

David Birkholz

From: dan fogal [danfogal@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 13, 2008 7:28 PM
To: David.Birkholz@state.mn.us; Suzanne.Steinhauer@state.mn.us
Subject: TL-08-734

MANKATO TOWNSHIP
19727 Ridge Drive,
Mankato MN 56001

David Birkholz
Project Manager
State of Minnesota Office of Energy and Security

Re: TL-08-734

Dear Mr. Birkholz:

I am writing you as the Planning Coordinator of Mankato Township, the governing body of a portion of the route for the South Bend-Stoney Creek 115 KV Transmission line project. This letter is to make you aware of the history of this project from Mankato Township's view and the future effect it may have on further development of Mankato Township.

Great River Energy came before Mankato Township with their proposed route a few years ago, and after careful review by the Planning Commission and the Township Board of Supervisors, we rejected the proposed route and recommended what is now Alternative SC-2, which the Township still believes is the best route.

We rejected the proposed route because of concern for future expansion of residential development in Mankato Township north and south of 200th Street. We had been approached by various developers who had considered residential developments along 200th Street. We expect and plan that future expansion of the City of Mankato will continue into this area with residential properties. We believe this would be hurt by a large transmission line down the roadway.

In our Planning Commission and Township Board meetings, the thought was that the power line would be better suited to be along Hwy #90, where it would become a natural commercial corridor and where a transmission line would not be as obtrusive. We were aware that the existing poles would have to be replaced, and therefore proposed why not place them where it would not be as unsightly as in a planned residential area.

Please note, this was also before Great River Energy purchased the property for the Stoney Creek Substation. The board recommended against that purchase, again saying it was not a fit for a planned residential area. Great River proceeded with the purchase and stated they would go before the State, and let the State decide their route.

We appreciate the opportunity to be heard by the State in this matter.

Sincerely,

12/11/2008

Dan Fogal
Planning Coordinator
Mankato Township

Color coding for safety: Windows Live Hotmail alerts you to suspicious email. [Sign up today.](#)

David Birkholz

From: Dan Rotchadl [dneubert@hickorytech.net]
Sent: Thursday, November 13, 2008 4:33 PM
To: David.Birkholz@state.mn.us
Cc: Suzanne.Steinhauer@state.mn.us
Subject: TL-08-734

Mr. Birkholz,

We are fortunate in Southern Minnesota to have the reliable power and distributors of that power. Our local Coop Benco, has done a very good job of education and management of the always challenging issues with servicing a demanding public. The Mankato Township Board recognizes the need for updating and improvements of the electrical grid system as we go forward into the future.

Several years ago the Electrical entities involved, came before the Township Board for a variance to facilitate the growing demand on the system. Along with the proposed route, they also had alternate routes. The Board denied the proposed route, and suggested they pursue one of the alternate routes, specifically the SC-2 route. Despite the denial, and suggestion of the alternate route, the Electrical parties pursued land aquisition assuming the proposed route approval. This was not consistent with the prudent fiscal management that I had personally witnessed before with these entities.

Our thinking at the time, and currently, was with the Residential growth most probable on both the north and south side of 200 street, it makes more sense to use one of the alternated routes. Rather that take this kind of system through this area. The costs of these alternates as given to the Township Board by the Electrical entities was actually less than the proposed route. The larger poles to be put in on 200 street will be in different locations than the existing, so wether we put them on 200 street or down along 90 is a non-issue.

Fiscally they indicated no hardship.

Developers have talked to us, and concur with this thinking. If you review the City of Mankato maps over the last 10 years, they will show this growth to the south towards this area. The voters approved and the School District #77 have procured land for a new Grade School just north of this area.

We have an opportunity before us to look into the future, and see this residential growth, and make good decisions on location of the power grid to service the Mankato and surrounding area. And not compromise the beauty and integrity of values for this residential area, based on location of these size power lines.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Daniel C. Rotchadl
Chairman
Mankato Township Board

Daniel C. Rotchadl

Neubert Millwork and Lumber Company

Office 507-387-1105

Fax 507-387-1068

dan@neubertmillwork.com

www.neubertmillwork.com

David Birkholz

From: Douglas Schaller [djschaller@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, August 29, 2008 1:03 PM
To: David.Birkholz@state.mn.us
Subject: Great River Energy South Bend Station

Dear Mr. Birkholz:

My name is Douglas Schaller and I am the chairman for the Board of Supervisors in South Bend Township, Blue Earth County.

I attended the public meeting in Mankato to discuss the transmission line improvement project for the City of Mankato (PUC Docket No. E002, ET2/TL-08-734). I was dismayed to learn that the proposed new substation is to be named after my township however it will not be located in South Bend Township but rather in Rapidan Township.

I inquired as to why it wasn't named for Rapidan and apparently there is already a Rapidan substation. I asked why it wasn't named the Red Jacket Substation which refers to the history of the area (Indian Chief) where this is to be located and the man said that that was the name in the original project report from the 70's and he didn't have a clue why it was named Red Jacket.

I suggested that the name be change back to the originally proposed name but apparently they didn't go for it.

I am opposed to naming projects after areas that are outside of the area where the project is to be constructed and request that the proposed substation not be named South Bend.

Thank you.

--Doug Schaller
55656 Hemlock Road
Mankato, MN 56001
ph. 507-625-5700

Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.