

**STATE OF MINNESOTA
BEFORE THE
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

Katie Siben
Hwikwon Ham
Audrey C. Partridge
Joseph K. Sullivan
John A. Tuma

Chair
Commissioner
Commissioner
Commissioner
Commissioner

**In the Matter of the Application for a
Route Permit Application for the
Laketown 115-kV Transmission Line in
Carver County, Minnesota**

Docket No. ET2/TL-24-132
CAH Docket No. 21-2500-40445

REPLY COMMENTS

Minnesota Valley Electric Cooperative Board of Directors, on behalf of Minnesota Valley Electric Cooperative (MVEC) submit these reply comments in response to Minnesota Public Utilities Commission's (Commission) November 17, 2025, Notice of Comment Period on Independent Consultant Report and for Additional Record Development (Notice).

In these reply comments, MVEC sets forth its support of Route Alternative B. At the outset, MVEC understands the necessity for this project but takes the position that the Preferred Route is not the best and least impactful route.

Route Alternative B is shorter and the least impactful to human and environmental impacts and will still provide reliability and integrity of the transmission line. A number of MVEC members approached their Board Members expressing concern about the Preferred Route because of the significant impacts to their farms, land, and homes. The Preferred Route and the Route Alternative B both impact MVEC's members, however, Route Alternative B minimizes these impacts by following existing infrastructure, roads, and rights-of-way.

The Preferred Route cuts through pristine farmland. Route Alternative B minimizes impacts these impacts by avoiding significant areas of farmland. The Preferred Route presents significant challenges for line inspection, repair, and patrol. Additionally repair and restoration for reliability would be delayed due to the challenging terrain associated with the Preferred Route.

Route Alternative B primarily follows existing infrastructure, roads, rights-of-way, and minimizes impact to membership growth. The Preferred Route cuts through the middle of fields and wetlands, leading to the destruction of groves of trees negatively impacting wetlands.

The Preferred Route cuts through prime real estate that will more than likely be developed in the near future. Having the Preferred Route go through developable real estate likely means that the real estate will not be developed resulting in less housing, less development, and a lower tax base for our School Districts, Counties, Cities, and Townships. Route Alternative B avoids these significant impacts.

Additionally, the Preferred Route presents significant concerns for linemen during inspections and restoration/repair. The Preferred Route crosses a railroad bed which presents safety concerns with railroad traffic when performing inspections and restoration/repair.

CONCLUSION

MVEC respectfully submits that Route Alternative B is the least impactful to humans and the environment.

Dated: December 23, 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

/e/Chad R. Felstul

Chad R. Felstul, Lic. No. 0345684

PEMBERTON LAW, PLLP

110 North Mill Street

Fergus Falls, MN 56537

Telephone: (218) 736-5493

Email: c.felstul@pemlaw.com

**Attorneys for Minnesota Valley Electric
Cooperative**