Exhibit No.:
Issues: Eminent Domain
Witness: Blake Hurst
Changarina Dantyu Missayuri Farm Dynasy

Sponsoring Party: Missouri Farm Bureau Type of Exhibit: Rebuttal Testimony

Case No.: EA-2016-0358

Date Testimony Prepared: January 24, 2017

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

-2016-0358
_

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF

BLAKE HURST

ON BEHALF OF

THE MISSOURI FARM BUREAU

JANUARY 24, 2017

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF BLAKE HURST ON BEHALF OF THE MISSOURI FARM BUREAU

JANUARY 24, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		<u>Page</u>
I.	Introduction and Purpose of Testimony	1
II.	Missouri Farm Bureau's Interest in Eminent Domain	2
III.	Conclusion.	

I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY

- 2 Q1. Please state your name, position, and business address.
- A. My name is Blake Hurst, and I am president of Missouri Farm Bureau. My business address is 701 South Country Club Drive, Jefferson City, MO, 65109.
 - Q2. Please describe your experience and qualifications.
 - A. I am a sixth generation farmer raising corn and soybeans and running a greenhouse nursery with my family in northwest Missouri. I was first elected president of Missouri Farm Bureau at our annual meeting in December 2010. As vice president for seven years, I chaired our State resolutions Committee, which coordinates the development of policy recommendations for consideration by members serving as voting delegates at our annual meeting.
 - Q3. On whose behalf are you appearing in this proceeding?
 - A. I am appearing on behalf of the Missouri Farm Bureau.
 - O4. Please describe the scope and purpose of your testimony.
 - A. I will address the direct testimony of Grain Belt witnesses regarding their assertions that Grain Belt's proposed project is necessary or convenient for the public, and that Grain Belt's proposed use of eminent domain would serve the public interest.

 Specifically, I will discuss Missouri Farm Bureau's opposition to Grain Belt's Application for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity in the context of our commitment as an organization to the protection of property rights relative to eminent domain.

II. MISSOURI FARM BUREAU'S INTEREST IN EMINENT DOMAIN

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

A. Protection of property rights is among the most fundamental beliefs expressed in our policy positions. Missouri Farm Bureau has a longstanding policy pertaining to various aspects of property rights, including the use of eminent domain. I will highlight the following excerpts (underlined) from our current policy, and the entire policy pertaining to eminent domain is included in my written testimony: The government acquisition of land and buildings should be severely restricted in cases where reasonable alternatives are available. We oppose the acquisition of land and buildings from an unwilling seller simply to keep development within a particular political boundary. We support Missouri's eminent domain reform law, which strengthens the protection of landowners from condemnation with assurance that needed rural infrastructure such as roads, power lines and water and sewer lines can be built in a timely and economical manner with equitable compensation granted to all affected landowners. We believe entities with condemnation authority should be required to consider alternate routes and to directly notify and publicly disclose routes for proposed rightof-way expansion to affected landowners. We oppose the use of eminent domain for the acquisition of land to be resold to private owners or for the transfer of property from one private entity to another for the purpose of economic development. We believe that easement acquired by an entity with condemnation authority should return to the landowner if unused after ten

1	years. We oppose granting eminent domain authority to cable companies or any other
2	entities that do not already have eminent domain authority.
3	We believe eminent domain authority should not be used for purposes of private
4	development or recreational facilities, and the term "public use" in eminent domain
5	statutes and the state constitution excludes these purposes.
6	We support further restrictions on the use of eminent domain to acquire blighted
7	property in both urban and rural areas.
8	We believe landowners in eminent domain cases should have five years from the time
9	of the original settlement in which to negotiate claims for damage from construction
10	and maintenance that may not have been confirmed at the time of the initial
11	settlement. We believe that when it becomes necessary for any city to condemn
12	private property outside the city limits, for any authorized purpose, the governing
13	body of the city must first be required to obtain the approval of the county
14	commission of the county containing such property.
15	We support changes to the Missouri Constitution which promote our established
16	policy on property rights. Furthermore, if deemed to be a valuable tool to that end,
17	we support the use of a Missouri Farm Bureau initiated initiative petition process to
18	effect those changes.
19	Missouri Supreme Court rulings have upheld key provisions of Missouri's eminent
20	domain reform law enacted in 2006. If legal challenges weaken the law, we support
21	necessary modifications to protect property rights.
22	
23	

Q6. Why did Missouri Farm Bureau adopt this Policy?

A. Significant portions of this policy were adopted by Missouri Farm Bureau members following the 2005 U.S. Supreme Court ruling in Kelo v. City of New London. This ruling prompted an overwhelming public outcry nationwide against allowing the transfer of private property from one owner to another through the condemnation for economic development purposes. Missouri Farm Bureau also served on the Eminent Domain Task Force appointed in 2005 by then Governor Matt Blunt to review state statutes in the wake of the Kelo ruling. Subsequently, we worked successfully with legislators from both houses and both parties to enact significant eminent domain legislation based on the task force's recommendations. The state law enacted in 2006 and subsequent court rulings have affirmed Missourians' deeply held belief that eminent domain power should be tightly controlled and used only when absolutely necessary for public purposes and not for economic development purposes.

Q7. Why does Missouri Farm Bureau so strongly oppose the use of eminent domain in this case?

A. Grain Belt Express Clean Line LLC is a consortium of private investors who propose to transmit electricity generated by wind farms in Kansas to a terminal in Indiana at which point it will be delivered to buyers. It is a business venture that does not merit certification by the Missouri Public Service Commission. Neither its purpose nor potential benefits to Missouri citizens enumerated by Grain Belt Express justify the authorization to exercise eminent domain power. Moreover, the potential benefits are outweighed by the concerns expressed by many of our members along with hundreds

1	of others who participated in the commission's local public hearings and submitted
2	comments in opposition to the project.

- Q8. Does Grain Belt Express Clean Line LLC's alleged commitment to give free or discounted power to Missouri municipalities change Missouri Farm Bureau's position as to whether eminent domain power is appropriate for the Grain Belt Express project?
- A. No. Grain Belt Express Clean Line LLC's supposed promises to sell power to Missouri municipalities should be recognized for what they are: a political stunt to create pressure for approval of this project by giving small benefits to local governments at the massive expense of landowners' rights. Those municipalities in support will bear none of the burden from Grain Belt's proposed project. It is instead Missouri's rural landowners that will experience significant disruptions in their operations if Grain Belt Express Clean Line LLC is given the power to force land sales through eminent domain takings. This development does not change the underlying nature of the Grain Belt Express proposal. The project remains an attempt to engage in the abuse of eminent domain for private gain.

III. CONCLUSION

- Q9. Does this conclude your testimony?
- 19 A. Yes, it does.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of	
the Application of Grain Belt Express Clean Line)	
LLC for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity)	
Authorizing it to Construct, Own, Operate, Control,	
Manage and Maintain a High Voltage, Direct Current)	File No. EA-2016-0358
Transmission Line and an Associated Converter)	
Station Providing an Interconnection on the	
Maywood-Montgomery 345kV Transmission Line)	

AFFIDAVIT OF BLAKE HURST

STATE OF MISSOURI)
) s
COUNTY OF COLE)

Blake Hurst, being first duly sworn on his oath, states:

- My name is Blake Hurst. I am the President of the Missouri Farm Bureau. My business address is 701 S. Country Club Drive, Jefferson City, MO 65109.
- Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes is my Rebuttal Testimony on behalf of the Missouri Farm Bureau, consisting of five (5) pages, all of which have been prepared in written form for introduction into evidence in the above-referenced docket.
- I hereby swear and affirm that my answers contained in the attached testimony to the
 questions therein propounded are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge,
 information and belief.

BLAKE HURST

Subscribed and sworn before me this 24th day of January, 2017.

My commission expires: March 16, 2012

otar DEBRAA JOHNSON
Notary Public - Notary Seel
STATE OF MISSOURI
County of Cole
Av Commission Expires 3/16/20

Commission # 14437959