

From: [Erin Smith](#)
To: [Staff, CAO \(PUC\)](#)
Cc: [bmareck](#)
Subject: ET-2/TL-24-132 - Great River Energy | Laketown 115kV
Date: Tuesday, December 16, 2025 11:48:37 AM
Attachments: [City of Carver Laketown Transmission.pdf](#)

You don't often get email from esmith@cityofcarver.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.

Greetings –

Attached is a comment letter on behalf of the City of Carver for Docket Number: ET-2/TL-24-132, Great River Energy Laketown 115-kV Transmission line.

If you could please confirm receipt, that would be great.

Thank you!

Erin Smith, AICP

Community Development Director | City of Carver
952.448.8743 | esmith@cityofcarver.com



December 15, 2025

Re: City of Carver Comments on the Proposed Great River Energy Laketown 115kV Project

To the Members of the Public Utilities Commission:

The City of Carver continues to oppose the preferred location identified by Great River Energy for their proposed Laketown 115kV Project.

According to the System Impact Study prepared for Great River Energy by POWER Engineers, the Laketown 115kV Project is being pursued to meet load growth in an area between Waconia and Victoria, north of Airport Road, which is well outside of future City limits of the City of Carver. Residents in this area will be deeply impacted by construction and easement restrictions while gaining no benefit from the power generated by this system. This recorded fact does not align with Great River's continued efforts to install the proposed infrastructure in the area occupied by those served. On the contrary, Great River Energy continues to pursue line placement through the City of Carver's future growth area, in favor of preserving and avoiding the future growth area for the City of Victoria.

We continue to note that Great River Energy's proposed route was shaped by early engagement with the City of Victoria and Carver County. Those discussions helped form the route currently under consideration. While we understand that revisiting that work may feel frustrating, we are confident that if the City of Carver had been provided with an equal opportunity to participate, Route B would have emerged as the proposed alignment.

Great River Energy's proposed route appears to be the most financially advantageous for the utility. While we understand the substantial \$9.475 million cost associated with the potential Breaker Station required for Route B and how this may impact future projects for Great River Energy, the financial impact on property in the proposed project area is equally significant. Developable land within the City is currently valued at approximately \$100,000 per acre for residential uses and \$140,000 per acre for commercial and industrial uses. The study states that the Breaker Station is a potential need for Route B but that cost may not be required. If the Breaker Station is not required, it is increasingly more challenging for the City to understand Great River Energy's preference for their proposed route. The value of the land rendered undevelopable by the proposed project location will quickly reach millions if a study were completed which must additionally be considered when choosing a route. In addition, the fragmentation of several large parcels would create severed properties that would be challenging, if not impossible, to develop.

We urge the Commission to carefully weigh not only the infrastructure cost to Great River Energy but also the substantial loss of development potential and land value for those within Carver's growth area. Though land ownership can happen and property lines can change, there are several instances where a single property owner would have their land bisected by the transmission line. Land between Hampshire Road and the proposed route, in particular, may become entirely undevelopable due to the easements required for the proposed route.

Sincerely,


Courtney Johnson
Mayor