Hello,

Please file this comment to 22-415 and 22-416.

Thanks,

Craig

From: Sullivan, Jim (COMM) <Jim.Sullivan@state.mn.us>
Sent: Friday, September 20, 2024 1:58 PM
To: Janezich, Craig (PUC) <craig.janezich@state.mn.us>
Subject: FW: Great River Energy Reliability Project

See below.

From: Mike Gindorff <<u>mwgindorff@yahoo.com</u>>
Sent: Friday, September 20, 2024 12:49 PM
To: Sullivan, Jim (COMM) <<u>Jim.Sullivan@state.mn.us</u>>; Sletten, Nichole (OAH)
<<u>Nichole.Sletten@state.mn.us</u>>; Gedicke, Michelle (She/Her/Hers) (OAH)
<<u>michelle.gedicke@state.mn.us</u>>; Phillip, Majeste (OAH) <<u>Majeste.Phillip@state.mn.us</u>>
Subject: Great River Energy Reliability Project

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 afternoon Mr. Sullivan, Ms. Sletten, Ms. Gedicke, Ms. Phillip

In talking with our neighborhood and reviewing recent electronic documents, we've identified an error regarding the proposed AA6 route on the north edge of our property, through our neighbor's property, and down Cole Lake Way. The document incorrectly states that this route does not cross other transmission lines. However, an existing line (likely a 115kV line) crosses Cole Lake Way just south of River Road.

The docket we're referencing is Doc TL 22-415, #20249-210005-04, dated 9/5/24. Specifically, the issue appears on page 43 of the 52-page report in Table 6.5: Human & Environmental Impacts. In the section on Reliability concerning the crossing of existing lines, it states "zero," though in reality, the new route would cross an existing line, thus posing what's referred to as a 'reliability concern.' This number should be corrected to one, not zero.

Additionally, the document mentions that the proposed new routes would require a 3,000-foot right-of-way

(ROW), which would severely impact our property and neighboring properties, significantly devaluing them.

Our community along Cole Lake Way has opposed the AA6 route from the start, especially because it deviates unnecessarily from the main ROW for a short distance, disrupting the environment. Additionally, everything to the south and east of our neighborhood is wetland. There is no valid reason for this detour when an existing transmission line ROW is available, cleared, and maintained and does not pose a reliability issue, as it would run parallel to the existing line. In speaking with a person in the DNR, he simply asked, "Why don't they stack the lines in the existing ROW?" We are in favor of considering the AA3 and AA4 alternative routes.

I hope this error can be corrected, as it adds to the reasons not to approve the proposed AA6 route in the Cole Lake area of the project.

As with our neighbors, we attempted to submit this through the e-docs system but were unsuccessful. We would greatly appreciate it if you could ensure that the Honorable Kimberly Middendorf reviews this matter and does not approve the AA6 portion of the route.

Thank you for your time and consideration, Mike Gindorff

26433 Cole Lake Way Crosby, MN 56441