

SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECT TESTIMONY OF
WILLIAM A. BONNET

VICE PRESIDENT
GOVERNMENT AND COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
HAWAIIAN ELECTRIC COMPANY, INC.

Subject: EMF

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Q. Please state your name and business address.

3 A. My name is William A. Bonnet. My business address is 900 Richards Street,
4 Honolulu, Hawaii.

5 Q. What is your present position with Hawaiian Electric Company, Inc. (“HECO”)?

6 A. I am Vice President of Government and Community Affairs. My educational
7 background and professional experience were provided in HECO-1100.

8 Q. Have you previously submitted testimony in this proceeding?

9 A. Yes. I submitted written direct testimony and exhibits as HECO T-11.

10 Q. What is the scope of your supplemental direct testimony?

11 A. My supplemental testimony discusses HECO’s continuing response to public
12 concern regarding electric and magnetic fields (“EMF”) resulting from the 46kV
13 Phased Project. My direct testimony addressed the issue of electric and magnetic
14 fields, including evolution of public concern, prior examination of this issue by
15 the Hawaii Public Utilities Commission relative to transmission line planning, and
16 the policy and practice of our company, with particular attention to this project.

17 Q. Since last December when your written direct testimony was filed, what work has
18 HECO done in response to public concern regarding EMF?

19 A. Since last December, HECO retained Entertech Consultants of Santa Clara, Inc.
20 (“Enertech”) to perform a magnetic field evaluation. The East Oahu Transmission
21 Project Magnetic Field Evaluation is marked as HECO-ST-1001, and is described
22 in the testimony of J. Michael Silva, P.E., HECO ST-10.

23 Q. Why did HECO perform this magnetic field evaluation?

24 A. In 2003, HECO gathered public comments for new proposed line initiatives. The
25 public meetings and survey conducted by HECO are described in the testimony of

1 Robert A. Alm, HECO T-12, and in a September 2003 report prepared by 3Point
2 entitled “East O‘ahu Transmission Project: A Report on Public Input Collected in
3 June and July 2003,” provided as Exhibit 11 to the Application in this proceeding.
4 The public comment process identified concerns with EMF. In response to public
5 concern, HECO retained Enertech to perform the magnetic field evaluation.

6 Q. What public concern was expressed regarding EMF?

7 A. Surveys showed that EMF was a concern, with a majority feeling somewhat
8 concerned (17.2%), quite a bit concerned (4.7%), or very concerned (34.4%). A
9 number of people expressed questions and concerns including: 1) how EMF is
10 measured; 2) the effect of nearness to the EMF sources; 3) the latest
11 understanding of health hazards related to EMF; and 4) the honesty of HECO’s
12 portrayal of EMF levels.

13 Q. What information is presented in Enertech’s magnetic field study?

14 A. Enertech measured magnetic fields at eleven project segments to characterize field
15 strengths due to existing electrical facilities, and performed magnetic field
16 calculations for forecasted conditions in 2009. Enertech also measured magnetic
17 fields encountered in everyday locations, and characterized magnetic fields around
18 transformers, manholes and risers on wooden poles. In addition, Enertech
19 evaluated present and future magnetic field levels in the vicinity of various
20 institutions, including daycare centers, preschools, schools, hospitals, churches
21 and retirement homes, in the project area. The results of Enertech’s magnetic
22 field survey are described in the East Oahu Transmission Project Magnetic Field
23 Evaluation, HECO-ST-1001, and in the Supplemental Direct Testimony of J.
24 Michael Silva, HECO ST-10.

25 Q. As stated in your testimony (HECO T-4, pages 3-4), the Hawaii Public Utilities

1 Commission found in a 1994 overhead 138 kV transmission line docket that,
2 “. . . a causal link between EMF and adverse health effects has yet to be
3 established by those in the scientific community who have been researching this
4 matter.” Do the studies and scientific reviews since then warrant a different
5 conclusion?

6 A. As described in my testimony, HECO T-11, and in section 4.21.2.5 of the
7 Kamoku-Pukele 138kV Transmission Line Project Revised Final Environmental
8 Impact Statement, provided as Exhibit 4 to the Application in this proceeding,
9 various studies, reviews and reports do not establish a cause and effect
10 relationship between EMF and any health outcome. In light of the continuing
11 public concern with EMF, we are submitting the supplemental written direct
12 testimonies of epidemiologist Linda S. Erdreich, Ph.D., HECO ST-11A, and
13 physician Stuart Aaronson, M.D., HECO ST-11B, which provide expert support
14 for this conclusion. Dr. Erdreich is an experienced epidemiologist, and has a
15 substantial amount of familiarity with EMF studies and reviews in her position as
16 Senior Managing Scientist at Exponent, Inc. Dr. Aaronson is a physician with a
17 nationally recognized cancer program knowledgeable about EMF studies and
18 reviews in his position at Mount Sinai School of Medicine, where he holds the
19 Jane B. and Jack R. Aron Professorship and serves as Chairman, Department of
20 Oncological Services.

21 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

22 A. Yes, it does.

23

24

25