

STATE OF WISCONSIN /  
DANE COUNTY /  
BRANCH 9 CIRCUIT COURT /

---

County of Dane, /  
Driftless Area Land Conservancy, /  
Wisconsin Wildlife Federation, /

Iowa County, /  
Town of Wyoming, /  
Village of Montfort, /

Petitioners,

Case No. 19-CV-3418

Chris Klopp,  
Gloria and LeRoy Belkin,  
S.O.U.L of Wisconsin  
Intervenor-Petitioners

v.

Public Service Commission of Wisconsin,  
Respondent,

American Transmission Company, LLC,  
ITC Midwest, LLC,  
Dairyland Power Cooperative,  
Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc.,  
Clean Grid Alliance,  
Fresh Energy,  
Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy,  
Intervenor-Respondents.

---

**BELKEN INITIAL BRIEF**

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
WHY HAS PSC IGNORED ALL ISSUES NOT TO BUILD CHC NOT TO BUILD CHC? WE, SOUTHERN WISCONSIN HAVE EVERYTHING TO LOSE	4
IMPACTS ON HUMAN HEALTH AND WELL BEING	4
ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND CHANGING ENERGY DEMANDS	7
PEOPLE OF SOUTHERN WISCONSIN HAVE EVERYTHING TO LOSE	10
ITC, ATC, DAIRYLAND AND THEIR INVESTORS HAVE EVERYTHING TO GAIN	12
THE PUBILC SERVICE COMMISSION APPEARED TO IGNORE RELAVANT EVIDENCE	14
CONCLUSION	16

## INTRODUCTION

My husband and I own a 181 acre farm in Southern Wisconsin and we will be able to see CHC line if built from our land. We have farmed this land as dairy and crop farmers. My family has lived in this Southern Wisconsin close to two hundred years. Our solar panels heat, combined with a wood-burning furnace power our home. We practice energy efficiency.

We would have an aerial “view” of CHC from our property. Our town of Montfort would become an 88-acre Substation if CHC were built. Because of our concerns, we have spent the better part of four years becoming educated on how CHC would impact people, lands, environments, real estate values, rates and the overall long-term health and well-being of Southern Wisconsin.

We joined hundreds of our neighbors to become outspoken advocates for all the things we value and cherish. Together we have learned that good, sound cost-effective alternatives to CHC not only exist, but would serve Wisconsin rate payers well. Together, we people of Southern Wisconsin shared our ideas, our concerns and our knowledge with our Legislatures, our elected City and County Representatives, ATC, ITC, Dairyland Energy Cooperative, through the DEIS public hearings, at the PSC public hearings, with our letters to our newspapers, and in becoming Citizen Intervenors.

To our dismay, the Commissioners of the PSC ignored the public, the rate payers and the evidence in making its decision, and sided with a costly proposal. We ask you to please set things right for the public.

**Why has the PSC Ignored ALL ISSUES NOT TO BUILD CHC?**  
**And We, Southern Wisconsin, Have Everything to Lose!!**

In this appeal process, we of Southern Wisconsin have everything to lose as discussed in the following concerns:

**IMPACTS ON HUMAN HEALTH AND WELL BEING**

Whether we live in Wisconsin, Iowa, Newfoundland or anywhere else for that matter, we all want a nurturing and healthy environment for ourselves and our children. This common goal was clearly stated throughout the CHC hearing process.

The Barneveld School District Board of Education in its Resolution in Opposition to the Proposed Cardinal Hickory Creek Transmission Line (PSC REF#: 367442, Ex.-GB-Belken-1r) puts it this way:

***"... our primary mission is nurturing a healthy learning and working environment for our students and staff..."***

CHC's high-voltage transmission lines will pass through, over, near or around over 120 miles of residences, schools, parks, playgrounds, nature preserves, farms, waterways and wetlands in Iowa and Wisconsin, including the Upper Mississippi River Wildlife Refuge.

In approving CHC, the PSC chose to disregard significant long-term impacts on human, animal and environmental health and well-being:

1) **Childhood Cancer**

There are risks of cancer in our children with exposure to high voltage power lines.

***"...research studies published in reputable, scientific journals have found an association between increased risk of childhood cancer and exposure to high voltage power lines..."*** (PSC REF#: 367442, Ex.-GB-Belken-1r).

As pointed out by Michael and Michelle Dubis in their Draft Environmental Impact Comments Dated April 14, 2019 (PSC REF #: 364147) DEIS Comment by Mike Dubis), the PSC did not take current research into account, and modified the data it was using:

*“Again, however, your tables appear outdated. Furthermore, the tables you reference from State of Connecticut study are modified from their original format. The original format offers recommendations that citizens would find helpful in their review of health impact.*

*... The table PSC modified from the State of Connecticut study excluded the column titled “Recommendations” in which the original table offered important suggestions, including minimizing exposure of lines to homeowners.*

*Further, the tables PSC provides from the Connecticut study reference summaries from January 2006 and earlier. However in regard to cancer and impact on children, the British Journal of Cancer from 2010 provides critically important updated research that PSC must apply in their consideration of siting of power lines.*

*... This study from the British Journal of Cancer from 2010 pooled most recent studies (seven studies with a total of 10,865 cases and 12,853 controls) based on primary data from studies on residential magnetic fields and childhood leukemia published after 2000. It states the following:*

*“Two pooled analyses by Ahlbom et al, (2000) and Greenland et al, (2000), based on 9 and 12 studies, respectively, published up to 1999, have provided a basis for concluding that a consistent epidemiological association exists between residential exposure to magnetic fields and the risk of childhood leukemia.*

*Similar results were obtained by pooling data from four studies that included 24/48 h measurements, for exposure over the entire day and at night only (Schuz et al, 2007).”...*

*Conclusions of study:*

*“Our results are in line with previous pooled analyses showing an association between magnetic fields and childhood leukemia. Overall, the association is weaker in the most recently conducted studies, but these studies are small and lack methodological improvements needed to resolve the apparent association. We conclude that recent studies on magnetic fields and childhood leukemia do*

***not alter the previous assessment that magnetic fields are possibly carcinogenic.”***

***Please study and then apply this updated research to your EIS and placement of line considerations since it is more current than your 2006 referenced table, has greater levels of relevance, statistical data, and the resulting “concern” would unarguably be considered above “low.”***

***It is critical to point out that the data on linking cancer to children continue to be consistent in its findings that there is a possible carcinogenic link.***

***Of equal importance, research further proves that contradictory or inconclusive research does not foreclose risk, and should not be cited to suggest or imply that exposure to high voltage and cancer is not a risk. Rather, in fact, it establishes the case that EMF exposures may in fact pose a huge risk.***

## 2) **Safety of Our Children**

***“... the establishment of an association does not constitute proof of causation, it does raise enough doubts about the safety of exposure to high voltage power lines to warrant prudent action to protect our children from possible harm”***  
(PSC REF#: 367442, Ex.-GB-Belken-1r)

This is a call for safety from exposure to high voltage power lines as mentioned in the Barneveld School District Resolution. That high voltage transmission is safe has not been proven by the Applicants beyond a reasonable doubt.

A large number of cases (10,865) in the British Journal discussed the support of leukemia or cancer of the blood in children living near high voltage power lines of a magnetic field such as the proposed Cardinal Hickory Creek Project. This updated 2010 research should understandably have a higher weighting in the siting of powerlines away from homes with children. . . This enormous study of cases from the *British Journal of Cancer* from 2010 pooled most recent studies (seven studies with a total of 10,865 cases and 12,853 controls) based on primary data from studies on residential magnetic fields and childhood leukemia published after 2000. It states the following: *Two pooled analyses by Ahlbom et al, (2000) and Greenland et al, (2000), based on 9 and 12 studies, respectively, published up to 1999, have provided a basis for **concluding***

*that a consistent epidemiological association exists between residential exposure to magnetic fields and the risk of childhood leukemia.” (PSC REF #: 364147) DEIS Comment by Mike Dubis)*

**3) PSC’s failure to the People of Southern Wisconsin to weigh in opposing evidence**

The Public Service Commissioners failed to weigh the evidence contained in the Barneveld School’s Resolution as follows:

*“...our primary mission is nurturing a healthy learning and working environment for our students and staff and . . .the American Transmission Co., ITC Transmission Co. ITC Transmission and Dairyland Power Cooperative have proposed the construction of a 125-mile, 345-kilovolt high-voltage transmission line which will ultimately will cost \$1-billion from Dubuque County, Iowa to Middleton, Wisconsin , called the Cardinal-Hickory Creek transmission line and . . .the proposed route for the Cardinal Hickory Creek transmission line would pass near the Barneveld school playing fields, outbuildings . . . .research studies published in reputable, scientific journals have found an association between increased risk of childhood cancer and exposure to high voltage power lines . . .the establishment of an association does not constitute proof of causation, it does raise enough doubts about the safety of exposure to high voltage power lines to warrant prudent action to protect our children from possible harm. . . .the proposed Cardinal-Hickory transmission line would have significant negative environmental, aesthetic, and other impacts throughout the Brigham and Barneveld region and would negative affect residential and other property values and property tax revenue” (PSC REF#: 367442, Ex.-GB-Belken-1r)*

**ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND CHANGING ENERGY DEMANDS**

**4) There is No Need for CHC As Usage of Electricity has declined in the Midwest**

As electricity use has decreased throughout the Midwest, despite growing populations, the Cardinal Hickory Creek transmission line is not needed as given in the Barneveld Resolution:

*“the demand for electricity has declined throughout the Midwest and the proposed Cardinal-Hickory Creek transmission line is not needed for electricity reliability because power supply exceeds the flat and declining electricity demand and sales in several local service territories including those*

*of Madison Gas and Electric Co. and Wisconsin Power & Light Co.”* (PSC REF #: 367442, Ex.-GB-Belken-1r)

There was no evidence of contracts that Wisconsin Utilities have signed showing intent to purchase renewable energy from out-of-state generators for the benefit of Wisconsin rate payers in the WPSC proceeding. CHC is a proposal to route electricity coming from nowhere and going to nowhere, therefore, we can say there is no need for CHC.

***“Overall, we do not see the need for these lines, and we’re very troubled by the potential negative impacts that so many have already clearly articulated”***  
**(PSC REF #: 364147) DEIS Comment by Mike Dubis)**

Wis. Stat. 196.491(3) Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity CPCN  
196.491(3)(a)1 that “Requires the Commission to issue a CPCN before any person may commence construction of a “large electric generating facility or a high voltage transmission line as defined in the Act Standards for CPCN approval 196.491(3)(d) state, “The Commission shall approve an application for a CPCN only if the commission determines all of the following: 2. The proposed facility satisfies the reasonable needs of the public for an adequate supply of electric energy. (Wis. Stat. 196.491(3))

As we already have an adequate supply of electricity, the need for CHC, as defined in the Act has not been established.

**5) Validity of CPCN (Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity).**

MISO and the Applicants have repeatedly stated that CHC is part of an overall plan, that their planning process since 2010, or earlier, has included CHC, and that all planning since 2011 has been based on the assumption that CHC is built. This plan has been one of the primary arguments MISO and the Applicants have used to justify CHC. However, a plan that assumes something already exists must necessarily ignore those upgrades, transmission line

improvements, and alternative transmission options that would negate the need for CHC, because in MISO's planning the line is built. MISO and the Applicants have been planning and acting all along as though the CPCN was approved and CHC was built. This appears to be in direct violation of Wisconsin statutes, if not a questionable way of coercing the PSC into making unnecessary and costly decisions.

6) **Wisconsin's Goal is to Decrease Carbon Dioxide as stated in Statute 1.12(3)(c)**

***“When trees are cut down and vegetation is removed, a valuable resource for reducing and storing CO2 is removed as well. A tree can absorb as much as 48 pounds of carbon dioxide per year and can sequester 1 ton of carbon dioxide by the time it reaches 40 years old.” (PSC REF#: 367445, Ex.-GB-Belken-4r, Pg 1)***

If the goal of the State of Wisconsin is to increase forested areas, why did the Commissioners approve a project of deforestation which appears to be in direct conflict of Wis. Statute 1.12(3)(c)?

***“It is the goal of the state to ensure a future supply of wood fuel and reduce atmospheric carbon dioxide by increasing the forested areas of the state.” Wis. Statute 1.12(3)(c)***

CHC Transmission Towers cannot replace the unique ecological, economical and health benefits of a healthy, living forest. You can't make it any plainer.

CHC's High-Voltage Transmission ROW is established at a 150-foot minimum width, requiring the removal of all trees within the ROW, with the Applicants having the authority to remove additional trees outside the ROW that it deems are "hazard trees". These trees are removed permanently for the life of the line (a minimum of 40 years). CHC would deny us our right to reduce atmospheric carbon dioxide naturally. Trees are a critically important asset we cannot live without.

## PEOPLE OF SOUTHERN WISCONSIN HAVE EVERYTHING TO LOSE

*The proposed facility will not have undue adverse impact on other environmental values such as, but not limited to, ecological balance, public health and welfare, historic sites, geological formations, the aesthetics of land and water and recreational use. In its consideration of the impact on other environmental values, the commission may not determine that the proposed facility will have an undue adverse impact on these values because of the impact of air pollution if the proposed facility will meet the requirements of ch. 285.. (Wis.Stat.196.491(3)(4)4)*

- 1) Michael and Michelle Dubis of Wisconsin are concerned the proposed Cardinal Hickory Creek Transmission Project will create hardship on local economies, businesses and loss of tourism due to health and appearance issues as they have stated:

*“We are also concerned that the proposed, high-profile transmission facility would create hardship on local economies we depend on and have very substantial interest in preserving. We observe local economies in many communities along the proposed routes depend, in large part, on preserving the health and appearance of natural assets which underpin tourism and the continued attraction of retirement residential housing and new businesses which take advantage of the significant financial advantages these quality of life considerations and values provide.” (PSC REF#: 353697, DEIS, Dubis).*

- 2) And, Dick and Laurie Graney comment in the DEIS, they are very concerned that, if built, Cardinal Hickory Creek will affect the residents of Southwest Wisconsin for many decades.

*“As landowners, we are very concerned about what this transmission line might do to Southwest Wisconsin property values, tourism, economic development, and environmental and cultural assets. Should CHC be built, it would affect the residents of Southwest Wisconsin for many decades. There would be destruction of some of the best farmland in this country. There would also be destruction to timber and hunting areas, as well as loss of property values.” (PSC REF#: 36394q, DEIS, Graney).*

A CHC, if built, will cut down trees and remove vegetation, put up 200-foot tall (approximate) transmission lines producing an electromagnetic field over children, schools, playgrounds, removal of soil, and the list goes on and on.

3) Like the Dubis' and the Graneys', many other citizens of Southern Wisconsin have also voiced their concerns about CHC<sup>1</sup>, including impacts on environmental values and ecological balance, public health of children and adults, historic sites, geological formations, the aesthetics of land, water and recreational use, cutting down trees and removing vegetation, putting up transmission towers approximately 200 feet tall and producing EMF's over children's playgrounds and homes, impacts of chemical herbicides, removal of soil, destruction of wetlands, devaluing land property, and forcing landowners into permanent easements that diminish their control of land use, limiting future energy choices, increasing electric bills.

4) In its Final Decision, the Commission states:

*The high-voltage transmission line facilities as approved by this Final Decision will not have undue adverse impacts on environmental values including ecological balance, public health and welfare, historic sites, geological formations, aesthetics of land and water, and recreational use. Wis. Stat. § 196.491(3)(d)4. (PSC REF#: 376391), Pg 7, No. 10)*

The Commission then goes on to state:

*The high-voltage transmission line facilities as approved by this Final Decision will not unreasonably interfere with the orderly land use and development plans for the area. Wis. Stat. § 196.491(3)(d)6.*

*The high-voltage transmission line facilities as approved by this Final Decision will affect local farmland, and DATCP has issued an agricultural impact statement.*

*The high-voltage transmission line facilities as approved by this Final Decision will affect waterways and wetlands...*

*The high-voltage transmission line facilities as approved by this Final Decision may affect endangered and threatened species...*

*The high-voltage transmission line facilities as approved by this Final Decision may affect historic properties listed with the Wisconsin Historical Society... (PSC REF#: 376391), Pgs 7 and 8)*

---

<sup>1</sup> PSC REF#: 371513, Tr. 2049-2135 Public Hearing Session 6-25-19, PSC REF#: 371514, Tr. 2136-2180 Public Hearing Session 6-25-19, PSC REF#: 371515, Tr. 2181-2313 Public Hearing Session 6-25-19, PSC REF#: 371516, Tr. 2314-2401 Public Hearing Session 6-25-19, PSC REF#: 371486, Tr. 2402-2563 Public Hearing Session 6-25-19, PSC REF#: 371487, Tr. 2564-2697 Public Hearing Session 6-25-19.

The PSC failed to show any evidence of concern for the significant undue adverse impacts CHC will have, thus the people of Southern Wisconsin have everything to lose.

**ITC, ATC, DAIRYLAND AND THEIR INVESTORS HAVE EVERYTHING TO GAIN**

- 1) They have a profit motive with a high guaranteed rate of return of 10.2% interest on their money, and the rate payers lose.
- 2) ITC, ATC, Dairyland and their investors have everything to gain, and the rate payer loses.
- 3) In 2014, ITC Midwest requested a Commission determination that it qualifies as a “foreign transmission provider” under Wis. Stat. § 32.02(5). Under this section of Wisconsin’s Eminent Domain statutes, condemnation rights for public utilities are limited to Wisconsin corporations and foreign transmission providers. (PSC REF#: 204180), Pg 7-8) The Commission ruled that ITC Midwest is a foreign corporation under Wis. Stat. § 196.53. (PSC REF#: 204180), Pg5) On February 9, 2016, two years after ITC Midwest requested “foreign transmission provider status”, Fortis announced an agreement to acquire ITC Holding Companies, Inc., the largest independent transmission utility in the United States, for US \$11.3 billion in cash and stock.

We should all be alarmed that **Fortis Inc.**, a St. John’s, Newfoundland based international diversified electric utility holding company operating in Canada, the United States, Central America, and the Caribbean and earning \$6.7 billion CAD now owns a transmission company that has not been granted the power of eminent domain to own and operate transmission facilities in Wisconsin.

ITC was not internationally owned in 2014. We should question whether a foreign entity like Fortis should be granted the right to eminent domain of our lands in Wisconsin. The answer is NO. We, the landowners of Wisconsin lose.

4) In 2014, the Commission went on to state that:

***The record in this proceeding is uncontested that ITC Midwest meets the definition of independent transmission owner under Wis. Stat. § 196.485(1)(dm). However, Commission staff questioned whether ITC Midwest would have the control as intended under Wis. Stat. § 196.53. ITC Midwest argued that it had sufficient control over its facilities, noting that the only control that it transferred to MISO was functional control, sometimes known as operational control.***

***Chapter 196 of the Wisconsin Statutes uses the term “control” somewhat inconsistently. Depending upon the context in which you read “control,” ITC Midwest may or may not actually control its facilities. (PSC REF# 204180), Pg 5)***

MISO’s “functional control” has been exerted through the CHC proceedings, with MISO experts and its members controlling the path that MISO wants to exert, rather than the path that Wisconsin rate payers, land owners and energy planners want. Does ITC Midwest actually control its facilities? That is an issue that has not been adequately addressed. We, the people of Wisconsin lose.

5) In 2014, the Commission also determined that

***“...the applicability of Wis. Admin. Code. § PSC 112.05(2) should be waived at this time. ITC Midwest has substantial out-of-state transmission assets and will only own one transmission line in Wisconsin for the foreseeable future. The Commission recognizes that, under current circumstances, ITC Midwest’s out-of-state projects are unlikely to have a significant impact upon Wisconsin public utility ratepayers.”*** (PSC REF#: 204180), Pg 11-12)

ITC owns approximately 6,600 miles of transmission lines and more than 200 electric transmission substations in Iowa, Minnesota, Illinois, and Missouri. How can these out-of-state projects that sit in the MISO region NOT have a significant impact upon Wisconsin public utility ratepayers, especially if these projects are “cost shared”? That is an issue that has not been properly addressed. We, the rate payers of Wisconsin lose.

6) Having their headquarters outside of Wisconsin, they are not from the area of Southern Wisconsin. They will not experience the Environmental Impact, Loss of Land, Health Issues,

Cancer, Leukemia, Lowering of Real Estate, Loss of Tourism, Loss of the Aesthetic Look, and Destruction of the Historical Land Value of the Southern Wisconsin District of the Driftless area. Thus, they will not suffer any of these EXTREMELY NEGATIVE ISSUES. We the people of Wisconsin lose.

**THE PSC APPEARED TO IGNORE RELEVANT EVIDENCE  
IN FAILING TO WEIGH EVIDENCE**

1) **Legislator Letters Opposing CHC Were Ignored.**

In its decision, the PSC stated:

*The general public interest and public convenience and necessity require completion of the project. (PSC REF#: 376391)*

In a letter dated July 22, 2019, on behalf of the public, four Wisconsin Legislators pointed out that hundreds of citizens from their legislative districts attended public hearings on CHC:

*“Lawmakers heard many diverse voices ask Commissioners to not only turn down the expansion transmission line for many reasons, but to choose cost-effective and community-serving solutions that are before the Commission to consider.” (PSC REF#: 372611).*

In their Opinion, the Commission did not address the Legislature’s concerns. (See also PSC REF: 356345, PSC REF#: 299295, PSC REF#: 372320, PSC REF#: 356404)

Nor did the Opinion explain why the general public’s interests as conveyed by their elected Legislators did not constitute the general public.

2) **The Public Was Ignored.**

In its Decision, the PSC noted that,

*“ Members of the public commented both in writing and through appearances at the public hearing about the impact that this line may have on them and their communities. ...This information assisted the Commission in its review of the application, in understanding the different perspectives toward the project, and in making its determinations on the application.” (PSC REF#: 376391) Pg 10)*

The PSC offered 3 days of June 25, 26, and 27, 2019 at 2 pm and 6 pm to the Public to give their Public Comments of the proposed CHC project at three locations (Lancaster, Dodgeville,

and Madison, Wisconsin), resulting in almost 650 pages of transcript (PSC REF #'s: 371513, 371514, 371515, 371516, 371486, 371487), as well as a number of comments submitted to the docket in writing or on-line. The volume was significant enough that the PSC system crashed and the deadline for filing comments was extended.

Even a quick and cursory review of the public comments reveals very real concerns about CHC, yet in its decision, the Commission did not address why the public's concerns were not considered. Does the PSC not have an obligation to the public?

**4) The PSC Ignored the Evidence Presented at the Hearing as Follows:**

- a) Surrebuttal-DALC/WWF-Desu-17, "So following Mr. Dagenais' reasoning, the Applicants' model effectively "stacked the deck" in favor of the CHC line and introduces such an error into the results that renders them unreliable." (PSC REF#: 368882)
- b) Surrebuttal-DALC/WWF-Desu-17, "The Applicants' analysis is flawed and the bias that it has introduced into the results very clearly favors the line. In a project with such a thin margin of net benefits, even a small deviation of the expected benefits could render the entire project uneconomical." (PSC REF#: 368882)
- c) Surrebuttal-CUB-Neal-r-2, "In my direct testimony I stated that internal congestion savings generated by the Project "may just be an artifact of PROMOD modeling that may never materialize" and I recommended that the Commission disregard these benefits "unless the Applicants can show adequate evidence the internal congestion in PROMOD is not just a modeling artifact and that the Project is a cost-effective way to reduce congestion within the ATC zone." (PSC REF# 370433)
- d) Surrebuttal-CUB-Neal-r-4, "Different assumed inputs for new generation within PROMOD will result in more or less congestion in the model results, depending on the exact configuration. As such, the base case internal congestion costs may be higher simply by selecting different locations to interconnect new generation or varying the amounts at different locations, under each of the generation futures. Consequently, estimates of internal congestion-related benefits may be amplified simply because the base case is modeled in such a way that it starts off

with more congestion. This would produce a systematic modeling bias in favor of the Project. This is an example of what I mean when I say that the results presented by the Applicants may be an “artifact” of PROMOD modeling.” (PSC REF# 370433)

e) Surrebuttal-CUB-Neal-r-2, “Nothing in the rebuttal testimony has changed my primary conclusions that contrary to Applicants’ claims, the benefits conferred to Wisconsin customers by the Project are largely dependent upon speculative modeling input assumptions and are therefore not robust. Moreover, there are also viable alternatives to the Project the Commission should consider.” (PSC REF# 370433)

f) Surrebuttal-DALC/WWF-Cusick-r, pages 11-12, “An option that has not been considered by the Applicants is installing a battery system now to increase transfer capability immediately, and decommissioning the system in a decade once the carrying capacity on the existing transmission lines has been doubled.”( PSC REF#: 369775

## **CONCLUSION**

A decision to build a very costly transmission project across Southern Wisconsin will change the entire landscape of Wisconsin. This project will impact land owners, rate payers and Wisconsin’s ability to make wise, fluid and flexible energy decisions. Building CHC will set us on a path of more transmission, more utility-scale energy projects and even greater erosion of our own ability to choose how we use our land. More than 60% of our monthly energy bill goes to pay-off the debt load on energy expansion projects. We need to question the role of utilities. Are they here to serve us, or are we here to serve them?

We are distraught at the thought of utility interests treating Wisconsin as one big energy plant. We are dismayed that the PSC has chosen to ignore the facts and has not given us, the public, any input or power to set or choose an energy direction that does not wreck so much havoc on our lives or limit our choices to choose non-transmission energy efficiency options over environmental havoc and incumbent debt.

This case shouldn’t be about putting long-term debt on the backs of the rate payers of Wisconsin and the Midwest. It should be about the facts.

The PSC's Decision ignored too many facts and too many public concerns.

**WHEREFORE**, the LeRoy and Gloria Belken request that the Judge overturn the Commission's Decision.

**Dated this 30<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2020.**

**Respectfully Submitted,**

*/s/ Electronically signed by LeRoy Belken*

*/s/ Electronically signed by Dr. Gloria Belken*

**LeRoy Belken**

**Dr. Gloria Belken**

1127 Cass Hollow Rd.

Montfort WI 53569

(608) 553-2544

[gbelken@tds.net](mailto:gbelken@tds.net)

[gjeanbelken@gmail.com](mailto:gjeanbelken@gmail.com)