

From: jpelsner@aol.com
To: [#PUC Public Comments](#)
Subject: Comment on docket 12-1163
Date: Friday, November 08, 2013 10:59:08 AM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

Re: the proposed Great Northern Transmission Line, (PUC Docket 12-1163)

My name is John Elsner. Our Family has owned 30 acres of property on the north side of Balm Lake (Beltrami Co.) since the early 1920's. As I learn more of this massive project I am quite surprised that routes passing to the south of the Red Lake Indian Reservation would even be considered. Rather than disrupt the landscape along a beautiful string of lakes that are populated by local landowners as well as many tourists and seasonal visitors, it seems very obvious to me that the proposed route North of Red Lake would be a much more logical choice.

My Dad first came to Balm Lake in the 1920s and originally bought more land than my siblings and I currently own. He had a small building first in one location, then in 1930 decided to build his log cabin on the lower ground closer to the lake. A second small cabin was added in 1970. The seven current owners, their many children, and now grandchildren have enjoyed this lake and forest property all of these years. It's a simple lifestyle at The Cabin - fishing, hunting, swimming, many boating options, and just enjoying a family reunion among the variety of wildlife and flora that the north woods has to offer. I myself plan to spend a lot more time there in the very near future.

The proposed route that passes north of Balm Lake would pass very near our property. The towers would be right in front of me as I worked and enjoyed the north part of our property where we currently have a large open field. Beyond the visual pollution, a major concern I have is the safety of the property. We currently live at the end of a road, and like most property owners, we always know we are vulnerable to theft. An open corridor through the forest would mean easy access and escape and would vastly increase our vulnerability. This corridor would no doubt also bring in many more hunters and unwanted snowmobile and 4-wheeler traffic. Just as important, this route would also likely disrupt the Balm Lake Aquatic Management Area, an area that was set aside by the State of Minnesota as a natural habitat sanctuary to be preserved for future generations.

The proposed route to the south of Balm Lake would not be any better. Having to look at 140 ft towers from the Lake, whether to the north or south is just not acceptable. From our shore, seeing them to the south out our large front windows . . . All Day, Every Day, would change the whole experience of being there. They would be in total disharmony with their surroundings and have a negative impact on everyone who had to look at them.

As I look forward to my future at The Lake, I am very concerned for myself, as well as for future generations. We enjoy the Lake Experience like many others throughout the State of Minnesota. It's a lifestyle that is unaccessible to many, limited by simple geographical availability. And it's a privilege to be a part of. We think it **should be preserved**, *Particularly* for Lakes classified by the State and County as "Natural Environment / Sensitive Area" as are Balm Lake and affected nearby Lakes.

The natural surroundings and a basic lifestyle drew my Father to the area all those years ago. To This Day, we Remain Off The Electrical Grid! How ironic would it be if we would have to look at these towers . . . forever. They bring no benefit to *anyone* near this area.

IF a line of this size is definitely *Needed*, I urge the Commission to please choose a northern route that avoids the Balm Lake proposed routes.

Thank you,

Sincerely,
John Elsner
11-5-13

From: [Ruth and Paul Erickson](#)
To: [#PUC Public Comments](#)
Subject: Mn Power
Date: Monday, November 04, 2013 7:57:39 PM

Hi We are against the Great Northern High-Voltage Transmission Line Project coming across our land. Our property is in Itasca County north of Grand Rapids. We are not able to determine the exact route as the "corridors" , "lines" are confusing. thanks Paul Erickson

From: wsuoja@frontiernet.net
To: [#PUC Public Comments](#)
Subject: MN Power Great Northern Transmission Line
Date: Wednesday, November 06, 2013 9:55:49 AM

To: The State of MN PUC:

I own 200 acres of property along the proposed corridor for the new Great Northern Transmission Line. My property is 13 miles North of Nashwauk along the East side of State Highway # 65. The property description is all in TWP 59, RG 22 : S. 30, Lot 4: S. 31, Lot 1: S.31, NE NW: S.31, NW NE: S. 30, SW SE. I was born on, and I grew up on this property over 68 years ago. For decades, I have spent considerable time, effort and money maintaining wildlife plots and roads for deer and grouse, thus I will NOT grant easements for access or maintenance on my property.

In my opinion, this MN Power Transmission Line is not necessary for the needs of its customers. Through September of 2013, ALLETE (MN Power) recorded net income of \$71.7 million, a five percent increase over last years \$68.2 million, thus, I believe this transmission line is for profit motive only for MN Power and its foreign partner, Manitoba Hydro's Dorsey. From the recent Online Form, about \$40 of our \$100 electric bill each month goes to the finance and banking industries. By law, since ratepayers pay for all utility investments, all utility decisions must be based on ratepayers priorities. We should be looking for local energy alternatives in MN instead of sending our money to Wall Street.

Please keep me posted at my mailing address of : Wayne Suoja, 1029 Eales Road, Tower, MN 55790.

Thank you,

Sincerely,
Wayne Suoja