. Oshkosh Northwestern. June 26, 2000.

63 Ibid.

64 Property Values (pages 212-215) from Final Environmental Impact Statement, Arrowhead-Weston Electric Transmission Line Project, Volume 1. Public Service Commission of Wisconsin. Docket 05-CE-113. Date issued, October 2000.

65 Ibid..

66 Ibid.

67 Property Values (pages 212-215) from Final Environmental Impact Statement, Arrowhead-Weston Electric Transmission Line Project, Volume 1. Public Service Commission of Wisconsin. Docket 05-CE-113. Date issued, October 2000.

68 Environmental Impacts of Transmission Lines. Public Service Commission of Wisconsin. March 2009.

69 Ibid.

70 Ibid.

properties to weed encroachment; compact soils and damage drain tiles; result in safety hazards due to pole and guy wire placement; hinder or prevent aerial activities by planes or helicopters; interfere with moving irrigation equipment; hinder future consolidation of farm fields or subdividing land for residential development.⁷¹

To oppose these potentially diminutive effects on their land, landowners sometimes organize against them. In Ohio, a group of concerned citizens formed the group, Citizens Advocating Responsible Energy (CARE), to oppose FirstEnergy's proposed Geauga County power line. On their website they state the reasons for their opposition. They fear the HVTL will devalue the properties it crosses, force affected property owners to continue paying taxes on damaged property, damage natural beauty and local ecology, lessen agricultural productivity of impacted land, thus reducing farm income and local purchasing power, and create a thorough-fare for snowmobiles and off-road vehicles.⁷²

Other times, concerned landowners are united in voice, but not in form. In 2010, Idaho property owners in Bonneville County are nervously following the progress of Idaho Falls Power's proposed 161kV HVTL that would pass close to their homes.⁷³

Lynn Pack, a Bonneville County dairy farmer, has educated himself on HVTLs and said he's most concerned with stray voltage. "It causes so many problems with cow's production. They won't feed, they won't drink water, they dry up and when they dry up they just don't give any milk." ⁷⁴ Another property owner, Sharon Nixon, fears the HVTL could harm her husband's health after his recent victory over bone cancer. She also fears the value of her home will fall. "It is not something we want in our backyard. We worked all our lives. This is our dream home." ⁷⁵

Idaho Falls Power General Manager Jackie Flowers said the HVTL is a necessary step to meet new federal energy reliability standards and that the utility is open to the public's input. ⁷⁶

A year earlier in Idaho, a coalition of Rockland County farmers tried to convince Idaho Power Company to avoid routing a new HVTL through their land, citing environmental and development concerns.⁷⁷ Doug Dokter, Idaho Power project leader, said the new lines are required because the existing lines are at their capacity.⁷⁸ Because of their concerns, utility representatives say they're looking at other options and hope for a compromise to avoid invoking eminent domain to take the land. ⁷⁹

Sometimes opposition to a proposed HVTL route can alter its course. In 1994, Public Service Company of New Mexico abandoned plans to take new right-of-way through the Jemez Mountains for a 50-mile long HVTL extension that Indian groups and environmentalists argued would cut through several miles

71 Ibid.

72 **We oppose FirstEnergy's proposed Geauga County power line.** Website posting by Citizens Advocating Responsible Energy (CARE). Date unknown but website copyright suggests sometime from 2008-2009.

73 **Transmission Lines Worry Property Owners.** Brett Crandall. Local News 8. March 5, 2010.

74 Ibid.

75 Ibid.

76 Ibid.

77 **Headway being made on proposed route for power transmission line.** Author Unknown. The Power County Press and Aberdeen Times. April 8, 2009.

78 Ibid.

79 Ibid.

of pristine vistas and Native American ruins.⁸⁰ The utility instead re-routed the extension to follow an existing utility corridor, bringing the decade-long dispute to a close.⁸¹

In 2008, California farmers and ranchers found themselves in a similar situation. San Diego Gas & Electric proposed a 150-mile long, 500kV HVTL (in conjunction with several 230kV HVTLs) across San Diego and surrounding counties to meet increasing energy needs and transport required renewable energy.⁸²

Affected landowners are worried the line will have “huge” impacts on their properties. Katie Moretti, an affected cattle rancher, and other farmers worry that building construction access roads across untouched land will limit their land’s future use. She also worries that the utility won’t compensate her for the loss of use.⁸³

Another rancher, Glen Drown, also worries about the impact the line will have on land-use and property values since the proposed route bisects several of his parcels subdivided for future development.⁸⁴

Local dairy producer, Richard Van Leeuwen, is worried that stray voltage from the line would damage the health of his calves and milking cows. To protect his herd’s health he said he would have to relocate the calf farm to another part of his property, costing millions.⁸⁵

San Diego County Farm Bureau Executive Director Eric Larson acknowledges that the farming community won’t be able to stop the project, but he’s trying to make it compatible with the area’s farming interests by recommending burying the line underground in some areas, going around some areas, and utilizing existing right-of-way.⁸⁶

Elsewhere in the state, the City of Brentwood researched the potential impact of HVTLs on agricultural land values by interviewing several of their local and experienced Real Estate brokers. All the brokers said that “Agricultural land with power lines above ground is worth less than properties with below-ground utilities.”⁸⁷

However, in a 2007 report, the California Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program reported that HVTLs installed on agricultural land for a wind farm will result in a temporary disturbance of 10 acres of farmland and permanently affect 1 acre. Since the affected areas are mainly grazing land, the report concluded that the HVTL would not significantly impair productivity. Though the impact to agricultural productivity during construction would be negative, they claimed it would be mostly insignificant.⁸⁸

80 PNM Scraps Jemez Power Line Plan. Keith Easthouse. Santa Fe New Mexican. December 16, 1994.

81 Ibid.

82 Proposed power line would impact farms. Christine Souza. California Farm Bureau Federation. May 28, 2008.

83 Proposed power line would impact farms. Christine Souza. California Farm Bureau Federation. May 28, 2008.

84 Ibid.

85 Ibid.

86 Ibid.

87 City of Brentwood, California. Website page explaining their approaches to valuing agricultural land. Date and author unknown.

88 3.3 Agricultural Resources. Part of the public draft by The California Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. July 2007.

Across the country in Leesburg, Virginia, 26 landowners opposed Dominion Energy's proposed 230kV HVTL, saying it will damage their property values, thus decreasing their tax base and thus affect the county as a whole. They also fear its impact on Blue Ridge tourism.⁸⁹

Bill Hatch, owner of a 400-acre farm was upset to learn the line would run through his farm. He said the proposed line would so affect his farm that he could only afford to keep it by direct marketing or agro-tourism, but he admitted that few people would want to visit a farm with power lines.⁹⁰

Landowners want the utility to bury the lines, but the utility says it will cost 10 times more than traditional overhead lines. However, Harry Orton, an underground power line expert, testified that while the initial costs of burying the lines are higher, the lower cost of maintenance over the years evens the cost along the lines' lifecycle.⁹¹

A year later in 2006, Dominion proposed an additional 500kV HVTL to meet growing demand and routed it through northern Virginia because it was the most efficient route. However, the area is also one of the state's most pristine, and the proposal met with fierce resistance from landowners, environmentalists, Congressman Frank Wolf, and actor Robert Duvall.⁹²

In the path of the HVTL are landowners of some of the most valuable land in Virginia, and they were bothered that the utility plans to erect the 40-mile, 15-story HVTL in their back yards.⁹³

One landowner, Cameron Eaton, fears the line will bring financial ruin and "sink" her investment into her 100-acre Fauquier County property and horse business. "No one will buy that land if some ugly power line could run right over their house. I'm broken off at the knees."⁹⁴

Real estate agents consider the area's picturesque countryside to be its most valuable quality. Matt Sheedy, a land developer and president of Virginians for Sensible Energy Policy, said that the very proposal that the line will soon dominate the countryside has already "sent land values plummeting." Brokers confirmed that the market froze. People backed out of real estate contracts, unwilling to live anywhere under the line. Sheedy's groups estimated that land immediately affected could lose as much as 75% of its value.⁹⁵

"When you're out in the country and you're selling property, what you're selling is the open space and the bucolic views and the history," Sheedy said. "Running power lines through an area like this is just devastating." To landowners Gene and Deborah Bedell, who were trying to sell their 223-acre farm to pay for their retirement, it was a hard blow. Their agent told them no one would buy their property if they knew "that it could have a power line looming over it."⁹⁶

89 **Committee Hears Debate Over Underground, Overhead Power Lines.** Megan Kuhn. Leesburg Today. May 20, 2005.

90 *Ibid.*

91 **Committee Hears Debate Over Underground, Overhead Power Lines.** Megan Kuhn. Leesburg Today. May 20, 2005.

92 **Landowners Fear Ruin from Power Line Route.** Sandhya Somashekhar. Washington Post Staff Writer. December 11, 2006.

93 *Ibid.*

94 *Ibid.*

95 *Ibid.*

96 *Ibid.*

Further north in New York, over 50 landowners and local officials spoke before the state's Public Service Commission in opposition to Upstate NY Power Corp's proposed construction of a 230kV HVTL in their community.⁹⁷

Sharon B. Rossiter, co-owner of Doubledale Farms in Ellisburg, said the HVTL will damage their crop cycle, remove 100 acres from use, and make planting difficult by having to navigate around the poles. Also worried is Roberta F. French, owner of Farnham Farms in Sandy Creek. The proposed line will bisect her blueberry farm, eliminating two-thirds of it.⁹⁸

Jay M. Matteson, Jefferson County agricultural coordinator, advocated routing the HVTL through public land to avoid damaging productive, private land. "The burden should be on New York state and the developer to prove to local landowners why their land is less valuable than public land," he said.⁹⁹

The Town of Henderson opposed it because the town's foundation is tourism and agriculture, and the community is "very concerned about the visual impacts of this project."¹⁰⁰

Robert E. Ashodian, chairman of the Henderson Harbor Area Chamber of Commerce's Economic Development Committee, agreed. "The scenic resources of the community and the natural resources are at the heart of the value of the community."¹⁰¹

In an effort to appease worried or angry landowners, agricultural property owners in Montana with HVTLs encumbering their land will be exempt from paying taxes on land within 600 feet on either side of the HVTL Right-of-Way.¹⁰²

In the 2002 study, "The Impact of Transmission Lines on Property Values: Coming to Terms with Stigma," authors Peter Elliott and David Wadley cite a 1978 Canadian study that, according to one commentary, found "the per acre values from more than 1,000 agricultural property sales in Eastern Canada were 16-29% lower for properties with easements for transmission lines than for similar properties without easements." The impact was greater on smaller properties. The 1978 study found little difference in impact from 230kV or 500kV HVTLs. The study also found that the impacts didn't seem influenced by time.¹⁰³

Three more Canadian studies on the impact of HVTLs on agricultural land values found different results.¹⁰⁴ Brown 1976 studied the effect of low-voltage power lines on agricultural land in Saskatchewan and found no measurable impact on property values. The Woods Gordon 1981 study focused on the effects of 230kV to 500kV HVTLs on Ontario farmland and found some areas had an average of a 16.9% negative impact, two areas had a positive effect, and others showed no statistically

97 **Transmission line gets no support.** Nancy Madsen. Watertown Daily Times. November 17, 2009.

98 **Transmission line gets no support.** Nancy Madsen. Watertown Daily Times. November 17, 2009.

99 Ibid.

100 Ibid.

101 Ibid.

102 **Tax facts on proposed power line.** The Montana Standard Staff. The Montana Standard. July 11, 2009.

103 **The Impact of Transmission Lines on Property Values: Coming to Terms with Stigma.** Peter Elliott & David Wadley. Property Management, pgs.137-152. 2002.

104 **The Effects of Overhead Transmission Lines On Property Values: A Review And Analysis Of The Literature.** Edison Electric Institute Siting & Environmental Planning Task Force. 1992.

significant effect. The third study, a master's thesis referred to as Thompson 1982 found sales prices lower for properties crossed by HVTLs but only where the land has potential for irrigation.(pgs. 56-57)¹⁰⁵

This paper copyrighted by Appraisal Group One, Inc. Any copying, publication, broadcast or distribution of this paper without the written consent of Appraisal Group One is prohibited. You may contact Appraisal Group One by phone at: (920)-233-9836, e-mail at: reprof@forensic-appraisal.com ,or by mail at: 2401 Omro Road, Oshkosh, Wisconsin, 54904.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.