

**BEFORE THE
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF WISCONSIN**

Joint Application of American Transmission Company, ITC
Midwest LLC, and Dairyland Power Cooperative for
Authority to Construct and Operate a New 345 kV
Transmission Line from the Existing Hickory Creek
Substation in Dubuque County, Iowa, to the Existing
Cardinal Substation in Dane County, Wisconsin, to be
Known as the Cardinal-Hickory Creek Project

05-CE-146

JEWELL JINKINS INTERVENORS

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF ALAN JEWELL

1 **Q: Please state your name and address.**

2 A: My name is Alan Jewell. My address is 3362 County Rd B, Dodgeville, WI.

3 **Q: Please state your affiliation with Jewell Jinkins Intervenors.**

4 A: I am the representative of Jewell Jinkins Intervenors. Jewell Jinkins Intervenors is
5 a group of neighbors and friends who organized to intervene initially in the Badger
6 Hollow CPCN and acquisition dockets, and now this docket before the Commission.

7 **Q: What is the purpose of your testimony?**

8 A: I am offering this testimony on behalf of Jewell Jinkins Intervenors. We wish to
9 raise several issues of concern, and because I have decades of farming and agricultural
10 reporting and finance experience, my testimony will focus on those concerns. My resume
11 follows this testimony as Ex.-JJI-Jewell-1. Jewell Jinkins Intervenors have legitimate
12 concerns that call into question the blind promotion of high voltage transmission lines
13 that doesn't examine sufficiently the details of a project such as this. Generally, there is
14 little benefit that can specifically be offered to the project area, and applicants can't
15 identify the specific benefits to Wisconsin. This testimony, supported in large part by the
16 Commission's own Environmental Impact Statement and omissions in the EIS, and
17 testimony of others intervening in this docket, raises problems that the Commission must
18 take into account.

19 As a large landowner in the project area, with multiple parcels of land targeted as
20 a preferred or alternate route, I personally, together with my family, will suffer
21 consequences beyond those of most other landowners, significant individual hardships
22 which the Commission must consider.

23 The project will disrupt lives in this community and take our land without

1 adequate compensation. It is not right that a project of any sort can move into a
2 community such as ours with so little regard for our lives and our livelihood. Although
3 the world is changing, there is more to change than just making money in whatever way
4 possible – the project must limit its impacts and respect our lives by keeping impacts
5 supportable by realized benefits. There is no benefit to landowners along the route.

6 **Q: Why did Jewell Jinkins Intervenors intervene?**

7 A: Jewell Jinkins Intervenors are parties in this docket because of the potential of
8 extreme individual hardships that this project presents to its members. This testimony is
9 narrowly limited to those issues directly affecting Jewell Jinkins Intervenors, and is
10 particularly focused on “individual hardships.” Wisconsin statute requires consideration
11 of individual hardships as a primary criteria. Wis. Stat. §196.491(3)(d)3. This
12 transmission project as proposed would affect many parcels of land in which we have an
13 interest, and we would be directly harmed and would suffer extreme individual hardships
14 if this transmission project is put on our land. There are also economic, environmental
15 and historical factors at issue, issues of impacts of electric and magnetic fields, and
16 although I do not have the knowledge and expertise to testify, Jewell Jinkins Intervenors
17 will join with those who raise these issues for the Commission’s consideration.

18 The applicants for the Cardinal-Hickory transmission project cannot show that this
19 project is in the public interest, particularly when considering the extreme individual
20 hardship we would suffer if this line were to be built.

21 **Q: In what Iowa County property do you have an interest?**

22 A: My wife Marcia Jewell and I live in Iowa County, and we have many properties
23 that we farm. Below is a listing of these Iowa County parcels, identified by parcel

1 number, in which Alan and Marcia Jewell, of Jewell Jinkins Intervenors, have an interest.
 2 We asked the Cardinal-Hickory Creek applicants to provide a map of transmission
 3 route/alignment over these parcels, such as the maps provided by Applicants to
 4 landowners at computer stations at open houses and/or public meetings. These route
 5 maps over our parcels provided by the applicants are necessary to determine which of the
 6 parcels are potentially affected and what the impacts may be, the type and extent, and are
 7 an indicator of our individual hardship. Ex.-JJI-Jewell-2. The listing below is set out by
 8 owners named, because some have been placed in various partnerships and/or trusts:

9 For Alan and Marcia Jewell:
 10

Parcel	Owner(s)	Site Address	Tax Years
0410 - TOWN OF LINDEN	JEWELL REVOCABLE TRUST;		1992-2018
0411 - TOWN OF LINDEN	JEWELL REVOCABLE TRUST;		1992-2018
0422 - TOWN OF LINDEN	JEWELL REVOCABLE TRUST;		1992-2018
0423 - TOWN OF LINDEN	JEWELL REVOCABLE TRUST;		1992-2018
0424 - TOWN OF LINDEN	JEWELL REVOCABLE TRUST;		1992-2018
0425 - TOWN OF LINDEN	JEWELL REVOCABLE TRUST;	3362 COUNTY ROAD B; 3366 COUNTY ROAD B	1992-2018
0406.A - TOWN OF LINDEN	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP		1992-2018
0407.A - TOWN OF LINDEN	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP		1992-2018
0408 - TOWN OF LINDEN	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP		1992-2018
0409 - TOWN OF LINDEN	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP		1992-2018
0428 - TOWN OF LINDEN	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP	2511 COUNTY ROAD Q	1992-2018

0428 - TOWN OF LINDEN	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP		N/A
0428.03 - TOWN OF LINDEN	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP	2511 COUNTY ROAD Q	N/A
0429 - TOWN OF LINDEN	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP		1992-2018
0628 - TOWN OF LINDEN	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP		1992-2018
0630 - TOWN OF LINDEN	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP		1992-2018
0631 - TOWN OF LINDEN	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP		1992-2018
0639 - TOWN OF LINDEN	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP		1992-2018
0642 - TOWN OF LINDEN	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP		N/A
0642 - TOWN OF LINDEN	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP	2215 COUNTY ROAD Q	1992-2018
0642.01 - TOWN OF LINDEN	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP	2215 COUNTY ROAD Q	N/A
0643 - TOWN OF LINDEN	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP		1992-2018
0665 - TOWN OF LINDEN	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP		1992-2018
0666 - TOWN OF LINDEN	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP		N/A
0666 - TOWN OF LINDEN	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP	2083 BLOOMFIELD RD	1992-2018
0666.01 - TOWN OF LINDEN	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP	2083 BLOOMFIELD RD	N/A
1176 - TOWN OF DODGEVILLE	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP	4050 US HIGHWAY 18	N/A
1176.01 - TOWN OF DODGEVILLE	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP	4050 US HIGHWAY 18	N/A

Parcel	Owner(s)	Site Address	Tax Years
1177 - TOWN OF DODGEVILLE	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP		1992-2018
1178 - TOWN OF DODGEVILLE	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP		1992-2018
1179 - TOWN OF DODGEVILLE	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP		1992-2018
1181 - TOWN OF DODGEVILLE	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP		1992-2018
1182 - TOWN OF DODGEVILLE	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP		1992-2018
1341 - TOWN OF DODGEVILLE	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP	4045 US HIGHWAY 18	1992-2018
1341.02 - TOWN OF DODGEVILLE	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP	4045 US HIGHWAY 18	N/A
1342 - TOWN OF DODGEVILLE	OAKDALE FARMS LTD PARTNERSHIP		1992-2018

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

Alan and Marcia Jewell have an interest in the following property of Marcia Jewell’s father, who passed away in 1981, through the Charles Mueller Trust naming Marcia Jewell as heir. This land has been in the family for 125 years. The Charles Mueller Trust parcels are adjacent to the Badger Hollow solar project, and some parcels are affected by Cardinal-Hickory Creek. The Jewells, Marcia Jewell’s brother, Mike, and nephew Matt, have rented this land for the last decade or so, keeping use in the family:

Parcel	Owner(s)	Site Address	Tax Years
0523 - TOWN OF EDEN	MUELLER, CHARLES TRUST		1992-2018
0524 - TOWN OF EDEN	MUELLER, CHARLES TRUST		1992-2018
0525 - TOWN OF EDEN	MUELLER, CHARLES TRUST		1992-2018
0526 - TOWN OF EDEN	MUELLER, CHARLES TRUST		1992-2018

8
9
10

Alan and Marcia Jewell also have an interest in Marcia Jewell's mother’s land, through the Evelyn L. Mueller Revocable Trust, of which Marcia is a named heir. The

1 Jewell’s have rented this farm, for the last decade or so, with Marcia's brother, Mike, and
 2 nephew Matt. Parcel 0513 of the Evelyn L. Mueller Revocable Trust will host roughly 40
 3 acres of Badger Hollow solar panels.

Parcel	Owner(s)	Site Address	Tax Years
0505 - TOWN OF EDEN	MUELLER, EVELYN L REV TR	821 COUNTY ROAD B	1992-2018
0506 - TOWN OF EDEN	MUELLER, EVELYN L REV TR	821 COUNTY ROAD B	1992-2018
0507 - TOWN OF EDEN	MUELLER, EVELYN L REV TR		1992-2018
0508 - TOWN OF EDEN	MUELLER, EVELYN L REV TR		1992-2018
0513 - TOWN OF EDEN	MUELLER, EVELYN L REV TR		1992-2018
0516 - TOWN OF EDEN	MUELLER, EVELYN L REV TR		1992-2018

4
 5 Two additional properties that Jewells have an interest in are our grain elevator
 6 just west of Edmund on Highway 18, and that of our farming partners Brad Walter and
 7 Megan Anderson, just east of Cobb on Highway 18. Those properties are:

8 SE-NW, Sect. 29, T6N, R2E (LOT 1 CSM 1468 REC IN V 10 CSM P 218 BEING
 9 PT OF LOT 1 CSM 153 & UNPLATTED LANDS ALL LOCATED IN THE
 10 SE1/4 OF NW1/4)
 11 County map via url: [https://maps.ags.ruekert-
 12 mielke.com/Html5Viewer/Index.html?viewer=swwigis&RunWorkflow=ParcelSe
 13 archByTaxKey&taxkey=0140271.A](https://maps.ags.ruekert-mielke.com/Html5Viewer/Index.html?viewer=swwigis&RunWorkflow=ParcelSearchByTaxKey&taxkey=0140271.A)

14
 15 Section, Sect. 25, T6N, R1E (LOT 1 CSM 243 REC IN V 1 CSM P 310
 16 LOCATED IN PT SE1/4 OF NW1/4 & PT SW1/4 OF NE1/4 (INCLUDES
 17 PARCEL 0041.C))
 18 County map via url: [https://maps.ags.ruekert-
 19 mielke.com/Html5Viewer/Index.html?viewer=swwigis&RunWorkflow=ParcelSe
 20 archByTaxKey&taxkey=1110041.D](https://maps.ags.ruekert-mielke.com/Html5Viewer/Index.html?viewer=swwigis&RunWorkflow=ParcelSearchByTaxKey&taxkey=1110041.D)

21
 22 The Jewells and Walter/Andersons are 50-50 owners of Bloomfield Farms LLC.
 23 Brad and Alan have farmed together as complementary individual proprietors, operating
 24 many tens of thousands of acres together since 2007. That facility of many steel grain
 25 bins, office, and shop area, west of Edmund on County Road 18, visible on google earth

1 and in the attached maps, will be negatively transformed by the high-voltage lines that
2 may pass directly overhead.

3 I have attached the maps provided by the applicants as Ex.-JJI-Jewell-2. I have
4 attached the Jewell-Walter/Andersons and Bloomfield Farms maps discussed above as
5 Ex.-JJI-Jewell-3.

6 **Q: What are the impacts that you anticipate would occur if this project would be built**
7 **over your land?**

8
9 A: As shown in the Environmental Impact Statement, we have concerns about how
10 this project will affect the community, visually, aurally, economically, historically, and
11 agriculturally in terms of land use, culture, and legacy. This is our opportunity to voice
12 our concerns and ask questions about this project that will change the character and
13 livability of our community and to explain the individual hardships that would occur.

14 This Cardinal-Hickory Creek transmission line is a part of several connected and
15 inter-related MISO “MVP” projects. As we intervened in those three other related
16 dockets, the Badger Hollow solar siting and “generation tie-line” dockets and the
17 acquisition docket, intervention in the Cardinal-Hickory Creek docket was necessary,
18 because it appears to be connected to the Badger Hollow “generation tie-line” and
19 acquisition dockets. Intervention was absolutely necessary because two proposed routes
20 would affect our properties quite negatively. It is our understanding that the Commission
21 must determine that this project is in the public interest prior to issuing a CPCN, and that
22 the Commission must consider individual hardships. This project is not in the public
23 interest – there is no benefit to Wisconsin. If this project goes forward, we will suffer
24 individual and community hardships, and those hardships include perhaps unintended but
25 predictable negative consequences.

1 **Q: Have you reviewed the Application for the this docket? If so, do you have concerns**
2 **with the project as proposed?**

3
4 A: Yes, we have reviewed the Applications for the Cardinal-Hickory Creek docket
5 and yes, we do now have concerns. We will also have additional issues to raise in
6 Rebuttal Testimony.

7 **Q: You mentioned you have concerns about the proposed transmission line. Can you**
8 **elaborate?**

9 Generally, the impacts that concern us most are those of decreased property
10 values, because of the extent of these property interests. We're also very disheartened
11 with the potential for visual and aesthetic change due to the tall, looming towers, visible
12 for many miles over this open, rolling terrain. We also have specific concerns about
13 vegetation management, and because those plans have been only recently released, with
14 very limited distribution as protected documents, those concerns will be laid out in our
15 Rebuttal testimony.

16 The timing of the release of the Agricultural Impact Statement is also problematic,
17 as only a summary was in the Environmental Impact Statement, and we had no
18 opportunity to comment on it during the established DEIS comment period.

19 **Q: What other issues are of concern to Jewell Jinkins Intervenors?**

20 A: There are several overarching issues that Jewell Jinkins Intervenors are concerned about.
21 The primary issues are:

22 **Eminent Domain**

23 We are concerned about the impact of use of eminent domain, where the applicants would
24 take our land, with us having little say and no opportunity to do anything but argue about
25 the price. The EIS claims that easements are negotiated, that the terms are specific

1 including numbers and locations of structures, that additional conditions may be obtained,
2 but it is not a discussion between equals if the project is approved by the PSC – that
3 CPCN gives the utilities the power to take our land, and we have no choice but to go to
4 court, which can cost more than we can gain.

5 If permitted, this project would take some of our land out of production and we would
6 have to work around it – our land would be worth less to us in our farming ventures. The
7 developers cannot show that this transmission project, much of it built on productive
8 agricultural land, will not have an impact, and in this case, a substantial impact.

9 **Impacts on property values**

10 There are three distinct categories of property value impacts, those of land under the
11 transmission, those on land near the transmission lines, and the value of residences near
12 the transmission, both value and marketability.

13 • **Impact on value of land under the transmission**

14 If transmission is built on productive agricultural land, it will remain forever, and as a
15 corridor, it will also be an invitation for use for additional transmission lines. This project
16 means that there will be a shift from value as farmland to value as a place to put a
17 transmission highway. The transmission line and perception of it will have an impact, not
18 just on direct value, but on marketability as well. The EIS, on page 141, says that
19 “Surveys or attitudinal research tends to show persistent adverse perceptions of the
20 impact of transmission lines. Most respondents believe that the presence of a
21 transmission line would result in lower property values, or respond that they would pay
22 less for a property encumbered by or near to a transmission line.” and that “with a trend

1 in the literature indicating a 10 percent or less reduction in property value,” with some
2 sources reporting lower losses and others reporting much higher valuation losses.

3 The EIS states that this project would not have “a significant negative impact on
4 property values,” but as an example, for a \$200,000 parcel of farmland, a 10% loss would
5 represent a \$20,000 decrease! Many of our parcels are directly or immediately affected, 5
6 parcels, roughly 5 quarter sections of 40 acres, on the blue Preferred Route, and 10
7 parcels, roughly 10 quarter sections of 40 acres, on the orange “Other Route Segments”
8 route. The balance of our parcels are also affected, though not as directly. Should the
9 values of only the parcels potentially directly affected, whether 5 quarter sections or 10
10 quarter sections, decrease by 10%, that is a large figure, a large loss to us. That is a
11 significant negative impact, a significant individual hardship. Wis. Stat. §196.401(3)(d)3.

12 The EIS suggests mitigation strategies, such as locating transmission lines and
13 structures along property edges, but does not address avoidance. A mitigation strategy is
14 “using structure designs that blend into the background and reduce aesthetic impacts,” but
15 I’ve not heard of “stealth” transmission towers like those used for cell tower, or other
16 ways that transmission structure designs blend into the background.

17 • **Impact on value of land near the transmission line.**

18 The EIS admits that land not just directly under the line, but land near the line is also
19 affected, and the property value may decrease, the amount lower with distance. On the
20 other hand, land near the project may be affected but it’s not clear what the
21 impact will be. Impacts on nearby land is highly probable, and there is potential that this
22 transmission corridor could be used to site additional transmission lines in the future and
23 that other projects may be proposed.

1 • **Impact on value of residences near transmission lines**

2 We are also concerned about the project’s impact on the value of residences in the
3 project area. The EIS admits that residential properties suffer increased property
4 valuation impacts, both farm residences and exurban residences with smaller parcels of
5 land. The visual impact may well decimate values of residences in the area. If
6 beauty is in the eyes of the beholder, and perception is a primary factor in valuation, the
7 transmission line may saddle those owners with properties that may not even be saleable.

8 We are reminded that there is decades of precedent in siting transmission lines,
9 guiding routing decisions, with a requirement that the no-build option be considered.

10 **Q: Are there any special considerations regarding your property?**

11 A: Yes. Our home, also known as the William J. Bennett House, is located at 3362
12 County Road B, Dodgeville, Wisconsin (County Road B, north side, ¼ mile east of
13 County Road Q), and was built in 1860 and is listed by the Wisconsin Historical Society
14 in its Wisconsin Architecture and History Inventory, reference number 46941. It is a
15 Greek Revival home, built of stone by Cornish settlers. This home has been in the Jewell
16 family since 1915. I’ve found no listing of this historical site in the DEIS.



17

1 This historical property is located on the route designated as “Other Route Segment” R09.



2
3 Transmission in the vicinity of this historic home would diminish its historical and
4 monetary value by degrading its setting and through a dramatic change in the viewshed.

5 **Q: What specific agricultural issues should be considered by the Commission?**

6 A: There are several overarching issues that Jewell Jinkins Intervenors is concerned about.

7 **Agricultural and Vegetation Management Issues**

8 Because the Agricultural Impact Statement and the Vegetation Management Plans
9 were provided at such a late date, after the DEIS comment period had closed, we will
10 address agricultural and vegetation issues raised in future testimony.

11 **Growth and vegetation management in transmission Right of Way**

12 I am very concerned about growth and vegetation management in the transmission
13 Right of Way, the impacts of vegetation management on surrounding farming acreage and
14 residences, and whether it is possible to grow grasses and pollinators in the transmission
15 right of way. Typically the right of way will be 150’ wide, a gash across the landscape,

1 often near a highway or road, but sometimes cross country. Trees are usually not allowed
2 and only short shrubs and/or grasses are permissible. Again, the Vegetation Management
3 Plans were only recently released and have limited distribution, and I am not able to
4 comment at this time.

- 5 • If permitted, as a condition, pesticide use must be prohibited in the right of way or
6 any area where it could drift beyond the easement.
7
- 8 • Right of Way is an excellent location for pollinator habitat, and if permitted, the
9 Commission should condition the permit on development of pollinator habitat
10 across the length of the corridor.
11

12 **Viewshed and Aesthetics**

13 The Cardinal-Hickory Creek transmission line will change the viewshed,
14 acknowledged in the DEIS. It will be altered for the long term, for the life of the
15 infrastructure. In an agricultural community, with flat land or rolling hills, the 85-105
16 mile transmission route in Wisconsin will change the look and feel of the community.
17 The transmission towers are tall and ugly, and in real estate marketability, perception is
18 the key. The stark dark brown steel towers impair the vista, and the DEIS does note
19 harms to viewshed. Mitigation is not possible because they are visible for many miles.

20 **Electric and Magnetic Fields**

21 Another concern is electric fields and magnetic fields and potential of electric
22 fields to interfere with farming operations near the line, through inductive transfer of
23 current to fences and equipment, interference with pacemakers, etc., and potential of
24 magnetic fields due to their association with increased risk of cancer and other disease.

25 **Q: Does this conclude your testimony?**

26 **A:** Yes, it does.