

From: [Mike Gindorff](#)
To: [Staff, CAO \(PUC\)](#)
Cc: [Sullivan, Jim \(COMM\)](#); [Janezich, Craig \(PUC\)](#); mboucher.pers@icloud.com
Subject: Discrepancies in Great River Energy Route Requests E015 OAH Docket No 21-2500-39822
Date: Monday, November 18, 2024 10:51:47 AM

You don't often get email from mwgindorff@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

Good morning, Mr. Seuffert,

I am writing in support of an email you received from Don and Marie Boucher regarding the diversion through our Cole Lake Way neighborhood. Please have the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission take a close look at the Cole Lake Way area before making their final decision on the project's route. It's stated it is feasible to stay on the main right of way without affecting the residents in the area (AA4/AA3 combination), and AA6 has not been supported. Yet the applicants' final modified route submitted on September 19 still has their proposed route following the AA6 pathway through the Cole Lake Way homeowners' property instead of staying on the main transmission line right of way (AA4/AA3)!

North and south of our area, the route follows a straight path along the existing ROW, yet diverts only through our small neighborhood for a small segment of the route, then hooks back up to the main line again. There is no reason for this diversion and disruption when staying on the existing ROW for this short distance is perfectly safe, feasible, and less impactful.

As the DNR suggested, the lines can be stacked, not disrupt the nearby wetlands, and the route needs to stay along the existing transmission line ROW in the Cole Lake Way segment and not cut new pathways through our properties and disrupt our neighborhood!

Thank you in advance for your attention to this issue.

Mike Gindorff
Cole Lake Way