

Dec 7/06

Dear Sir,

I am not in favor of Big Stone II if coal is going to be burned.

Coal is dirty, which produces global warming pollutants, mercury, smog and haze.

Water is a precious commodity, and Big Stone Lake is our recreation area and fishing.

Mercury levels have risen since the first plant was built, now we want to increase it more with Big Stone II

I guess I am not willing to risk my health on the emissions of coal burning, the effects of respiratory and cardiovascular diseases that are well documented because of it.

RECEIVED
2006 DEC 11 AM 8:58
ADMINISTRATIVE
SERVICES

Why not look at clean energy, such as wind and solar. Not only is it cleaner and better for the environment, but this would create more jobs in this sector.

The time is now. Do the right thing and forget coal. Big business and the almighty Big Bucks aren't always right. Especially on this project.

Dore Annam
13847 474th Ave
Corona SD
57227

Flo Sandok
1516 13th Ave N.E.
Rochester, Mn.
55906

RECEIVED
2006 DEC - 8 AM 8:31
ADMINISTRATIVE
HEARINGS

Stene M. Mihalchick
Barbara L. Neilson
Administrative Law Judges
Office of Administrative Hearings
100 Washington Ave S. Suite 1700
Minneapolis, Mn. 55401

Dear Judges,

I am concerned about the potential negative effects of the Big Stone II plant and ask you to deny the permitting of this plant's transmission line, and its problematic effects.

Because the BSTII has not provided an adequate analysis of clean energy alternatives, we need to look at these potentials first, not last. That makes the most sense.

In addition, the BSTII proposal

Does not estimate all of the costs involved, especially how the rising cost of the proposed plant stands up to alternatives which now are available in greater quantity and quality. The future is changing as we speak, and Global Warming is no longer debatable. Coal plants are the past, not the future.

We know their impacts on health, and Climate Change. We need more intelligent choices - and they are available now.

Please deny this transmission line - we want choices that make greater strides toward a better future.

Thank you in advance for your kind consideration of this matter.

Yours Truly,
Mrs. Florence Sandok

December 1, 2006

Ms. Barbara L. Neilson
Administrative Law Judge
100 Washington Avenue South, Suite 1700
Minneapolis, MN 55401

RECEIVED
2006 DEC 11 AM 9:04
ADMINISTRATIVE
HEARINGS

Dear Ms. Neilson:

As a retiree who worked at Otter Tail Power Company for XX years and still invests in it, I've had the pleasure of watching the company grow steadily while maintaining rates that are some of the lowest in the nation. The company has a good record of reliability, and its customer satisfaction levels are high. I write today as an individual who has spent a lifetime in the area the company serves. I've seen the results of its economic development efforts firsthand, watched its employees battle the elements to restore power, and seen, in my own home, the financial rewards of its demand-side management program.

Today I see the company, after a multi-year study, taking the lead in a unique partnership with six other power companies to build the generation and transmission facilities needed to meet the growing energy needs of more than 2 million people in this region. That growth is expected to reach 15 percent within the next ten years.

Because homegrown energy is a vital component in our nation's energy independence, I take a great deal of pride in the company's contribution. I'm equally proud of the fact that the proposal calls for advanced environmental control technologies that will make sulfur, nitrogen, and mercury emission from Big Stone I and Big Stone II combined as low as, or lower than, they now are from the existing plant alone. I see that as a remarkable achievement. And, together with the partnership's plans to add 850 megawatts of wind generation, it's graphic testimony to the commitment of the Big Stone II partners to the environment.

Of course, I always am aware of the importance of energy costs to everyone, myself included. That's why it seems so reasonable to me that the plant will be built on the existing Big Stone Plant site. Experienced employees are already there, as are railway access, coal- and ash-handling facilities, a cooling pond, and water-pumping equipment. Combined, those factors will reduce construction and operation costs substantially.

I urge you to approve the Big Stone II application for a transmission Certificate of Need.

Most sincerely,

Richard D. Miller

8537 W. Sierra Vista Dr. Glendale, AZ 85305

2006 DEC 1 10AM 9:01
RECEIVED
ADJUTANT GENERAL
HEADQUARTERS
2006

To whom this concerns

I am writing this to let you know my concerns of the need of the transmission lines from the Big Stone II Plant of South Dakota.

In the years to come we will need more power - a reason why Big Stone II is necessary. Also wind power as we will have a bigger demand in years to come. We won't be able to produce enough from wind. I feel the plant will keep the emission under control. Thank you. Please consider the transmission lines.

Catherine Harels
512 NW 4th St
Ortonville
MN 56278