

October 14, 2014 **Letter to the PSC**

Instructions for comments DUE BY NOVEMBER 13th:

Download the "boilerplate" comment word document(Below). If in agreement, it can be sent as-is, but should be prefaced with who you are, do you live in the project area, do you farm or have other business in project area (see "How to Prepare Effective Public Testimony or Public Comment") attached in document below.

1) Should you prefer to personalize it, feel free to add as needed keeping in mind the boiler plate comment document targets the following major concerns:

- a. Need
- b. Value to Wisconsin
- c. Long-term costs including negative impact into total project costs.
- d. Lack of information required by law
- e. Lack of regard to municipal policy
- f. Disregard of Wisconsin State Statutes designed to guide transmission structure
- g. Alternative solutions

2) How to file your document:

- a. Go to www.psc.wi.gov
- b. Click tab "file with us"
- c. Click tab "public comments"
- d. Scroll down to 137-CE-166 and click "file a comment"
- e. Comment period is September 30 – Nov 13th

3) How to view all recorded documents:

- a. Electronically: Google search 137-CE-166 and click will bring you to:
http://psc.wi.gov/apps40/dockets/content/detail.aspx?docket_id=137-CE-166 (or click on the above link)
- i. Click on Documents tab for recorded documents

b. Mailing:

i. Include the following information:

1. This comment addresses the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) prepared by Commission staff, docket 137-CE166
2. Be sure to include your full name and address, do you live in the project area, do you farm or have other business in project area at the beginning of the boiler plate document.

MAIL TO:

Cindy Burtley
Docket 137-CE166
Public Service Commission of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7854
Madison, WI 53707-7854

Remember documents must be received by Nov 13th, so get this in the mail asap, make a copy, be sure to sign and date it.

State law clearly states the impact report must incorporate local energy priorities and account for non-transmission energy alternatives. I do not see this as having happened in the least. The justification for additional substation construction and pole structures of 85 and 135 feet in stature cutting 180 - 335 foot wide swaths for 40 and 50 miles is weak and makes great assumptions that are counter to the facts. This project would have little to no positive impact on our local communities, and would continue the trend of Wisconsin exporting its energy dollars to other states, even as we, the ratepayers, bear the costs of energy transmission through our properties. I fail to see sufficient documentation of the need for this, or any of the other high-capacity transmission lines currently proposed when electricity use in US homes has been on the decline for seven years. In the Midwest, this rate, according to data supplied by the regional utilities, comes to approximately 2.5% per year. Meanwhile, every year since 2005 when Wisconsin utilities began adding charges for our larger, robust transmission system, our average electricity rates have ranked either the highest or second highest in the Midwest. Though once below national average, in 2013, only ten states had electricity rates higher than Wisconsin. As our electric bills continue to soar to pay the capital debt on the high capacity transmission system we have added in WI since 2002, we must stop and realize that this debt will remain on our bills for the next 40 years: even if this transmission line and multiple other projects which utilities want to add are not added.

Multitudes of submissions made during the Scoping Phase listing specific economic and environmental concerns are not accounted for in the draft. No estimated values have been placed on potential losses in tourism and housing, business and agricultural development or loss of natural space, habitat and lowered carbon sequestration effects. Positive impacts on

local economies from Non Transmission Alternative Solutions based on Energy Efficiency and Local Power are avoided entirely. Plus, there is no mention that over the last three years, 90+ municipal WI governments have asked the PSC to please make sure that a cost-benefit analysis of all energy alternatives becomes available for us to evaluate and comment upon before the PSC sets any pen to paper on this report.

Additionally, if transmission is truly the goal, then why are we not utilizing existing adjacent corridors to capacity before expanding footprint? We all have read and listened to the response that point out reliability of redundant corridors, but are not supplied with comprehensive data that reflects a history of using corridors to fullest capacity as unreliable in comparison. The plan as proposed clearly violates WI State statutes which are in place to govern projects such as this.

Please take these comments into account and make the following corrections and additions to the current draft:

Include and describe, in detail, all PSC measures taken to comply with the Municipal Resolution requests and supporting petitions and letter requests from Wisconsin lawmakers asking the PSC to study non-transmission energy alternatives economic and environmental impact assessments and make this information publicly accessible in advance of the current comment period. See WI State Statutes: 1.13(2); 1.11(2) (e)3; 1.11(2)(c)6 and 1.11(2)(e).

For the high voltage transmission option of this proposal, include dollar estimates of the following impacts in all affected Wisconsin communities: losses in local property values and tax revenue due to negative perceptions; long term decreased potential in housing, business and agriculture development for properties within view of the transmission system including economic activities associated with tourism. For an energy alternative based on a comparable, increased, investment in energy efficiency, provide (state wide) dollar estimates of home farm and business operation cost savings, local job creation and the value of the avoided carbon emissions.

Add these values to the transmission induced losses that would be avoided with the alternative solution and compare this sum to the "impact payments" affected communities would receive for the high voltage transmission option.

Thank you for your time and please consider the alternatives, especially, accelerated energy efficiency measures that would have the most immediate positive effect on energy use, the grid in general, and carbon emissions.

Also the Due date is 11/13/2014.