

Exhibit 1: Narrative for Figures

Narrative for Figures 1-23

Figure 1: An overview of the TTRA showing the area within which Excelsior's search for practicable alternatives for siting Mesaba One and Mesaba Two was focused. The cross hatched region generally represented areas within the TTRA where access to sufficient water supplies were available, where access to existing rail tracks and HVTL corridors were feasible, and where impacts to wetlands could be minimized.

Figure 1A: An overview map of the TTRA showing the general location of the area shown in Figures 2 through 23. This figure also identifies areas within the TTRA that have been designated "environmental setting boundaries" for various mining operations.

Figure 2: The western-most portion of the TTRA, in the vicinity of La Prairie and Coleraine, MN, is highly residential and generally unsuitable for siting a large power plant. Only one location appeared to have some potential for low wetland impacts, but the plat map revealed that no large blocks of land were available there, and the close proximity to resort homes on Trout Lake pose insurmountable issues precluding further consideration of the site.

Figure 3: To the east, the next portion of the TTRA, between Coleraine and Pengilly, MN, contains a number of promising-looking sites, but only the preferred West Range site is worthy of further consideration. To the west of that site, the unfavorable topography and the difficulty of routing rail access around the Canisteo Mine Pit eliminates that area from consideration. The area to the east of the preferred West Range site is owned and proposed for use by another industrial entity. The region south of US-169 is covered with lakes and wetlands, and the three areas identified are of insufficient size to site a power plant without having significant wetland impacts.

Figure 4: The portion of the TTRA between Pengilly, MN and Keewatin, MN is much like the previous region. The area north of US-169 is owned and proposed for use by another industrial entity. The region south of US-169 is covered with lakes and wetlands, and is also owned and used by other industrial entities.

Figure 5: The portion of the TTRA between Keewatin, MN and Hibbing, MN is much like the previous region. Nearly the entire area is owned and used by other industrial entities.

Figure 6: The portion of the TTRA just south of Hibbing, MN is dominated by wetlands. The only area that appears to have less wetland is residential and lacks large blocks of available land, making it unsuitable for siting a power plant.

Figure 7: The portion of the TTRA in the vicinity of Chisholm, MN and Buhl, MN contains three of the alternative sites identified in the site selection process. Aside from those areas, the Iron Formation precludes development in much of the region. The area northeast of Chisholm

APPENDIX F1: EXHIBIT 1

appears promising, but GIS software does not reflect that the nearby rail line has since been removed, rendering that location beyond all the three mile rail line buffers.

Figure 8: The portion of the TTRA between Kinney, MN and Virginia, MN contains two of the alternative sites identified in the site selection process. Aside from those areas, the Iron Formation precludes development in much of the region. Otherwise, the region north of Virginia is largely controlled and used by industrial entities, but the availability of water is unlikely to be sufficient anyway. The plat map reveals that the area southeast of Kinney contains no large blocks of land suitable for siting a power plant.

Figure 9: The portion of the TTRA between Virginia, MN and Biwabik, MN is dominated by the Iron Formation. Otherwise, the area just west of Gilbert is controlled and used by an industrial entity. East of Gilbert, water availability to the north of the Iron Formation is insufficient for siting a power plant, and the region south of the Iron Formation is dominated by wetlands and residential developments, leaving no areas suitable for power plant siting.

Figure 10: The portion of the TTRA between Biwabik, MN and Hoyt Lakes, MN contains three of the alternative sites identified in the site selection process, including the alternative East Range site. Aside from these sites, the region is dominated by the Iron Formation, residential development, and wetlands that preclude any other sites from being considered. East of Hoyt Lakes, water availability is insufficient for siting a power plant.

Figure 11: The portion of the TTRA in the vicinity of Eveleth and Leonidas, MN contains five of the alternative sites identified in the site selection process. Outside of these locations, the region is dominated by the Iron Formation, residential development and wetlands, which preclude any other sites from being considered for siting a power plant.

Figure 12: The portion of the TTRA in the vicinity of Forbes, MN contains one of the alternative sites identified in the site selection process. Aside from this location, the region is dominated by wetlands and residential development, which preclude other sites from being considered for siting a power plant. The plat map revealed that the area southwest of Forbes and southeast of the St. Louis River contained no large blocks of available land.

Figures 13-18: The large southern portion of the TTRA along the DMIR and DWP rail lines contains vast amounts of wetlands, while generally lacking sufficient water availability for siting a power plant. The few areas with less wetland area lack large blocks of available land.

Figure 19: The southern-most portion of the TTRA in the vicinity of Brookston, MN is dominated by wetlands and residential development. South of the St. Louis River, the Fon du Lac Reservation would complicate power plant siting beyond the issues cited above. The area north of the confluence of the St. Louis and Cloquet rivers would result in significant wetland impacts, due to rail access and because aesthetic considerations would force some setback from the river.

Figure 20: The southwestern-most portion of the TTRA to the west of Brookston, MN contains significant residential development and no large blocks of available land suitable for siting a power plant.

APPENDIX F1: EXHIBIT 1

Figure 21: The small portion of the TTRA near Swan River, MN contains significant wetlands, residential development and no large blocks of available land suitable for siting a power plant.

Figure 22: The portion of the TTRA along the BNSF rail near Casco, MN is dominated by wetlands. The two areas with less wetland are either controlled by another industrial entity or lack large blocks of available land.

Figure 23: The portion of the TTRA east of Hibbing and south of Buhl, MN contains two of the alternative sites identified in the site selection process. Aside from these locations, the region is dominated by residential development and wetlands, and sufficient water availability is unlikely.

Narrative for Figures 24-29

Figures 24 through 29 illustrate how Excelsior screened alternative site locations for wetland impacts using the IGCC Power Station footprint and National Wetland Inventory maps. The results of this screening analysis are presented in Table 5. The methodology used in the screening analysis is presented in the text immediately following that table.