

From: [Lobby, Sam \(He/Him/His\) \(PUC\)](#)
To: [Staff, CAO \(PUC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Laketown 115 kV Transmission Line Project
Date: Tuesday, December 16, 2025 2:22:12 PM
Attachments: [Public Comment_Laketown 115 kV Transmission Line Project - 12-16-25.pdf](#)

Good afternoon,

Can you please file this e-mail/attachment as a public comment into the record for the Laketown 115 kV Transmission Line, docket 24-132? Please let me know if you have any questions, thanks very much!

Sam

From: Tony Schuster <tonykschuster@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 16, 2025 11:08 AM
To: Lobby, Sam (He/Him/His) (PUC) <Sam.Lobby@state.mn.us>; Staff, CAO (PUC) <consumer.puc@state.mn.us>
Subject: Laketown 115 kV Transmission Line Project

You don't often get email from tonykschuster@gmail.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.

Attached are my comments regarding the Laketown 115 kV Transmission Line Project.

Thank you very much!

Tony Schuster

Public Comment: Laketown 115 kV Transmission Line Project

Date: 12/16/2025

Resident Name: Anthony Schuster

Resident Address: 6725 Augusta Road Chaska MN 55318

Resident Phone: (952) 715-1557

Resident email address: TonyKSchuster@gmail.com

I (Anthony Schuster) would like to state my concerns regarding the proposed power line route by Great River Energy and Minnesota Valley Electric serving the proposed Laketown substation.

I still question the necessity of this project altogether, especially since several transportation corridors (county road 43 and county road 10) will require re-alignment in the near future. I believe it is in the best interest of all parties to coordinate power line transmission at the same time those transportation corridors will be re-aligned. Proceeding with this project, along with the transportation corridor projects planned for the future, will create unnecessary easements, messy property lines, and an overall disorganized use of land and utilities.

I believe the county of Carver should be more involved in this decision. People at Great River Energy have mentioned to me that the county of Carver has been exceptionally difficult to coordinate with. Along with this commission and the state of Minnesota, they are the only governing body where this project is proposed. I am very disappointed that they have not helped the residents and businesses find an alternative or assisted in addressing their concerns. I feel the county should be required to be more involved in mediating this matter. Especially since they are aware of the growing need for organized growth and development of transportation corridors in this area.

There are already two existing powerlines >115Kv running east/west less than 2 miles apart from each other in this region. The applicant's proposed route would be a third line and it would lie halfway between the two existing. It seems illogical to have three different 115kv powerlines running east/west within two miles of each other. Perhaps the existing southern 115kv line that already exists should be upgraded to 230kv and eliminate the need for this project altogether.

If a route had to be chosen, I would strongly urge the commission to issue a permit for route alternative B for the following reasons:

- 1) Route Alternative B keeps the entire powerline within very close proximity to the road(s), instead of cutting across countryside, woods, fields and the undisturbed natural environment. This seems like a logical approach to minimize construction and maintenance costs, especially in the winter. It also has far less of an impact on the natural environment, particularly the aesthetical impacts to residents.
- 2) The applicant has admitted to needing very large 'corner poles' when the route changes directions. The proposed route would require several directional changes and very large corner poles to be constructed. The most disruptive one would be where it meets the

paved portion of Augusta road before heading west to Jersey avenue, where another very large corner pole will be required before heading north. Route alternative B is a much simpler route that lies entirely along gravel road and requires fewer of the large “corner” structural poles for this size of powerline.

- 3) Route alternative B preserves more naturally wooded land from needing to be cleared and destroyed.
- 4) Route alternative B is a more north/south route and creates better spacing for transmission lines in this region.
- 5) The visual damage this powerline will create for me and my neighbors will be extremely detrimental. Especially the portion of the powerline that extends north to Augusta road along the western border of the Eiden property. There is nothing man-made existing along this route and it would be in the best interest of the environment to keep it that way. There are several homes that will suffer permanent loss of beautiful views and aesthetics if a permit is issued for the proposed route.
- 6) Augusta is a small establishment that has a rich history in Carver county. Augusta once served as a town for local residents with a feed mill, bank, post office, and creamery. This historic value of Augusta should be preserved. Although those buildings have been transitioned to residential homes, the buildings still remain close to the road that travels east/west through the establishment. The layout of these homes create small front yards, so the backyards of these properties are very valuable to the residents and landowners of Augusta. A large powerline would be detrimental to property values, aesthetics, and scenery of the community.
- 7) The increased traffic, construction, and maintenance of this powerline would negatively impact the residents' quality of living. A considerable amount of money was recently (2024) spent on paving Augusta road where the proposed route meets Augusta road. The township boards and residents recognized the value of this rural neighborhood, and I ask the PUC to do the same.
- 8) Due to the fact that the establishment of Augusta is not an official town, or incorporated as such, we feel a lack of governmental representation to aid us in future development and opposing projects like this. Therefore we are hoping the State of Minnesota recognizes this and utilizes route alternative B so as to not affect the residents of Augusta.