

**From:** [Randy Schroeder](#)  
**To:** [Leshner, Dan GRE-MG](#)  
**Cc:** [Paul Torkelson](#); [charles enter](#); [whensel@BENCO.org](mailto:whensel@BENCO.org); [#PUC Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** CapX could save over \$600,000 and keep landowners happy by slightly revising path  
**Date:** Monday, May 07, 2012 7:49:30 AM

---

To: Dan Leshner, Great River Energy

Good morning, Dan:

As you are well aware, the five mile path of the CapX transmission line in Brown County has been problematic from the start. The path discussed at all the public information meetings showed the line essentially over my neighbor's house, a fatal flaw that should have been recognized by CapX planners before they recommended it. After all the public information meetings were over, and without formal notice to affected land owners, the path was changed to avoid my neighbor's house, but instead ran along an open drainage ditch, and cornered our house on the south and east sides (the only two exposed sides of almost any farm site), approximately 500' from our house and 300' from our yard. Carol's doctor has told us (you have a copy of his letter) that Carol must avoid proximity to this power line or risk worsening her neurological condition and making her further disabled. The currently approved path also makes three right angle turns in that five mile stretch, which makes aerial spraying in those corner fields nearly impossible.

The Eden Township Board of Supervisors, the Brown County Commissioners, and Rep. Paul Torkelson all acknowledged the unusually harsh consequences of this path in Brown County, and fully supported the request of 21 Eden Township landowners for a reconsideration of the approval by the PUC. Some of us made two trips to the PUC in St. Paul to voice our objections, and we expressed our concerns about this path to you and other authorities. CapX, however, asked the PUC to deny our request for reconsideration, and the PUC sided with CapX.

Since that time, during dozens of discussions with affected neighbors, it has become clear to my neighbors and me that we will indeed have the power line on our land, but that **there could be a less damaging path to our properties that would also save CapX at least two poles and over 2000' of line** as compared to the currently approved path: a diagonal path through Sections 5 and 32 of Eden Township. CapX's website estimates the cost of the line at \$1.5 to \$2 million per mile, so the reduction of over 2000' of line (and two poles) should save CapX between \$600,000 and \$800,000. The diagonal path would also eliminate the three right angle turns, which would further benefit CapX and adjacent landowners.

It is clear that all affected landowners (including a landowner in Section 31-32 not impacted by the current path) **would agree to this diagonal path if they were fairly compensated for the reduction to the value of their property.** However, the negotiator representing Great River Energy and CapX has indicated that affected landowners would be paid no more than what CapX has offered to other landowners: 80% of \$7500 per acre for the narrow strip of land needed for the easement, plus **\$1000 for each pole in the middle of a field.** Any farmer will agree that \$1000 is not even close to fair compensation for perpetually farming around a pole in the middle of a field, generally six times per year.

**So it seems that the only barrier to a path acceptable to all landowners that will also save CapX \$600,000 to \$800,000 is CapX's unwillingness to pay fair compensation to**

**affected landowners.** And that unwillingness to pay fair compensation is based on the amount CapX has been offering to absentee landowners and other landowners whose properties are far less severely impacted. It is not surprising that such landowners would accept the modest payment offered by CapX when they have only a straight line path on the edge of their property, far from their homes.

Please don't waste the opportunity to settle this issue amicably and fairly with all affected landowners, letting a disabled person and her family stay living in their century farm, and saving CapX \$600,000 to \$800,000 of project costs. Please work with affected landowners to revise the path, and compensate them fairly for the damages to their property.

Sincerely,

Randy Schroeder  
33763 327<sup>th</sup> Ave.  
Morgan, MN 56266

Direct phone during the day: 507-233-4797  
Home phone: 507-249-3988  
Cell phone: 507-766-3300

CC:  
Rep. Paul Torkelson  
Charles Enter for Brown County Commissioners  
Wade Hensel for Brown County REA  
[PublicComments.Puc@state.mn.us](mailto:PublicComments.Puc@state.mn.us)

This message contains confidential information intended only for the addressee(s) named above. If you are not the addressee, or the person responsible for delivering it to the addressee, you are hereby notified that reading, disseminating, distributing or copying this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message by mistake, please immediately notify the sender by replying to the message and delete the original message immediately thereafter. Thank you for your consideration and compliance with this message. **SECURITY NOTICE: Frandsen Bank & Trust will never ask you to send non-public private information through e-mail, such as your PIN, Social Security numbers, or account numbers. Please do not respond to any e-mail requesting this type of information.**

**From:** [staff\\_cao \(PUC\)](#)  
**Subject:** CapX2020 Hampton-Rochester-LaCrosse Project (Docket E002/TL-09-1448)  
**Date:** Thursday, May 17, 2012 12:11:19 PM

---

Thank you for contacting the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission to express your concerns about the recent Commission decisions concerning the placement of electrical transmission lines in Southeast Minnesota. The Commission issued a route permit setting a specific route and permit conditions for the Minnesota portion of the CapX2020 project from Hampton, Minnesota - Rochester, Minnesota - La Crosse, Wisconsin involving 345kV and 161 kV transmission lines (Docket E002/TL-09-1448).

We have retained your comments for further review during any future proceedings.

The Commission often is required to act in a quasi-judicial capacity, as it was in the Hampton-Rochester-LaCrosse proceeding. As such, Minnesota Statute §216A.037 prohibits ex parte communications, directly or indirectly, between a Commissioner and a party or a participant relating to any material issue concerning an open Docket item.

Accordingly, although your comments were sent directly to a specific Member of the Commission, it would be inappropriate for that Commissioner to review or to respond to those comments. In my capacity, I have read your comments and wanted to take an opportunity to address those concerns.

We understand the sincere beliefs held by individuals impacted by the route selected for these electric transmission lines and facilities and we respect their perspectives. However, it is important to be clear concerning some misunderstandings that appear to have surfaced.

First, some individuals appear to have been under the impression that they would not be allowed to testify at the April 12, 2012 public hearing at which the Commission would make its decisions. The Commission's notice for that meeting included the Agenda which listed only the Hampton-Rochester-LaCrosse matter for oral argument, deliberation, and decision on that day. It also included a separate notice that explicitly allowed for public comment at the meeting and placed that segment of the hearing to follow the oral arguments of the formal parties. This Notice did provide that persons wishing to speak needed to pre-register to do so and placed time limits on those comments; it did not, however, prohibit anyone from registering to speak. Individuals had until end of the day April 9, 2012 to register. Those members of the public who registered to speak were placed on a list, that list was provided to the chair presiding at the meeting, and the chair called on those individuals who were on the list.

Second, the Commission's decisions on a particular segment of the route did differ from that recommended by the Administrative Law Judge that heard the contested case and the recommendations of the Department of Commerce. The law is very clear that the

Administrative Law Judge is to hear the testimony and weigh the evidence in the contested case. Their role is to make factual determinations and recommendations. However, their Report in a proceeding such as this has no force or effect until acted upon by the Commission; i.e., it is a recommendation. It is up to the Commission to act on those findings by independently factoring in its responsibilities under the law. Similarly, the input of the Department of Commerce is very integral to the work of the Commission, but again that input is a set of recommendations. To be clear, the Report of the Administrative Law Judge and the materials from the Department of Commerce are significant elements in the record upon which the Commission must make its decisions. However, the Commission's decisions must be based on the **entire record** in the proceeding and the role of the Commission is to make the best decisions it can balancing the statutory and policy considerations it must take into account in the context of the facts of the matter.

The Order formalizing the Commission's decisions granting the route permit has not yet been issued, but should be soon. Once that Order is issued, a party or person aggrieved and directly affected by the decision may file a petition asking the Commission to rehear, amend, vacate, or reconsider the matter. That petition must be filed within 20 days after the Order is issued by the Executive Secretary. The petition must set forth specifically the grounds relied upon or the errors claimed.

Beyond these administrative proceedings, one may have the standing to appeal the matter to the Minnesota Court of Appeals.

The Commission's Order will be posted on the Commission's website under Spotlights as soon as it is released. You may also wish to [Subscribe to this Docket](#) to receive electronic notification when the Order becomes available.

Again, we respect the viewpoints of individuals impacted by the Commission's selection of a specific route for these electric transmission lines and facilities. The Commission made the best decision it could taking into account all of the record before it and balancing the facts and policy considerations it is charged with effecting.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

*Deborah Motz, Manager*  
Minnesota Public Utilities Commission  
Consumer Affairs Office

[consumer.puc@state.mn.us](mailto:consumer.puc@state.mn.us)

[www.puc.state.mn.us](http://www.puc.state.mn.us)

121 7th Place East, Suite 350  
St. Paul, MN 55101-2147  
1-800-657-3782 | 651-296-0406

**From:** [Haar, Burl \(PUC\)](#)  
**To:** [#PUC Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** FW: CAP route in Oronoco  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 25, 2012 10:55:29 AM

---

Hampton/LaX

---

**From:** Boyd, David C (PUC)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 25, 2012 10:55 AM  
**To:** Haar, Burl (PUC)  
**Subject:** FW: CAP route in Oronoco

---

**From:** Barb Sorenson [<mailto:B.Sorenson@schmidtgoodman.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 25, 2012 10:42 AM  
**To:** Boyd, David C (PUC)  
**Subject:** CAP route in Oronoco

Dear Mr. Boyd~

I am asking for a reconsideration of the action taken on Thursday, April 12<sup>th</sup> by the Public Utility Commission. Their action switches the Cap route from Power Dam to White Bridge.

Our personal stories are of a much graver (in the public record) "demonstrating that the White Bridge Crossing is inappropriate". The White Bridge alternative requites the power line to zig zag both north & south of highway 12 through an area more densely populated with people, destroying homes, farms, livelihoods & negatively impacting our children year round, not just one week camp sessions during the summer at the Christian Day Camp located at the other alternative.

I am a homeowner, along with my husband that lives on a quiet gravel road just south of the White Bridge Road.

A short 2 mile stretch of this gravel road will affect 12 family homes which includes 2 dairy farms, one of which has 150 head of cattle.

Families & farm livelihoods should bear greater consideration then a minimal impact on the forest in the Power Dam route alternative. As the Administrative Law Judge stated, Oronoco Township (White Birdge Corssing) is much more densely populated & prone to future development because it is in the Rochester School District.

We respectfully request (beg, plead, hope, implore, wish) you to reconsider your determination & follow the recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge & your staff from the Department of Commerce.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Rich & Barb Sorenson

**Barb Sorenson**  
Account Manager  
schmidt goodman office products inc  
good stuff. good prices.

507.282.3870 cell.507.254.5960  
[www.schmidtgoodman.com](http://www.schmidtgoodman.com)

**From:** [Reha, Phyllis \(PUC\)](#)  
**To:** [#PUC Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Cap X 2020 -White Bridge Road  
**Date:** Thursday, April 26, 2012 1:23:01 PM

---

Please file this letter.

---

**From:** Hazel Markham [mailto:[hazelmark@charter.net](mailto:hazelmark@charter.net)]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 26, 2012 11:55 AM  
**To:** Reha, Phyllis (PUC)  
**Subject:** FW: Cap X 2020 -White Bridge Road

---

**From:** Hazel Markham [<mailto:hazelmark@charter.net>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 26, 2012 11:49 AM  
**To:** 'Betsy.Wergin@state.mn.us'; 'PhyllisRea@state.mn.us'  
**Subject:** FW: Cap X 2020 -White Bridge Road

This is written as an effort to hope to get a clearer picture of your plan to run the Cap X 2020 through Oronoco Township, especially along the White Bridge Road Hwy 12.

The publicity on the Cap X 2020 in the Rochester Post Bulletin and other publications has been too vague for the average person to understand exactly what you are trying to do. The map does not show the route clearly in regard to which property would be affected. It is not apparent what all this will entail. What all is involved? What will the effect be on the properties along that route? I am especially interested in what it would do to the property owned by **my daughter and son-in-law** and also other relatives, friends, and neighbors.

**A really big concern to me** is the land I and my husband owned for 56 years which we sold on a contract for deed. The buyer plans to re-sell it again someday when the economy improves. He is making a big investment. The property was re-zoned from agricultural to special district residential before we sold it. It is adjacent to Zumbro Haven, a residential district which is also a great concern. My husband passed away in 2009 and I moved to Rochester. One of my granddaughters is living on the property at the present time.

I am worried that your work will devalue the property, discourage the buyer, and leave me with a piece of property that I



cannot sell again because of what you might do.

As I said, your map is not clear; it covers too large an area; therefore, it is difficult to see just where you plan to put your power line, poles, stations, etc. You should be able to supply a map that zeros in on the exact area you are trying to take over.

I would like some answers that will give us a chance to know what all we can do to rescue our lifestyles and plans for our future.

Sincerely,

Hazel Markham

1889 Waterford Pl SW

Rochester MN 55902

Ph: 507-206-3614

E-mail: [hazemark@charter.net](mailto:hazemark@charter.net)

**From:** [Haar, Burl \(PUC\)](#)  
**To:** [#PUC Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Cap X 2020 -White Bridge Road  
**Date:** Thursday, April 26, 2012 1:41:56 PM

---

Hampton/LaX

---

**From:** Boyd, David C (PUC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 26, 2012 12:19 PM  
**To:** Haar, Burl (PUC); Wolf, Dan (PUC)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Cap X 2020 -White Bridge Road

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Hazel Markham <[hazelmark@charter.net](mailto:hazelmark@charter.net)>  
**Date:** April 26, 2012 11:35:25 AM CDT  
**To:** <[David.C.Boyd@state.mn.us](mailto:David.C.Boyd@state.mn.us)>, <[Phyllis.Rea@state.mn.us](mailto:Phyllis.Rea@state.mn.us)>, <[BetsyWergin@state.mn.us](mailto:BetsyWergin@state.mn.us)>  
**Cc:** <[jsbroberg@mcghiebetts.com](mailto:jsbroberg@mcghiebetts.com)>  
**Subject:** Cap X 2020 -White Bridge Road

This is written as an effort to hope to get a clearer picture of your plan to run the Cap X 2020 through Oronoco Township, especially along the White Bridge Road Hwy 12.

The publicity on the Cap X 2020 in the Rochester Post Bulletin and other publications has been too vague for the average person to understand exactly what you are trying to do. The map does not show the route clearly in regard to which property would be affected. It is not apparent what all this will entail. What all is involved? What will the effect be on the properties along that route? I am especially interested in what it would do to the property owned by **my daughter and son-in-law** and also other relatives, friends, and neighbors.

**A really big concern to me** is the land I and my

husband owned for 56 years which we sold on a contract for deed. The buyer plans to re-sell it again someday when the economy improves. He is making a big investment. The property was re-zoned from agricultural to special district residential before we sold it. It is adjacent to Zumbro Haven, a residential district which is also a great concern. My husband passed away in 2009 and I moved to Rochester. One of my granddaughters is living on the property at the present time.

I am worried that your work will devalue the property, discourage the buyer, and leave me with a piece of property that I cannot sell again because of what you might do.

As I said, your map is not clear; it covers too large an area; therefore, it is difficult to see just where you plan to put your power line, poles, stations, etc. You should be able to supply a map that zeros in on the exact area you are trying to take over.

I would like some answers that will give us a chance to know what all we can do to rescue our lifestyles and plans for our future.

Sincerely,

Hazel Markham

1889 Waterford Pl SW

Rochester MN 55902

Ph: 507-206-3614

E-mail: [hazelmark@charter.net](mailto:hazelmark@charter.net)

**From:** [Reha, Phyllis \(PUC\)](#)  
**To:** [#PUC Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Cap X 2020 -White Bridge Road  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 01, 2012 10:38:15 AM

---

Please file.

---

**From:** Hazel Markham [mailto:[hazelmark@charter.net](mailto:hazelmark@charter.net)]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 26, 2012 11:55 AM  
**To:** Reha, Phyllis (PUC)  
**Subject:** FW: Cap X 2020 -White Bridge Road

---

**From:** Hazel Markham [<mailto:hazelmark@charter.net>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 26, 2012 11:49 AM  
**To:** 'Betsy.Wergin@state.mn.us'; 'PhyllisRea@state.mn.us'  
**Subject:** FW: Cap X 2020 -White Bridge Road

This is written as an effort to hope to get a clearer picture of your plan to run the Cap X 2020 through Oronoco Township, especially along the White Bridge Road Hwy 12.

The publicity on the Cap X 2020 in the Rochester Post Bulletin and other publications has been too vague for the average person to understand exactly what you are trying to do. The map does not show the route clearly in regard to which property would be affected. It is not apparent what all this will entail. What all is involved? What will the effect be on the properties along that route? I am especially interested in what it would do to the property owned by **my daughter and son-in-law** and also other relatives, friends, and neighbors.

**A really big concern to me** is the land I and my husband owned for 56 years which we sold on a contract for deed. The buyer plans to re-sell it again someday when the economy improves. He is making a big investment. The property was re-zoned from agricultural to special district residential before we sold it. It is adjacent to Zumbro Haven, a residential district which is also a great concern. My husband passed away in 2009 and I moved to Rochester. One of my granddaughters is living on the property at the present time.

I am worried that your work will devalue the property, discourage the buyer, and leave me with a piece of property that I

cannot sell again because of what you might do.

As I said, your map is not clear; it covers too large an area; therefore, it is difficult to see just where you plan to put your power line, poles, stations, etc. You should be able to supply a map that zeros in on the exact area you are trying to take over.

I would like some answers that will give us a chance to know what all we can do to rescue our lifestyles and plans for our future.

Sincerely,

Hazel Markham

1889 Waterford Pl SW

Rochester MN 55902

Ph: 507-206-3614

E-mail: [hazemark@charter.net](mailto:hazemark@charter.net)

**From:** [Haar, Burl \(PUC\)](#)  
**To:** [#PUC Public Comments](#)  
**Cc:** [Wolf, Dan \(PUC\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: CAPX Power Line Route Decision  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 25, 2012 4:07:51 PM

---

Hampton/LaX

---

**From:** Boyd, David C (PUC)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 25, 2012 3:22 PM  
**To:** Wolf, Dan (PUC); Haar, Burl (PUC)  
**Subject:** FW: CAPX Power Line Route Decision

**From:** Rick Jorgensen [<mailto:greyjay80@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 25, 2012 3:05 PM  
**To:** Boyd, David C (PUC)  
**Subject:** CAPX Power Line Route Decision

Dear Dr. Boyd:

I'm writing to ask you, as a MNPUC member, **to reconsider the recommendations and ramifications regarding the the CAPX Power Line Route. Choose the Zumbro Power Dam Route instead.**

The Administrative Law Judge's **recommendation**, based, as I understand it, on 490 findings and 14 reasons, was to **choose the Zumbro Power Dam Route.**

Instead, the MNPUC chose the White Bridge Route, which apparently will have greater negative impacts on far more people, their lives, property, and businesses than the recommended Zumbro Power Dam Route would have. I have relatives in rural Pine Island. Due to this decision and routing, the CAPX Line will directly affect them, going along and through their 40 acres of wooded wildlife property and extremely close to their home. This will have a devastating affect on their lives. And they are but one example of the many who will be highly impacted by the MNPUC decision.

Based on the material I have read, I understand that there far fewer negative effects from the use of the Zumbro Power Dam Route. Essentially, two have been mentioned--

- Impact on 2 SEASONAL youth camps (SEASONAL!) and
- Impact on some old-growth trees, which, according to what I have read, the MN DNR and Excel Energy said could be mitigated by running the Zumbro Route to the north of its original position.

It seems the Zumbro Power Dam Route would be far more preferable, with apparently far fewer negatives, than using the White Bridge Route.

Therefore, I'm respectfully asking you to reconsider the recommendation, the consequences of the choosing the White Bridge Route, and instead PLEASE CHANGE YOUR DECISION AND CHOOSE INSTEAD THE ZUMBRO POWER DAM ROUTE FOR THE CAPX POWER LINE.

Thank you.

Richard Jorgensen  
214 S. Third Avenue  
Albert Lea, MN 56007-1732

**From:** [Reha, Phyllis \(PUC\)](#)  
**To:** [#PUC Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** FW: CAPX Power Line Route Decision  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 25, 2012 3:32:13 PM

---

Please file.

**From:** Rick Jorgensen [mailto:greyjay80@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 25, 2012 3:11 PM  
**To:** Reha, Phyllis (PUC)  
**Subject:** CAPX Power Line Route Decision

Dear Ms. Reha:

I'm writing to ask you, as a MNPUC member, **to reconsider the recommendations and ramifications regarding the the CAPX Power Line Route. Choose the Zumbro Power Dam Route instead.**

The Administrative Law Judge's **recommendation**, based, as I understand it, on 490 findings and 14 reasons, was to **choose the Zumbro Power Dam Route.**

Instead, the MNPUC chose the White Bridge Route, which apparently will have greater negative impacts on far more people, their lives, property, and businesses than the recommended Zumbro Power Dam Route would have. I have relatives in rural Pine Island. Due to this decision and routing, the CAPX Line will directly affect them, going along and through their 40 acres of wooded wildlife property and extremely close to their home. This will have a devastating affect on their lives. And they are but one example of the many who will be highly impacted by the MNPUC decision.

Based on the material I have read, I understand that there far fewer negative effects from the use of the Zumbro Power Dam Route. Essentially, two have been mentioned--

- Impact on 2 SEASONAL youth camps (SEASONAL!) and
- Impact on some old-growth trees, which, according to what I have read, the MN DNR and Excel Energy said could be mitigated by running the Zumbro Route to the north of its original position.

It seems the Zumbro Power Dam Route would be far more preferable, with apparently far fewer negatives, than using the White Bridge Route.

Therefore, I'm respectfully asking you to reconsider the recommendation, the consequences of the choosing the White Bridge Route, and instead PLEASE CHANGE YOUR DECISION AND CHOOSE INSTEAD THE ZUMBRO POWER DAM ROUTE FOR THE CAPX POWER LINE.

Thank you.

Richard Jorgensen  
214 S. Third Avenue  
Albert Lea, MN 56007-1732



**From:** [Haar, Burl \(PUC\)](#)  
**To:** [#PUC Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Capx2020 route switch from power dam to White Bridge Road  
**Date:** Monday, April 30, 2012 1:24:42 PM

---

**From:** Boyd, David C (PUC)  
**Sent:** Monday, April 30, 2012 11:50 AM  
**To:** Haar, Burl (PUC); Wolf, Dan (PUC)  
**Subject:** FW: Capx2020 route switch from power dam to White Bridge Road

---

**From:** Lowell Huber [[mailto:hlh\\_zumbro@hotmail.com](mailto:hlh_zumbro@hotmail.com)]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 30, 2012 11:48 AM  
**To:** Boyd, David C (PUC)  
**Cc:** Reha, Phyllis (PUC); OBrien, Dennis (PUC); Wergin, Betsy (PUC)  
**Subject:** Capx2020 route switch from power dam to White Bridge Road

To: Dr. David C. Boyd, Commisioner

I am writing this note to request that you and the other commisioners review the change that was made to the power line route. I thought that the meeting in which this change was made was for the 165 KV powerline that was to run toward Rochester on the East side of U.S 63. I later found out that the powerdam route was changed to the County Road 12(White Bridge) route after an emotional appeal by two parties who live East of the powerdam. There are many more people along the County Road 12 that will be affected by this power line, than those who are on the powerdam routing. I wish it would be possible for you and the other commisioners to take a flight along both proposed routes to see for yourselves how much more disruption there will be on the County Road 12 route. The administrative law judge did a very clear documented findings of fact and recommendation that detailed how much more densely populated the County Road 12 route is as well as how much more future development will be happening in that area. I may add that that judge was also attacked in some emails by one of the people making the emotional appeals that resulted in the change. The County Road 12 route will require extra poles and transmission wire due to the zig-zag route back and forth across the County Road 12 route. This will all result in devaluation of property values for many homes along that route. The arguement that the route should be in Olmsted County because some of the electricity will go to Rochester is meaningless due to the fact that a much greater majority of the power will end up east of the Mississippi. We would never have built the interstate highway systems with thinking like that. I respectfully request that you reconsider, and reset the route back to the one known as the powerdam route.

Henry Lowell Huber  
156 Sandy Point Court NE  
Rochester, MN 55906

**From:** [Reha, Phyllis \(PUC\)](#)  
**To:** [#PUC Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Capx2020 route switch from power dam to White Bridge Road  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 01, 2012 10:13:01 AM

---

Please file

---

**From:** Lowell Huber [mailto:hlh\_zumbro@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 30, 2012 11:48 AM  
**To:** Boyd, David C (PUC)  
**Cc:** Reha, Phyllis (PUC); OBrien, Dennis (PUC); Wergin, Betsy (PUC)  
**Subject:** Capx2020 route switch from power dam to White Bridge Road

To: Dr. David C. Boyd, Commisioner

I am writing this note to request that you and the other commisioners review the change that was made to the power line route. I thought that the meeting in which this change was made was for the 165 KV powerline that was to run toward Rochester on the East side of U.S 63.

I later found out that the powerdam route was changed to the County Road 12(White Bridge) route after an emotional appeal by two parties who live East of the powerdam.

There are many more people along the County Road 12 that will be affected by this power line, than those who are on the powerdam routing. I wish it would be possible for you and the other commisioners to take a flight along both proposed routes to see for yourselves how much more disruption there will be on the County Road 12 route.

The administrative law judge did a very clear documented findings of fact and recommendation that detailed how much more densely populated the County Road 12 route is as well as how much more future development will be happening in that area. I may add that that judge was also attacked in some emails by one of the people making the emotional appeals that resulted in the change.

The County Road 12 route will require extra poles and transmission wire due to the zig-zag route back and forth across the County Road 12 route.

This will all result in devaluation of property values for many homes along that route.

The arguement that the route should be in Olmsted County because some of the electricity will go to Rochester is meaningless due to the fact that a much greater majority of the power will end up east of the Mississippi. We would never have built the interstate highway systems with thinking like that. I respectfully request that you reconsider, and reset the route back to the one known as the powerdam route.

Henry Lowell Huber  
156 Sandy Point Court NE  
Rochester, MN 55906

**From:** [Haar, Burl \(PUC\)](#)  
**To:** [#PUC Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** FW: CapX2020 ruling -- April 12, 2012  
**Date:** Thursday, April 26, 2012 8:48:10 AM

---

[Hampton/LaX](#)

---

**From:** Boyd, David C (PUC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 26, 2012 7:04 AM  
**To:** Haar, Burl (PUC); Wolf, Dan (PUC)  
**Subject:** FW: CapX2020 ruling -- April 12, 2012

---

**From:** Kea Applen [kea.applen@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 25, 2012 8:35 PM  
**To:** Boyd, David C (PUC); Reha, Phyllis (PUC); OBrien, Dennis (PUC); Wergin, Betsy (PUC)  
**Subject:** RE: CapX2020 ruling -- April 12, 2012

To Whom It May Concern:

Our family of five lives on a homestead on County Rd 12 (White Bridge Road) and is greatly disappointed at the ruling brought forth on April 12, 2012. We urge you to revisit this case and amend your judgment.

The route of the White Bridge Road crossing has been well documented to disrupt many properties that are occupied and/or farmed year round, unlike the camps that are on the route near the Power Dam which are designed for visitation only. In addition, the EIS had shown that the Power Dam Crossing has the least environmental impact. The White Bridge Road route will have detrimental impact to future developments in Oronoco Township and Elk Run as well as other areas. It should be noted that the White Bridge is a public access point for boating.

We did not attend the hearing in person but did watch the entire proceeding on the live feed provided to us on the internet. First and foremost, we felt that our arguments and concerns were not well represented. Since we'd previously written statements and put them on the record & also since no objections had been filed to the Administrative Law Judge's ruling, at the advice of the attorney for Oronoco Township, we were told our presence was unneeded and that our side was well represented. However, as the day wore on, it became clear this was not the case. The emotional testimony given by those who were physically present in the room seemed to bear more weight on this case than did the testimony and written statements that had been submitted earlier this year on the behalf of those of us who were not present. This ruling went against the recommendations of the Excel Energy advisors and the Department of Commerce and the ALJ.

We respectfully plead with you to reconsider your ruling in this matter.

James & Kea Applen

11530 11<sup>th</sup> Ave NE

Rochester, MN 55906

**From:** [Reha, Phyllis \(PUC\)](#)  
**To:** [#PUC Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** FW: CapX2020 ruling -- April 12, 2012  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 01, 2012 10:38:58 AM

---

Please file.

**From:** Kea Applen [mailto:kea.applen@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 25, 2012 8:36 PM  
**To:** Boyd, David C (PUC); Reha, Phyllis (PUC); OBrien, Dennis (PUC); Wergin, Betsy (PUC)  
**Subject:** RE: CapX2020 ruling -- April 12, 2012

To Whom It May Concern:

Our family of five lives on a homestead on County Rd 12 (White Bridge Road) and is greatly disappointed at the ruling brought forth on April 12, 2012. We urge you to revisit this case and amend your judgment.

The route of the White Bridge Road crossing has been well documented to disrupt many properties that are occupied and/or farmed year round, unlike the camps that are on the route near the Power Dam which are designed for visitation only. In addition, the EIS had shown that the Power Dam Crossing has the least environmental impact. The White Bridge Road route will have detrimental impact to future developments in Oronoco Township and Elk Run as well as other areas. It should be noted that the White Bridge is a public access point for boating.

We did not attend the hearing in person but did watch the entire proceeding on the live feed provided to us on the internet. First and foremost, we felt that our arguments and concerns were not well represented. Since we'd previously written statements and put them on the record & also since no objections had been filed to the Administrative Law Judge's ruling, at the advice of the attorney for Oronoco Township, we were told our presence was unneeded and that our side was well represented. However, as the day wore on, it became clear this was not the case. The emotional testimony given by those who were physically present in the room seemed to bear more weight on this case than did the testimony and written statements that had been submitted earlier this year on the behalf of those of us who were not present. This ruling went against the recommendations of the Excel Energy advisors and the Department of Commerce and the ALJ.

We respectfully plead with you to reconsider your ruling in this matter.

James & Kea Applen

11530 11<sup>th</sup> Ave NE

Rochester, MN 55906

**From:** [Reha, Phyllis \(PUC\)](#)  
**To:** [#PUC Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** FW: CapX2020  
**Date:** Thursday, April 19, 2012 10:33:58 AM

---

Received 4/18

**From:** Julsto5 [mailto:julsto5@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 18, 2012 8:43 PM  
**To:** Reha, Phyllis (PUC)  
**Subject:** CapX2020

Dear Ms. Reha,

On Thursday, April 12th your decision has left our family confused. We would like to know how you chose the White Bridge route when your staff and the Administrative Law Judge picked the Zumbro Power Dam route!

When we asked if we could attend the meeting and speak we were told no. It seems odd that other people could speak from the alternative route.

We are the 5th generation living on this land with our three children. This would impact our lives forever, not like a camp where the people may attend for one week of their lifetime.

Sincerely,  
David and Julie Stolp

**From:** [Haar, Burl \(PUC\)](#)  
**To:** [#PUC Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** FW: CapX2020  
**Date:** Thursday, April 26, 2012 10:40:03 AM

---

Hampton/LaX

**From:** Boyd, David C (PUC)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 18, 2012 9:40 PM  
**To:** Haar, Burl (PUC)  
**Subject:** Fw: CapX2020

---

**From:** Julsto5 [<mailto:julsto5@aol.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 18, 2012 08:39 PM  
**To:** Boyd, David C (PUC)  
**Subject:** CapX2020

Dear Dr. David Boyd

On Thursday, April 12th your decision has left our family confused. We would like to know how you chose the White Bridge route when your staff and the Administrative Law Judge picked the Zumbro Power Dam route!

When we asked if we could attend the meeting and speak we were told no. It seems odd that other people could speak from the alternative route.

We are the 5th generation living on this land with our three children. This would impact our lives forever, not like a camp where the people may attend for one week of their lifetime.

Sincerely,  
David and Julie Stolp



**From:** [Reha, Phyllis \(PUC\)](#)  
**To:** [#PUC Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** FW: CapX2020  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 01, 2012 10:37:20 AM

---

Please file.

---

**From:** Ohly Judy [mailto:ohly.judy@CO.OLMSTED.MN.US]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 27, 2012 8:58 AM  
**To:** Reha, Phyllis (PUC)  
**Subject:** CapX2020

Dear Phyllis:

I am writing today to voice my opposition to the last minute decision to shift the line route three miles south to cross the Zumbro River at White Bridge Road rather than at the Lake Zumbro dam.

The Administrative Law Judge recommended the Power Dam Route because the White Bridge route is in a much more densely populated area. This was a long process with many opportunities for public comment. After the Judge submitted her findings, all parties had the opportunity to file exceptions. None were filed!

This decision change will be devastating to our community! Unlike most of Minnesota, we are positioning for growth. We are privileged by having Mayo Clinic as our #1 employer with 58,000 total employees. They have \$600 million in capital projects for 2012 and estimate spending \$700 million per year on capital projects over the next five years. This means we have an enormous growth potential in Rochester, and most of that growth will be to the North. To put this in prospective, Mayo Clinic will be investing more money in Rochester in the next 5 years than the Minnesota Legislature has invested in bonding projects FOR THE WHOLE STATE OF MINNESOTA in the last 5 years!

The City of Pine Island, Olmsted County, and Oronoco have been planning for this growth. That is why the interchange over Hwy 52 just north of Oronoco is being built today. It is not too late to reconsider your decision! Please do not cripple our community by running this high-voltage power line through an area that is positioned for the highest growth in Minnesota. Please give us the space to grow.

The DNR and the applicant Excel Energy both said mitigation of the forest issue east of the dam could occur by moving the line to the north of its original position, farther down the forest bluff. Please reconsider your determination and follow the recommendations of the Administrative Law Judge and your staff from the Department of Commerce.

Respectfully,

Judy Ohly  
Olmsted County Commissioner, District 7

Zumbro Watershed Partnership Director

**From:** [Wolf, Dan \(PUC\)](#)  
**To:** [#PUC Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Last Minute Decision for CapX Route  
**Date:** Friday, April 20, 2012 11:08:33 AM

---

**From:** Boyd, David C (PUC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 19, 2012 5:24 PM  
**To:** Wolf, Dan (PUC)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Last Minute Decision for CapX Route

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Roger Poole <[rbpoole@pitel.net](mailto:rbpoole@pitel.net)>  
**Date:** April 19, 2012 6:22:13 PM CDT  
**To:** <[David.C.Boyd@state.mn.us](mailto:David.C.Boyd@state.mn.us)>  
**Subject:** **FW: Last Minute Decision for CapX Route**

---

**From:** Roger Poole [<mailto:rbpoole@pitel.net>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 19, 2012 5:13 PM  
**To:** '[David.C.Boyd@state.mn.us](mailto:David.C.Boyd@state.mn.us)'  
**Cc:** '[Phyllis.Reha@state.mn.us](mailto:Phyllis.Reha@state.mn.us)'; '[Dennis.Obrien@state.mn.us](mailto:Dennis.Obrien@state.mn.us)'; '[Betsy.Wergin@state.mn.us](mailto:Betsy.Wergin@state.mn.us)'  
**Subject:** Last Minute Decision for CapX Route

Commissioner Dr. David C. Boyd

I am writing in regard to Cap X 2020's placement of lines on our Reinvest in Minnesota Property.

When we purchased our land for our retirement home, we agreed to follow the rules and regulations for the R.I.M. property. They have strict guidelines, which we have followed. My husband has worked to preserve and maintain our woodlands. One of the R.I.M.s guidelines is that: we are NEVER to harvest trees. We are also inspected by a R.I.M. property official annually.

We have controlled invasive species, and planted hundreds of trees. With your decision of line placement, all of our work and dedication has been in vain, and we will be forced to move as the power lines will be very close to our home.

**THIS IS NOT FAIR !!**

I implore you to reconsider.

Barbara Poole

**From:** [Reha, Phyllis \(PUC\)](#)  
**To:** [#PUC Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Oronoco Cap route  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 25, 2012 3:32:38 PM

---

Please file.

---

**From:** Barb Sorenson [mailto:[B.Sorenson@schmidtgoodman.com](mailto:B.Sorenson@schmidtgoodman.com)]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 25, 2012 2:14 PM  
**To:** Reha, Phyllis (PUC)  
**Subject:** Oronoco Cap route

Dear Ms. Reha~

I am asking for a reconsideration of the action taken on Thursday, April 12 by the Public Utility Commission. Their action switches the Cap route from Power Dam to White Bridge.

Our personal stories are of a much graver (in the public record) "demonstrating that the White Bridge Crossing is inappropriate". The White Bridge alternative requires the power line to zig-zag both north & south of highway 12 through an area more densely populated with people, destroying homes, farms, livelihoods & negatively impacting our children year round, not just one week camp sessions during the summer at the Christian Day Camp located at the other alternative.

My husband & I are homeowners that live on a gravel road just south of the White Bridge Road County Rd 12. A short 2 mile stretch of this gravel road will affect 12 family homes which includes 2 dairy farms, one of which has 150 head of cattle.

Families & farm livelihoods should bear greater consideration than a minimal impact on the forest in the Power Dam route alternative. As the Administrative Law Judge stated, Oronoco Township (White Bridge Crossing) is much more densely populated and prone to future development because it is in the Rochester School District.

We respectfully request (beg, plead, hope, implore, wish) you reconsider your determination & follow the recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge & your staff from the Department of Commerce.

Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Rich & Barb Sorenson

**Barb Sorenson**  
Account Manager  
schmidt goodman office products inc  
good stuff. good prices.  
507.282.3870 cell.507.254.5960  
[www.schmidtgoodman.com](http://www.schmidtgoodman.com)

**From:** [Haar, Burl \(PUC\)](#)  
**To:** [#PUC Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Petition for: CapX2020 line to be reconsidered  
**Date:** Thursday, April 19, 2012 1:29:08 PM

---

**From:** Boyd, David C (PUC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 19, 2012 1:23 PM  
**To:** Haar, Burl (PUC)  
**Subject:** Fw: Petition for: CapX2020 line to be reconsidered

---

**From:** Kukson, Brenda L., R.N. [<mailto:Kukson.Brenda@mayo.edu>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 19, 2012 12:44 PM  
**To:** Boyd, David C (PUC)  
**Subject:** Petition for: CapX2020 line to be reconsidered

Commission member, this petition letter is in regards to why the Minnesota Public Utility Commission should be reconsidered in switching the CapX Power line from the Zumbro Power Dam Route to the White Bridge Route.

1. The PUC Commissioners voted contrary to their own staff recommendation which was to select the Zumbro Power Dam route.
2. The Energy Facility Permitting section of the Minnesota Department of Commerce, representing the state supported the Zumbro Dam crossing.
3. The White Bridge route is in a much more densely populated area. More homesteads, farms, businesses, and families affected which will bring out more lawsuits.
4. On a more personal note. My parents Roger and Barb Poole 23637 510th ST home and 40 acre RIM (reinvest in Minnesota) property will be affected.

This is my parents retirement home which would have not one but two 345KV lines going through their property. One will split their 40 acres right in two! One East -West line and one North -South. That is unethical and irresponsible in many ways. Cut down the trees that the State of Minnesota has paid for! Burden one homeowner with 2 lines!

The East-West line could have been placed off his RIM property where there is not any home. And the North -South line could have been placed in the field further North-South. So therefore no "Buy the Farm" law and which will save CapX2020 a lawsuit.

I urge you to reconsider! Move the lines off my parents land! We are devastated to say the least!

Sincerely, Brenda Kukson

**From:** [Haar, Burl \(PUC\)](#)  
**To:** [#PUC Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Reconsider CapX Power line back to Zumbro Power Dam route  
**Date:** Thursday, April 19, 2012 12:16:38 PM

---

**From:** Wergin, Betsy (PUC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 19, 2012 10:48 AM  
**To:** Haar, Burl (PUC)  
**Cc:** Wolf, Dan (PUC)  
**Subject:** FW: Reconsider CapX Power line back to Zumbro Power Dam route

#5

---

**From:** Lerum, Dawn J. [<mailto:Lerum.Dawn@mayo.edu>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 19, 2012 7:32 AM  
**To:** Wergin, Betsy (PUC)  
**Subject:** Reconsider CapX Power line back to Zumbro Power Dam route

I am writing this on behalf of myself and my family because of the large effect it WILL have on our health and my family's lively hood!!!! I have 2 small children that are 3 and 5 years old that will be living only .25 mile away from the power lines **365 days a year**, not just for a short week during the summer. Plus they spend a large amount of time at the family farm that will be located only 500 to 1000 feet away from the power lines. I am afraid how this will affect my children's growth, health and maturity. I moved out into the county to have a better environment for my family. The power lines will take away our serene view over the farmland and our pure environment!!!

The Administrative Law Judge's prepared 490 findings with 14 conclusions in a 93 page analysis of the alternative routes. Their analysis found Zumbro Power Dam Route to be the recommended route because White Bridge Road is more densely populated so it would have a larger impact on families and farms. Not only did the Administrative Law Judge recommend the Zumbro Power Dam Route, so did the staff from the Department of Commerce and Energy Facility Permitting section of the Minnesota Department of commerce. So it just doesn't add up how the decision was made AGAINST PUC staff's recommendations and Energy Facility Permitting section of the Minnesota Department of commerce. When it is clear that the more desirable route is Zumbro Power Dam because it is less populated and it will affect less people and farms. Since when, are trees more important than people!!!!

I am **begging** that you reconsider your decision and move the CAPX Power line to the Zumbro Power Dam route and follow the recommendations of the Administrative Law Judge, the staff from the Department of Commerce and Energy Facility Permitting section of the Minnesota Department of commerce.

Thanks for your consideration,  
**Dawn Lerum**  
Procurement Specialist  
Supply Chain Management-P2P

Fax 507-293-1444  
507-266-5551 for Customer Support  
E-mail: [lerum.dawn@mayo.edu](mailto:lerum.dawn@mayo.edu)

---

**Mayo Clinic**

200 First Street SW  
Rochester, MN 55905  
[www.mayoclinic.org](http://www.mayoclinic.org)



**From:** [Haar, Burl \(PUC\)](#)  
**To:** [#PUC Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Reconsider CapX Power line back to Zumbro Power Dam route  
**Date:** Thursday, April 19, 2012 9:56:51 AM

---

Hampton/LaX

---

**From:** Boyd, David C (PUC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 19, 2012 7:50 AM  
**To:** Haar, Burl (PUC)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Reconsider CapX Power line back to Zumbro Power Dam route

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Lerum, Dawn J." <[Lerum.Dawn@mayo.edu](mailto:Lerum.Dawn@mayo.edu)>  
**Date:** April 19, 2012 7:28:25 AM CDT  
**To:** <[david.c.boyd@state.mn.us](mailto:david.c.boyd@state.mn.us)>  
**Subject:** **Reconsider CapX Power line back to Zumbro Power Dam route**

I am writing this on behalf of myself and my family because of the large effect it WILL have on our health and my family's lively hood!!!! I have 2 small children that are 3 and 5 years old that will be living only .25 mile away from the power lines **365 days a year**, not just for a short week during the summer. **Plus** they spend a large amount of time at the family farm that will be located only 500 to 1000 feet away from the power lines. I am afraid how this will affect my children's growth, health and maturity. I moved out into the county to have a better environment for my family. The power lines will take away our serene view over the farmland and our pure environment!!!

The Administrative Law Judge's prepared 490 findings with 14 conclusions in a 93 page analysis of the alternative routes. Their analysis found Zumbro Power Dam Route to be the recommended route because White Bridge Road is more densely populated so it would have a larger impact on families and farms. Not only did the Administrative Law Judge recommend the Zumbro Power Dam Route, so did the staff from the Department of Commerce and Energy Facility Permitting section of the Minnesota Department of commerce. So it just doesn't add up how the decision was made AGAINST PUC staff's recommendations and Energy Facility Permitting section of the Minnesota Department of commerce. When it is clear that the more desirable route is Zumbro Power Dam because it is less populated and it will affect less people and farms. Since when, are trees more important than people!!!!

I am **begging** that you reconsider your decision and move the CAPX Power line to the

Zumbro Power Dam route and follow the recommendations of the Administrative Law Judge, the staff from the Department of Commerce and Energy Facility Permitting section of the Minnesota Department of commerce.

Thanks for your consideration,

**Dawn Lerum**

Procurement Specialist

Supply Chain Management-P2P

Fax 507-293-1444

507-266-5551 for Customer Support

E-mail: [lerum.dawn@mayo.edu](mailto:lerum.dawn@mayo.edu)

---

**Mayo Clinic**

200 First Street SW

Rochester, MN 55905

[www.mayoclinic.org](http://www.mayoclinic.org)

**From:** [Reha, Phyllis \(PUC\)](#)  
**To:** [#PUC Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Reconsider CapX Power line back to Zumbro Power Dam route  
**Date:** Thursday, April 19, 2012 10:33:34 AM

---

Received 4/19

---

**From:** Lerum, Dawn J. [mailto:Lerum.Dawn@mayo.edu]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 19, 2012 7:29 AM  
**To:** Reha, Phyllis (PUC)  
**Subject:** Reconsider CapX Power line back to Zumbro Power Dam route

I am writing this on behalf of myself and my family because of the large effect it WILL have on our health and my family's lively hood!!!! I have 2 small children that are 3 and 5 years old that will be living only .25 mile away from the power lines **365 days a year**, not just for a short week during the summer. Plus they spend a large amount of time at the family farm that will be located only 500 to 1000 feet away from the power lines. I am afraid how this will affect my children's growth, health and maturity. I moved out into the county to have a better environment for my family. The power lines will take away our serene view over the farmland and our pure environment!!!

The Administrative Law Judge's prepared 490 findings with 14 conclusions in a 93 page analysis of the alternative routes. Their analysis found Zumbro Power Dam Route to be the recommended route because White Bridge Road is more densely populated so it would have a larger impact on families and farms. Not only did the Administrative Law Judge recommend the Zumbro Power Dam Route, so did the staff from the Department of Commerce and Energy Facility Permitting section of the Minnesota Department of commerce. So it just doesn't add up how the decision was made AGAINST PUC staff's recommendations and Energy Facility Permitting section of the Minnesota Department of commerce. When it is clear that the more desirable route is Zumbro Power Dam because it is less populated and it will affect less people and farms. Since when, are trees more important than people!!!!

I am **begging** that you reconsider your decision and move the CAPX Power line to the Zumbro Power Dam route and follow the recommendations of the Administrative Law Judge, the staff from the Department of Commerce and Energy Facility Permitting section of the Minnesota Department of commerce.

Thanks for your consideration,  
**Dawn Lerum**  
Procurement Specialist  
Supply Chain Management-P2P  
Fax 507-293-1444  
507-266-5551 for Customer Support  
E-mail: [lerum.dawn@mayo.edu](mailto:lerum.dawn@mayo.edu)

---

**Mayo Clinic**  
200 First Street SW  
Rochester, MN 55905  
[www.mayoclinic.org](http://www.mayoclinic.org)



**From:** [Reha, Phyllis \(PUC\)](#)  
**To:** [#PUC Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** FW: X2020  
**Date:** Monday, April 23, 2012 10:32:12 AM

---

Please file

---

**From:** Susan Hareldson [mailto:silveryears@pitel.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 21, 2012 7:52 AM  
**To:** Reha, Phyllis (PUC)  
**Subject:** X2020

Dr. David C. Boyd, Commissioner

I am a home owner of Oronoco township living on White Bridge Rd. If you have ever driven threw this area and noticed the farms and homes with people and children living in this surrounding area, which is very populated. Where this 345 volt power line is going it puts electric lines on all four sides of four family dwellings including one farmer in between us. Talk about stray voltage, cancer, health issues. This has got to be the worst case. The people in this area live here all year round not just one or two weeks at a time. The best place to put this power line is where people don't have to live by it for a life time. The Power Dam is a better route. So please reconsider the Power Dam Crossing.

Richard and Susan Hareldson  
11973 14th Ave NW  
Oronoco, MN 55960

**From:** [Reha, Phyllis \(PUC\)](#)  
**To:** [#PUC Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** FW: X2020  
**Date:** Monday, April 23, 2012 10:34:24 AM

---

Please file

---

**From:** Susan Hareldson [mailto:silveryears@pitel.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 21, 2012 7:52 AM  
**To:** Reha, Phyllis (PUC)  
**Subject:** X2020

Dr. David C. Boyd, Commissioner

I am a home owner of Oronoco township living on White Bridge Rd. If you have ever driven threw this area and noticed the farms and homes with people and children living in this surrounding area, which is very populated. Where this 345 volt power line is going it puts electric lines on all four sides of four family dwellings including one farmer in between us. Talk about stray voltage, cancer, health issues. This has got to be the worst case. The people in this area live here all year round not just one or two weeks at a time. The best place to put this power line is where people don't have to live by it for a life time. The Power Dam is a better route. So please reconsider the Power Dam Crossing.

Richard and Susan Hareldson  
11973 14th Ave NW  
Oronoco, MN 55960

**From:** [Nystuen, Patti J](#)  
**Subject:** Wisconsin regulatory permit approved for CapX2020 Hampton-Rochester-La Crosse line  
**Date:** Thursday, May 10, 2012 2:02:35 PM

---

Contact:  
Tim Carlsgaard  
[timothy.s.carlsgaard@xcelenergy.com](mailto:timothy.s.carlsgaard@xcelenergy.com)  
Office: (612) 330-7697  
Cell: (612) 201-7538

**Wisconsin regulatory permit approved for CapX2020 Hampton-Rochester-La Crosse 345 kV line**  
*PSCW selects Q1-Galesville route with a modification near Holmen*

Minneapolis – May 10, 2012 – The Public Service Commission of Wisconsin voted to grant a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for an approximate 48-mile 345 kilovolt (kV) electric transmission line between Alma, Wis., and Holmen, Wis. The CapX2020 Hampton-Rochester-La Crosse project will provide local reliability benefits to the La Crosse and Winona areas as well as to the rural Wisconsin areas of Buffalo, Trempealeau and La Crosse counties. It will also enhance regional reliability and increase access to lower cost renewable energy by providing a 345 kV link between Wisconsin and Minnesota.

“We appreciate the time and effort of the Commission and staff as well as the many agencies and other stakeholders. The Wisconsin regulatory process is thorough, comprehensive and provides many opportunities for public and agency involvement,” said Priti Patel, CapX2020 co-director. “The project expands the electric infrastructure to support the area’s long-term economic development and job growth.”

The Commission approved a modified Q1-Galesville route, which follows about 27 miles of the existing 60-year-old Dairyland Power Cooperative 161 kV line near Highway 35. The Q1-Galesville route was modified in the Holmen area. The approved route connects the Q1-Galesville route to the Q1-Highway 35 route with a new half-mile segment along a property line just north of the Highway 35 and Highway 53 interchange. The route modification generally avoids a future Holmen development area and would parallel Highway 53 for three miles into the new Briggs Road substation near Holmen. Detailed route maps will be posted by May 14 at [www.capx2020.com/lacrosse](http://www.capx2020.com/lacrosse).

“The Commissioners considered the route’s impacts and approved the route they saw as having the fewest impacts,” said Tom Hillstrom, project routing lead. “We look forward to working with each agency to issue the final permits so that the line can be built and energized by 2015.”

The CapX2020 Hampton-Rochester-La Crosse 345 kV project has been identified in numerous state and regional planning studies. Experts testifying at the Commission’s technical hearings in March agreed that a transmission deficit exists in the La Crosse area and that transmission line construction is necessary. The project will address regional deficiencies identified by the Midwest ISO, which concluded that if the project isn’t constructed, substantial overloading of existing transmission in Wisconsin, Iowa and Minnesota will occur.

Rural Utilities Service is expected to issue the federal Environmental Impact Statement, which covers the entire project, in June, with federal approval this fall. Construction is expected to start in Minnesota in early 2013 and in Wisconsin in late 2013. The Hampton-Rochester-La Crosse project is scheduled to be energized in 2015. With the modified Galesville route, the estimated project cost in Wisconsin is \$210 million, and the overall project cost is approximately \$500 million.

Partners in the CapX2020 Hampton-Rochester-La Crosse 345 kV project include Dairyland Power Cooperative, Rochester Public Utilities, Southern Minnesota Municipal Power Agency, WPPI Energy and Xcel Energy.

### **About CapX2020**

CapX2020 is a joint initiative of 11 investor-owned, cooperative and municipal utilities in Minnesota and the surrounding region to upgrade and expand the electricity transmission grid to ensure continued reliable and affordable service. The CapX2020 projects include three 345 kV transmission lines and a 230 kV line and represent the largest development of new transmission in the Upper Midwest in 30 years. They are projected to cost nearly \$2 billion and cover a distance of more than 700 miles.