

Foundry Ridge PSC Public Comment Examples

PSC Docket 9835-CE-100

PUBLIC COMMENT DEADLINE

Thursday, July 23, 2026

Ten editable examples organized in three tiers

Choose one example, personalize it, and submit only one comment.

Highlighted bracketed text is intended to be replaced or removed.

Table of Contents

How to Use These Examples

Tier 1: Personal and Accessible Comments

1. Air Pollution, Public Health and Children

Personal health and air-quality concerns.

2. Private Wells, Groundwater and Turtle Creek

Water, wells, wastewater and surface-water protection.

3. Farmland, Wildlife, Rural Character and Daily Life

Land, habitat, noise, lighting, traffic and community character.

Tier 2: Focused Evidence-Based Comments

4. Foundry Ridge Would Not Be Needed Without One Very Large Customer

Project need, fairness and customer-driven demand.

5. Utility and Customer Arrangements Predated the Merchant Application

Transparency, acquisition chronology and customer commitments.

6. The "20% Peaker" Description and the Actual Operating Profile

Hours, emissions, firm gas and what "peak" means.

7. The Required Pipeline and Transmission System Remains Unresolved

Routes, affected land, MISO review and connected infrastructure.

Tier 3: Detailed Record and Accountability Comments

8. The Final-Filed Record Is Not Internally Consistent

Construction, pipeline, operating, acreage and transmission discrepancies.

9. Merchant Status Has Produced a Fragmented Review

Need, costs and infrastructure split across proceedings.

10. Comprehensive Request to Deny, Delay or Reopen the Record

A complete comment bringing the major issues together.

How to Use These Examples

These comments are starting points. They are not intended to be submitted word-for-word by multiple people.

Before You Submit

- Choose the example that most closely reflects your concerns.
- Replace the highlighted bracketed language with your own information.
- Describe your personal connection to the area or issue.
- Remove facts or statements that do not apply to you.
- Add firsthand experiences you want the Commission to understand.
- End with a clear request for Commission action.
- Submit only one personalized comment.

Important

Do not say that you personally reviewed a PSC document unless you actually did. You may instead write, "The PSC record states..." or "Public filings in this proceeding show..."

Duplicate Comments

Anyone who already testified at the July 16 public hearing or submitted a written comment during this comment period should not submit a duplicate comment. This comment period began June 17th.

Source-location note: Most technical project filings cited below are in Docket 9835-CE-100. Records concerning Wisconsin Electric's proposed acquisition, the Very Large Customer subscription, customer agreements, procurement, and certain gas-service information are in related Docket 6630-BS-103. A reference that does not appear in the 9835 document list may be located in the related docket identified beside it; that does not mean the filing was deleted.

How the Three Tiers Work

- Tier 1 comments are personal and accessible. They require little technical knowledge.
- Tier 2 comments focus on one defined issue and use selected PSC record facts.
- Tier 3 comments are longer and address final-record accuracy, fragmented review or the full case.

Helpful Opening Examples

- I have lived in Walworth County for ____ years.
- My family relies on a private well.
- I farm land near the proposed project.
- I am a parent of a child attending school in the area.
- I work in healthcare and am concerned about...
- I use Turtle Creek for...
- I do not live next to the site, but I am concerned because...

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Tier 1: Personal and Accessible Comments

These examples help residents submit a clear, personal comment without addressing every technical issue.

Comment 1: Air Pollution, Public Health and Children

Best for

Parents, grandparents, healthcare professionals, educators, residents with respiratory or cardiovascular concerns, and anyone concerned about regional air quality.

Make It Your Own

- Who in your family or community concerns you most?
- Have you personally experienced poor-air-quality conditions?
- Why does adding another combustion source concern you?
- Do you live, work, attend school or spend time near the project area?

Comment Template

Re: Foundry Ridge Energy Center, PSC Docket 9835-CE-100

Dear Commissioners:

I am writing to ask the Public Service Commission to deny or delay approval of the Foundry Ridge Energy Center because of its potential effects on public health and regional air quality.

[I live in the area / I am a parent or grandparent / I work in healthcare or education / I have a family member with asthma or another health concern.] My concern is not based on the belief that every predicted health outcome is certain. It's based on the fact that Foundry Ridge would be a new fossil-fuel combustion source that would add emissions to the air people are already breathing.

The applicant may be able to comply with applicable air permits. However, permit compliance does not mean that additional emissions are harmless or that cumulative exposure is insignificant. The Commission should evaluate the project's emissions together with existing pollution, wildfire smoke, traffic, agricultural exposures and other proposed industrial development in southeastern Wisconsin.

The plant has commonly been described as an approximately 20% peaking facility, but the final application says it would be designed for continuous service, available throughout the year and capable of daily or weekly capacity factors as high as 100%. The record also contains different descriptions of whether the enforceable full-load limit is closer to a 20% or 27% annual capacity factor.

The public-health analysis should therefore be based on the maximum reasonably foreseeable and legally permissible operation - not only an anticipated annual average.

[Add two or three personal sentences here. Example: "My child attends school in this region, and I do not believe families should be asked to accept additional air pollution without a clear demonstration that the plant is genuinely necessary."]

I ask the Commission to require a clear and enforceable operating limit, evaluate cumulative air-quality and health effects, and explain how children, older adults and medically vulnerable residents will be protected.

Until those questions are answered, please deny the application or delay a decision.

Thank you for considering my comment.

Relevant PSC References and Docket Locations

- [PSC REF 598382](#) - July 16 public hearing transcript (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 593425](#) - health-effects analysis discussed during the proceeding (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 598750](#) - final clean application narrative (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 597140](#) - operating-profile and firm-gas response (Docket 9835-CE-100)

Accuracy Note

Do not state that the project has been proven to cause a specific number of illnesses or deaths. The estimate of 118 premature deaths discussed at the hearing applies to modeled combined effects of Foundry Ridge and Red Oak Ridge over 30 years, not Foundry Ridge alone.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Comment 2: Private Wells, Groundwater and Turtle Creek

Best for

Private-well owners, farmers, livestock owners, anglers, paddlers, conservationists and residents concerned about Turtle Creek, Little Turtle Creek, wastewater or stormwater.

Make It Your Own

- How your household, farm or business depends on groundwater.
- Approximately how far you live from the proposed or alternative site.
- How you use Turtle Creek or Little Turtle Creek.
- What protection you would expect if your well changed after construction.

Comment Template

Re: Foundry Ridge Energy Center, PSC Docket 9835-CE-100

Dear Commissioners:

I am asking the Public Service Commission to deny or delay approval of Foundry Ridge until groundwater, private-well and wastewater protections are clear, enforceable and understandable to the people who could be affected.

[My household relies on a private well / I operate a farm or care for livestock / I use Turtle Creek for fishing, paddling or recreation / I am concerned about local groundwater resources.]

Project records describe a proposed on-site sandstone well with a maximum pumping rate of 35 gallons per minute. That is equivalent to a maximum withdrawal of approximately 50,400 gallons over 24 hours. The application separately identifies estimated annual consumptive water use and maximum daily consumptive use by the three turbines.

Water withdrawal and consumptive use are different measurements. They should not be combined or described as though they are the same. However, the existence of different figures makes it especially important for the Commission to explain clearly how much water could be withdrawn, how much would be consumed and how those amounts could change during periods of extended plant operation.

The applicant's hydrogeologic consultant concluded that surrounding wells are not expected to be adversely affected. A provisional mitigation plan has also been proposed for qualifying existing wells. But residents should not have to wait for a well problem, prove that the plant caused it and then depend upon a company-administered claims process before receiving assistance.

[Add your personal concern. Example: "Our well is essential to our home and cannot simply be replaced with municipal service if something goes wrong."]

The wastewater record has also changed during the proceeding. Earlier materials discussed certain wastewater moving through a retention pond toward a tributary of Little Turtle Creek, while later filings revised parts of that plan. The Commission should require one current, complete explanation of every wastewater stream, how it will be managed and whether any discharge could reach surrounding surface waters.

Before approval, I ask the Commission to require:

- baseline testing for potentially affected private wells;
- independent monitoring;
- a clear and enforceable mitigation process;

- prompt assistance without placing an unreasonable burden of proof on residents;
- one final water and wastewater plan; and
- protection for Turtle Creek, Little Turtle Creek, wetlands and agricultural water supplies.

Please deny or delay the project until these protections are established.

Thank you for considering my comment.

Relevant PSC References and Docket Locations

- [PSC REF 568152](#) - well and water information (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 568160](#) - hydrogeologic assessment (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 568161](#) - provisional well-mitigation plan (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 568157](#) - earlier WPDES materials (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 592403](#) - later revised water and permit materials (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 598750](#) - final clean application narrative (Docket 9835-CE-100)

Accuracy Note

Do not claim that Foundry Ridge would consume millions of gallons every day. The application identifies approximately 4.95 million gallons of estimated consumptive use annually, not daily. It separately identifies a maximum well withdrawal of approximately 50,400 gallons over 24 hours and maximum daily consumptive use of 67,824 gallons across the three turbines.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Comment 3: Farmland, Wildlife, Rural Character and Daily Life

Best for

Farmers, rural landowners, nearby homeowners, hunters, anglers, outdoor recreation users and residents concerned about wildlife, noise, lighting, traffic, safety or property marketability.

Make It Your Own

- How long you or your family have lived or farmed in the area.
- What wildlife, landscape or rural feature matters to you.
- How you currently use the surrounding roads or land.
- Which daily impact concerns you most: noise, lighting, traffic, safety or industrial development.

Comment Template

Re: Foundry Ridge Energy Center, PSC Docket 9835-CE-100

Dear Commissioners:

I am asking the Public Service Commission to recognize that the land proposed for Foundry Ridge is not empty or interchangeable land. It is part of a rural agricultural and ecological landscape that supports farms, wildlife, groundwater recharge, recreation, family continuity and the character of the Town of Darien.

[I farm in the area / I live nearby / my family has owned land here for ____ years / I hunt, fish, paddle or observe wildlife here / I value the area's dark skies, quiet roads and open land.]

The applicant frequently describes the generating facility as having an approximately 16-acre permanent footprint. That number does not represent the project's entire effect. The application also identifies temporary construction disturbance, generator transmission rights-of-way, roads, utility infrastructure and other associated facilities. The alternative-site transmission route could require a substantially larger right-of-way.

The final rebuttal testimony also states that 16 acres represents 0.00074% of the Town of Darien. The correct calculation is approximately 0.0742% - a factor-of-100 difference. Although 16 acres remains a small percentage of the entire town, comparing it only with the town's total acreage does not address whether farmland preservation land should be permanently converted or whether the complete project footprint is compatible with the surrounding area.

Residents also raised concerns about turbine noise, humming or vibration, nighttime lighting, construction traffic, pipeline safety, fire and explosion risk, emergency response, evacuation and property marketability.

The applicant has submitted models and mitigation plans, but models cannot fully describe what a new industrial sound, light source or traffic pattern will mean in a quiet rural setting.

[Add your personal experience. Example: "The quiet and darkness of this area are part of why my family lives here. Those qualities have real value even though they do not appear on a project balance sheet."]

I ask the Commission to evaluate:

- the full permanent and temporary land disturbance;
- farmland-preservation history;
- wildlife and habitat effects;
- the transmission and pipeline corridors;
- enforceable noise and lighting protections;
- traffic and emergency-response capacity; and

- whether previously developed or less environmentally damaging locations were adequately considered.
- Please deny the application or delay approval until these impacts are fully evaluated.

Thank you for considering my comment.

Relevant PSC References and Docket Locations

- [PSC REF 598382](#) - public hearing transcript (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 598750](#) - final clean application narrative (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 598755](#) - final rebuttal testimony containing the acreage calculation (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 598934](#) - surrebuttal testimony concerning farmland-preservation and land-use compatibility (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- PSC REF 568165 and PSC REF 568179 - land-cover and prime-farmland impact tables ([Docket 9835-CE-100](#)) (These are downloadable Excel sheets – [go to the docket link](#) and search for the document number to download the files)

Accuracy Note

Property-value loss, well failure, noise violations, fires and other predicted harms should be presented as unresolved risks or concerns unless supported by project-specific evidence. Do not state that these outcomes have already been proven.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Tier 2: Focused Evidence-Based Comments

These examples address one defined issue in greater detail while leaving room for residents to explain why it matters personally.

Comment 4: Foundry Ridge Would Not Be Needed Without One Very Large Customer

Best for

Residents concerned about project need, data-center electricity demand, fairness, financial risk or the local consequences of serving one extraordinary customer.

Make It Your Own

- Why you believe public need should be clearly demonstrated.
- Which local impacts your community would be asked to carry.
- Whether you are concerned about risks to ordinary utility customers.
- Whether you believe the customer - not the community - should bear the full costs and risks it creates.

Comment Template

Re: Foundry Ridge Energy Center, PSC Docket 9835-CE-100

Dear Commissioners:

I am asking the Public Service Commission to deny or postpone approval of Foundry Ridge because Wisconsin Electric's related filings show that the plant would not otherwise be required for its generation portfolio.

In PSC REF 596269, Wisconsin Electric states:

PSC Record Statement

"But for the incremental load from the VLC, this dispatchable resource would not be required for Wisconsin Electric's generation portfolio."

The same filing confirms that one Very Large Customer has elected to subscribe to 100% of Foundry Ridge as a Bespoke Resource.

PSC REF 596268 separately states that the project is needed to meet that Very Large Customer's load obligations and that the customer intends to continue subscribing to 100% of the project.

These statements substantially change the question before the Commission.

The question is not simply whether Foundry Ridge could generate electricity for the regional grid or whether its maximum output could be compared with the number of homes it might theoretically power. A plant's capability to produce electricity does not establish why it is being built.

The more important question is whether Foundry Ridge would be proposed in Darien, on this timeline, if this one customer were not adding extraordinary new demand to Wisconsin Electric's system. Wisconsin Electric's own filing indicates that it would not.

I understand that electricity generated at Foundry Ridge would enter the interconnected regional system and would not necessarily travel through a dedicated wire directly to one customer. However, the record establishes that the customer is economically subscribing to the full resource and that its incremental load is the reason Wisconsin Electric says the resource is needed.

Meanwhile, Darien and surrounding communities would experience the land conversion, air emissions, noise, groundwater use, wastewater concerns, pipeline construction, transmission facilities, traffic, emergency-response responsibilities and other long-term impacts.

[Add your personal perspective. Example: "I do not believe a rural community should be required to absorb decades of environmental and land-use consequences for infrastructure that the utility says it would not otherwise need."]

Before approval, the Commission should determine:

- the identity and projected load characteristics of the subscribing customer to the extent legally available;
- whether the customer's actual hourly and seasonal demand was used to evaluate plant operation;
- who will pay for the plant, pipeline, transmission upgrades and interconnection facilities;
- who bears the risk if the customer delays, reduces its load or leaves the system; and
- whether the project is in the public interest when its stated need arises from one customer.

Please deny the CPCN or postpone a decision until the project's actual purpose, costs, risks and customer-driven need are evaluated transparently.

Thank you for considering my comment.

Relevant PSC References and Docket Locations

- [PSC REF 596269](#) - resource not required but for the VLC's incremental load; 100% subscription (Related acquisition Docket 6630-BS-103)
- [PSC REF 596268](#) - project needed to meet the VLC's load obligations (Related acquisition Docket 6630-BS-103)
- [PSC REF 594996](#) - earlier confirmation of the customer's subscription (Related acquisition Docket 6630-BS-103)
- [PSC REF 598750](#) - final clean Foundry Ridge application narrative (Docket 9835-CE-100)

Accuracy Note

Do not say that every unit of electricity produced by Foundry Ridge would physically flow directly to one data center. The supported statement is that one Very Large Customer is economically subscribing to 100% of the project and that Wisconsin Electric says the plant would not otherwise be required without that customer's incremental load.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Comment 5: Utility and Customer Arrangements Predated the Merchant Application

Best for

Residents concerned about transparency, merchant-plant treatment, utility ownership, customer commitments and whether the public received a complete explanation of the project.

Make It Your Own

- When you first learned Wisconsin Electric intended to acquire the plant.
- Whether the merchant description affected your initial understanding.
- Whether you believe the project's purpose and likely ownership were clearly explained.
- Why the timeline matters to your ability to participate meaningfully.

Comment Template

Re: Foundry Ridge Energy Center, PSC Docket 9835-CE-100

Dear Commissioners:

I am asking the Public Service Commission to evaluate Foundry Ridge with a complete understanding of the utility and customer arrangements that existed before the wholesale-merchant CPCN application was filed.

Foundry Ridge entered this proceeding through an Invenergy-controlled subsidiary and was described as a wholesale merchant plant. The application also stated that the project could later be sold or assigned to a public utility or another qualified entity.

However, Wisconsin Electric's related acquisition proceeding reveals that its involvement began well before the public merchant application.

PSC REF 586309 states that: (Related acquisition Docket 6630-BS-103)

- Wisconsin Electric and Invenergy began acquisition communications in 2024;
- Wisconsin Electric offered Foundry Ridge to a Very Large Customer in June 2025;
- Wisconsin Electric and that customer signed a Project Cancellation Agreement in June 2025; and
- Wisconsin Electric and Invenergy entered a procurement agreement in August 2025 involving long-lead equipment.

The Foundry Ridge merchant CPCN application was filed in early August 2025.

The public record does not provide the exact August date of the procurement agreement, so it should not be assumed that the procurement agreement necessarily preceded the CPCN filing. But the 2024 acquisition discussions and June 2025 customer offer and financial agreement clearly did.

This does not, by itself, prove that the project's legal classification as a merchant plant was invalid. It does show that Foundry Ridge was already embedded in a utility-acquisition and large-customer service plan when it entered the CPCN process.

The merchant description did not fully communicate that:

- Wisconsin Electric had been discussing acquisition since 2024;
- the project had been offered to a specific Very Large Customer;
- the customer had signed a financial commitment before the CPCN filing;
- Wisconsin Electric was planning to acquire the project and CPCN rights; and
- Wisconsin Electric now says the plant would not be needed without that customer's incremental load.

[Add your perspective. Example: "I should not have had to search multiple separate dockets to understand who was likely to own this plant and whose demand was driving it."]

The Commission should determine whether the environmental review, public notice and merchant CPCN record gave residents a complete and accurate understanding of the project's intended ownership, committed customer, financing and economic purpose.

If the Commission concludes that this information materially changes how the project should be evaluated, it should deny the application, reopen the record or provide an additional opportunity for public review.

Thank you for considering my comment.

Relevant PSC References and Docket Locations

- [PSC REF 586309](#) - acquisition and customer-agreement chronology (Related acquisition Docket 6630-BS-103)
- [PSC REF 590022](#) - public-redacted customer transaction agreement (Related acquisition Docket 6630-BS-103)
- ~~PSC REF 598230 - public procurement agreement (Related acquisition Docket 6630-BS-103) was removed~~
- [PSC REF 598750](#) - final clean application narrative (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [Docket 6630-BS-103](#) - Wisconsin Electric's proposed acquisition

Accuracy Note

Do not state that the merchant classification has been proven legally invalid. The public-redacted customer agreement names Vantage Data Centers Management Company, LLC in its confidentiality provision, strongly indicating a connection. However, the customer's name is redacted from the principal customer fields, so the publicly available agreement does not conclusively confirm that Vantage is the subscribing customer.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Comment 6: The "20% Peaker" Description and the Actual Operating Profile

Best for

Residents concerned about operating hours, emissions, noise, water use, gas demand, nighttime operation or whether the environmental analysis reflects the plant's actual customer arrangement.

Make It Your Own

- Which operating impact concerns you most.
- Whether you live close enough to hear or see the facility.
- Why daily or weekly continuous operation matters to you.
- Whether you believe the customer's actual load profile should be disclosed and analyzed.

Comment Template

Re: Foundry Ridge Energy Center, PSC Docket 9835-CE-100

Dear Commissioners:

I am concerned that describing Foundry Ridge simply as a "20% peaker" does not provide the public with a complete understanding of how often or how long the plant could operate.

The final application states that the facility is expected to operate primarily during periods of peak electrical demand and to have an annual capacity factor of approximately 20%.

However, the same application also states that the plant would:

- be designed for continuous service;
- be available to operate 24 hours per day, seven days per week and 365 days per year, except for outages;
- be capable of daily and weekly capacity factors as high as 100%;
- have a fuel-based limit equivalent to 2,338 hours per turbine at full load, described elsewhere as approximately a 27% capacity factor; and
- potentially operate for more than 2,338 actual hours when running below full load.

These statements may not be technically incompatible. A plant could be idle for substantial parts of a year while operating continuously for days or weeks during periods of high demand.

But they show that an expected 20% annual average is not the same as a restriction allowing operation during only 20% of the year.

The record also states that one Very Large Customer has subscribed to 100% of Foundry Ridge and that the plant would not otherwise be required for Wisconsin Electric's portfolio without that customer's incremental load.

That raises an additional question: what does "peak demand" mean for this project?

Is it based upon:

- regional MISO demand;
- Wisconsin Electric's system peak;
- the subscribing customer's hourly and seasonal load;
- periods when that customer's demand places new stress on the system; or
- a combination of these conditions?

The applicant's operating response relies on regional market assumptions and historical operation of comparable peaking and intermediate resources. It does not clearly establish that the forecast incorporates the actual load profile of the customer subscribing to the full project.

The project is also seeking approximately 68,800 dekatherms per day of firm gas service. Firm delivery capacity is not the same as annual gas consumption, but the scale of that requested service further demonstrates the need for a consistent explanation of the plant's operating assumptions.

[Add your concern. Example: "For nearby residents, a yearly average does not answer whether all three turbines could operate continuously through several hot summer days or cold winter nights."]

Before approving Foundry Ridge, the Commission should require:

- the precise enforceable operating limit;
- the maximum number of actual operating hours at full and partial load;
- the maximum period of continuous operation;
- an explanation of the 20%-versus-27% descriptions;
- an operating analysis using the subscribing customer's actual projected load; and
- confirmation that air, health, noise and water analyses reflect the maximum reasonably foreseeable operation.

Please delay or deny approval until the plant's operating profile is defined clearly and consistently.

Thank you for considering my comment.

Relevant PSC References and Docket Locations

- [PSC REF 598750](#) - final clean application narrative (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 597140](#) - operating-profile and firm-gas response (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 596268](#) and PSC REF 596269 - VLC need and 100% subscription (Related acquisition Docket 6630-BS-103)
- [PSC REF 598228](#) - alternative gas-service and gas-lateral information (Related acquisition Docket 9835-CE-100)

Accuracy Note

An expected 20% annual capacity factor does not mean the plant would operate exactly 20% of each day. It could operate continuously during particular days or weeks and remain idle during other periods. Firm gas capacity also should not be treated as proof that the plant would use that amount of gas every day.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Comment 7: The Required Pipeline and Transmission System Remains Unresolved

Best for

Landowners, farmers, residents near possible corridors and anyone concerned that the plant could be approved before its required gas and transmission infrastructure is fully identified.

Make It Your Own

- Whether you own or farm land that could be crossed.
- Whether you have received notice of a possible pipeline or transmission route.
- Which roads, waterways, wetlands or agricultural areas concern you.
- Why you believe associated infrastructure should be reviewed before the plant is approved.

Comment Template

Re: Foundry Ridge Energy Center, PSC Docket 9835-CE-100

Dear Commissioners:

I am asking the Public Service Commission not to approve Foundry Ridge before the gas pipeline and transmission facilities required to operate it have been fully identified and evaluated.

Foundry Ridge would require a new natural-gas lateral. The final application estimates that this lateral would be approximately 5.3 miles for the proposed site or 2.5 miles for the alternative site and approximately 16 inches in diameter.

However, the applicant's final documents describe the pipeline route differently.

The final application repeatedly states that preliminary routing from Wisconsin Electric Gas Operations is not currently available. The final-filed testimony of the applicant's thermal-engineering witness instead states that preliminary routing has been identified.

These statements should be reconciled.

If a preliminary route exists, the Commission should determine:

- who developed or possesses it;
- which properties and landowners could be affected;
- whether landowners have been notified;
- which roads, farms, wetlands and waterways could be crossed;
- why the route is absent from the public CPCN record; and
- whether its environmental and cumulative impacts have been evaluated.

A post-hearing response also states that if Wisconsin Electric Gas Operations cannot provide service, Foundry Ridge could seek a direct connection to the Guardian or ANR pipeline systems. The applicant acknowledges that this alternative was not evaluated in the current CPCN application and could add cost and schedule risk.

The transmission configuration also remains unsettled.

The application describes an Alternative Gen-Tie Line of approximately 2.2 miles, including approximately 1.8 miles attached to an existing transmission line. Final engineering testimony instead describes the Alternative Gen-Tie Line itself as approximately 1.8 miles and refers more generally to interconnection with the existing ATC system.

Foundry Ridge is also pursuing both surplus interconnection service associated with Darien Solar queue position J850 and standalone interconnection service through queue position J4028. Final testimony states that the precise configuration will be determined after additional MISO review.

The application identifies another possible configuration if necessary property rights cannot be acquired, potentially including an approximately five-acre graded site for a new switchyard.

These may be contingencies that arise during infrastructure development. But the Commission is being asked to approve the generating plant before the final routes, agreements, property rights, construction responsibilities, upgrades and impacts are settled.

[Add your personal concern. Example: "A pipeline or transmission corridor could directly affect farms and families that do not yet know they are part of the project."]

Before approval, the Commission should require:

- the preliminary and proposed gas-lateral routes;
- identification and notice of potentially affected properties;
- the final gas-service facilities and costs;
- the complete Alternative Gen-Tie route;
- the final point of interconnection;
- the responsibilities of Foundry Ridge and ATC;
- the required MISO upgrades;
- all additional land requirements; and
- an explanation of which later changes would require new environmental review or public participation.

Please deny or postpone approval until the Commission and public know what connected infrastructure is actually being authorized.

Thank you for considering my comment.

Relevant PSC References and Docket Locations

- [PSC REF 598750](#) - final clean application narrative (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 598751](#) - final engineering testimony (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 598228](#) - alternative gas-service and lateral-cost response (Related acquisition Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 598755](#) - final rebuttal testimony concerning interconnection (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- MISO queue positions [J850](#) and [J4028](#)

Accuracy Note

The conflicting pipeline statements do not prove that a route was intentionally concealed. They do establish a need to clarify whether a preliminary route exists, who has it and why it is not clearly presented in the public CPCN record.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Tier 3: Detailed Record and Accountability Comments

These examples are designed for residents who want to submit a more comprehensive record-based comment.

Comment 8: The Final-Filed Record Is Not Internally Consistent

Best for

Residents concerned about accuracy, document quality, contradictory filings and whether the Commission has one reliable version of the project before making its decision.

Make It Your Own

- Why accuracy matters to public participation.
- Whether the discrepancies changed your understanding of the project.
- What information you believe must be corrected before approval.
- Whether new material filings should trigger additional public comment.

Comment Template

Re: Foundry Ridge Energy Center, PSC Docket 9835-CE-100

Dear Commissioners:

I am asking the Public Service Commission to require a corrected, authoritative and internally consistent final record before deciding whether to approve Foundry Ridge.

The applicant designated a clean revised application and final testimony as its final-filed evidence. Those documents nevertheless contain multiple confirmed errors, apparent inconsistencies and unresolved project details.

Construction schedules

The final clean application states that construction would begin on September 1, 2026, with commercial operation on March 31, 2028. Its construction table lists February 31, 2028, as the end of hot commissioning, even though February 31 does not exist.

The final-filed testimony of the applicant's thermal-engineering witness provides a substantially different schedule. It states that construction would begin in January 2027 and be completed in August 2028.

The schedule reproduced in that testimony also contains several events ending before construction begins, including:

- grading ending in August 2026 after being shown as beginning in February 2027;
- testing and pre-commissioning ending in June 2026 after beginning in January 2028; and
- substantial completion dates for all three units occurring in 2026 even though construction is described as beginning in 2027.

The Commission should not have to infer which construction schedule is accurate.

Gas-pipeline route

The final application repeatedly says preliminary pipeline routing is not available. The final engineering testimony says preliminary routing has been identified.

The Commission should determine whether a route exists, where it is, who possesses it and whether the affected landowners and resources have been identified.

Operating limits

The project is described as having an expected annual capacity factor of approximately 20%. Other portions of the record describe a fuel-based full-load equivalent of approximately 27%, possible operation

beyond 2,338 actual hours at partial load, continuous-service design and daily or weekly capacity factors as high as 100%.

The Commission should state clearly which limit is legally enforceable and which operating scenario was used in the environmental analysis.

Land-use calculation

Final rebuttal testimony states that 16 acres represents 0.00074% of the Town of Darien's approximately 21,568 acres.

The correct calculation is approximately 0.0742%. The testimony understates the percentage by a factor of 100.

The corrected percentage remains relatively small compared with the entire town. But the calculation was used to answer a land-use concern involving farmland preservation and the broader permanent and temporary project footprint.

Transmission and interconnection

The application and final engineering testimony provide different descriptions of the Alternative Gen-Tie Line's length and interconnection.

The precise combination of surplus and standalone interconnection service also remains subject to future MISO review. A separate possible configuration could require an additional approximately five-acre switchyard site.

[Add your personal perspective. Example: "Residents cannot participate meaningfully when the final evidence contains multiple timelines, different descriptions of required infrastructure and unresolved operating limits."]

Before issuing a decision, I ask the Commission to:

1. require one corrected construction schedule;
2. identify which schedule and assumptions were used in the environmental review;
3. reconcile the gas-pipeline statements;
4. define the enforceable operating limits;
5. correct the acreage calculation;
6. clarify the complete gen-tie route;
7. identify the final interconnection configuration;
8. file one consolidated list of material corrections; and
9. reopen public comment if those corrections or routes materially change the project.

A decision with decades of consequences should be based on a record that is accurate, consistent and understandable.

Please postpone approval until that standard is met.

Thank you for considering my comment.

Relevant PSC References and Docket Locations

- [PSC REF 598750](#) - final clean application narrative (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 598751](#) - final engineering testimony (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 598755](#) - final rebuttal testimony (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 598934](#) - final surrebuttal testimony (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 598922](#) - final application exhibit index (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 597140](#) - operating-profile response (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 598228](#) - gas-service response (Related acquisition Docket 9835-CE-100)

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Comment 9: Merchant Status Has Produced a Fragmented Review

Best for

Residents concerned about transparency, project need, alternatives, utility costs, cumulative impacts and important information being divided among multiple PSC proceedings.

Make It Your Own

- How difficult it was to understand the project across separate dockets.
- Which connected infrastructure concerns you most.
- Why the Commission should review the related proceedings together.
- What information you believe the public did not receive clearly or early enough.

Comment Template

Re: Foundry Ridge Energy Center, PSC Docket 9835-CE-100

Dear Commissioners:

I am asking the Public Service Commission to deny or delay Foundry Ridge because the project's merchant classification has resulted in a fragmented review of a project that is physically and economically interconnected.

Foundry Ridge entered the CPCN proceeding as a wholesale merchant plant. The Commission's project page states that project need and cost are not reviewed in the same manner for this merchant application.

The final application invokes merchant status to decline or limit substantial requested analysis, including information concerning:

- overall project costs;
- long-term demand and energy forecasts;
- generation-expansion modeling;
- capacity and reserve-margin needs;
- purchased-power alternatives;
- energy efficiency and demand response;
- a meaningful no-build alternative; and
- renewable and other generation alternatives.

At the same time, the application relies on data-center and artificial-intelligence electricity demand, Wisconsin Electric's Very Large Customer tariff and WEC Energy Group generation plans to explain why Foundry Ridge is appropriate.

The related Wisconsin Electric acquisition docket then supplies the information that one Very Large Customer is subscribing to 100% of Foundry Ridge, that the project is needed to meet the customer's load obligations and that the resource would not otherwise be required without that customer's incremental demand.

Other portions of the overall project remain divided among additional records and future decisions involving:

- Wisconsin Electric's proposed acquisition;
- Very Large Customer and Bespoke Resource tariffs;
- customer cost allocation;
- firm gas transportation;
- a new gas lateral;
- transmission interconnection;

- MISO studies and agreements;
- property rights;
- environmental permits; and
- possible related regional generation and transmission projects.

This creates an incomplete public picture:

- utility and customer demand are used to explain why the plant should exist;
- merchant status is used to avoid a full utility need, cost, efficiency and alternatives analysis; and
- the infrastructure required to operate the plant remains under development in separate processes.

A gas plant, pipeline, gen-tie line, substation, switchyard and customer-driven electric load may appear in different filings. On the landscape and in the utility system, however, they form one connected project.

The local community would experience the combined effects regardless of which company owns each component or which docket contains each approval.

[Add your experience. Example: "I should not have to reconstruct the project's true purpose and infrastructure from several separate proceedings after the environmental review and public hearing are already underway."]

Before approving Foundry Ridge, the Commission should conduct an integrated review that addresses:

- the actual customer-driven need;
- likely utility ownership;
- total project and infrastructure costs;
- cost responsibility and customer risk;
- gas and transmission facilities;
- the no-build alternative;
- energy efficiency and demand response;
- cleaner resource alternatives;
- cumulative air, water, agricultural and community effects; and
- the broader infrastructure buildout associated with Very Large Customer demand.

The Commission should also explain how it can make a finding of public convenience and necessity when the project's purpose, ownership, demand, costs and associated infrastructure are treated as separate questions.

Please deny the application or postpone a decision until the connected record is evaluated as a whole.

Thank you for considering my comment.

Relevant PSC References and Docket Locations

- [PSC REF 598750](#) - final clean application narrative (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 596268](#) and [PSC REF 596269](#) - VLC need and subscription (Related acquisition Docket 6630-BS-103)
- [PSC REF 586309](#) - acquisition and customer timeline (Related acquisition Docket 6630-BS-103)
- ~~PSC REF 598230 - procurement agreement (Related acquisition Docket 6630-BS-103) was removed~~
- [Docket 6630-BS-103](#) - proposed acquisition
- [Docket 6630-TE-113](#) - Very Large Customer and Bespoke Resource tariff
- [PSC REF 598382](#) - public hearing transcript (Docket 9835-CE-100)

Accuracy Note

The record does not establish that the merchant classification is legally invalid. The stronger supported argument is that merchant treatment prevented important need, cost and alternatives information from being evaluated within the same public proceeding even though utility demand and acquisition plans are central to the project's purpose.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Comment 10: Comprehensive Request to Deny, Delay or Reopen the Record

Best for

Residents who want one comment bringing together public need, health, water, land, infrastructure, transparency and final-record concerns.

Make It Your Own

- Your connection to Darien, Walworth County or Wisconsin.
- The two or three impacts that matter most to you.
- One firsthand experience or personal concern.
- Your preferred action: deny, delay or reopen the record.

Comment Template

Re: Foundry Ridge Energy Center, PSC Docket 9835-CE-100

Dear Commissioners:

I am asking the Public Service Commission to deny the Foundry Ridge CPCN or postpone a decision until the project's need, operating profile, infrastructure, environmental effects and financial risks have been evaluated through a complete and internally consistent record.

[I live in ____ / I own property near ____ / my family farms in the area / I use Turtle Creek / I am concerned as a Wisconsin utility customer / I am a parent, educator or healthcare worker.]

My principal concerns are the following.

One Very Large Customer is driving the stated need

Wisconsin Electric states that one Very Large Customer has subscribed to 100% of Foundry Ridge, that the project is needed to meet that customer's load obligations and that the resource would not otherwise be required for Wisconsin Electric's generation portfolio without the customer's incremental demand.

The fact that electricity would enter the regional grid does not change the reason Wisconsin Electric says the resource is needed.

The Commission should determine whether it is in the public interest for a rural community to bear decades of environmental and land-use consequences for infrastructure driven by one customer's extraordinary demand.

Utility and customer arrangements began before the merchant application

Wisconsin Electric reports that acquisition discussions with Invenergy began in 2024. The project was offered to a Very Large Customer and a Project Cancellation Agreement was signed in June 2025, before the wholesale-merchant CPCN application was filed.

These facts do not automatically invalidate the merchant classification, but they show that the project was already part of a utility-acquisition and customer-service plan.

The public should have received a complete explanation of likely ownership, customer commitment, financing and purpose when the environmental review began.

The operating profile remains unclear

The plant is commonly described as an approximately 20% peaker. The application also says it would be designed for continuous service, available throughout the year and capable of daily or weekly capacity factors as high as 100%.

The record includes both approximately 20% and approximately 27% full-load-equivalent descriptions and acknowledges that actual operating hours could exceed 2,338 when the turbines operate below full load.

The Commission should define the enforceable maximum and ensure that air, health, noise, water and gas analyses reflect the maximum reasonably foreseeable operation and the actual subscribing customer's load profile.

Required gas and transmission facilities remain unsettled

The final application says preliminary pipeline routing is unavailable, while final engineering testimony says preliminary routing has been identified.

A post-hearing response also discusses possible direct connections to the Guardian or ANR systems that were not evaluated in the current application.

The Alternative Gen-Tie Line is described differently in final documents, and the final combination of surplus and standalone MISO interconnection service remains subject to later review. Another possible configuration could require an additional switchyard site.

The Commission should not approve the plant before knowing the routes, affected properties, facilities, costs, construction responsibilities and environmental effects of the infrastructure required to operate it.

The final-filed evidence contains significant discrepancies

The applicant's final documents contain:

- two substantially different construction schedules;
- several chronologically impossible construction dates;
- an invalid February 31 date;
- conflicting gas-route statements;
- unclear 20%-versus-27% operating limits;
- an acreage percentage understated by a factor of 100;
- inconsistent Alternative Gen-Tie descriptions; and
- unresolved interconnection details.

These issues do not prove intentional wrongdoing. They do raise a legitimate question about whether the Commission has a sufficiently clear and reliable record for a final decision.

Local and cumulative impacts have not been addressed as one system

Residents have raised concerns involving:

- air pollution and public health;
- private wells and groundwater;
- wastewater and Turtle Creek;
- farmland preservation;
- wildlife and habitat;
- noise, vibration and lighting;
- construction traffic;
- pipeline and emergency risks;
- property marketability;
- local emergency-response capacity;
- transmission development; and
- the cumulative industrialization of rural Walworth County.

The project should not be evaluated only as the acreage inside the plant fence. The Commission should consider the plant, pipeline, transmission facilities, utility acquisition, customer demand and related regional infrastructure as one connected system.

[Add two or three personal sentences. Example: "My family has lived in this area for ____ years. We value its farmland, water and rural character. I do not believe these permanent impacts have been justified by a project the utility says it would not otherwise need."]

I respectfully ask the Commission to take the following actions:

1. Determine whether Foundry Ridge is in the public interest when one customer's incremental load is the stated reason it is needed.
2. Reconcile the merchant application with the pre-application utility and customer arrangements.
3. Require a corrected and authoritative construction schedule.
4. Define the maximum enforceable operating limits.
5. Require an operating analysis based on the VLC's actual projected demand.
6. Disclose and evaluate the gas-pipeline route.
7. Finalize the transmission and interconnection configuration.
8. Identify all project and infrastructure costs and who bears them.
9. Evaluate reasonable no-build, efficiency, demand-response and cleaner-resource alternatives.
10. Conduct an integrated cumulative-impact review.
11. Reopen public comment if material new routes, costs, corrections or interconnection information are filed.

Choose One Closing

Request to Deny

For these reasons, I ask the Commission to deny the Foundry Ridge CPCN. The applicant has not demonstrated through a complete and reliable record that this project is necessary, sufficiently defined or in the public interest.

Request to Delay

At minimum, I ask the Commission to postpone its decision until the record is corrected, the connected proceedings and infrastructure are evaluated together, and the public has access to all material information.

Request to Reopen Public Participation

If material construction schedules, pipeline routes, transmission configurations, cost information or other corrected evidence are filed after the public-comment deadline, I ask the Commission to reopen public comment so residents can review and respond to that information.

Thank you for considering my comment.

Principal PSC References and Docket Locations

- [PSC REF 598750](#) - final clean application narrative (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 598751](#) - final engineering testimony (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 598755](#) - final rebuttal testimony (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 598934](#) - final surrebuttal testimony (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 597140](#) - operating profile and firm gas (Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 598228](#) - alternative gas service and lateral costs (Related acquisition Docket 9835-CE-100)
- [PSC REF 596268](#) - project needed for VLC load obligations (Related acquisition Docket 6630-BS-103)
- [PSC REF 596269](#) - resource not otherwise required; 100% subscription (Related acquisition Docket 6630-BS-103)

- [PSC REF 586309](#) - acquisition and customer-agreement chronology (Related acquisition Docket 6630-BS-103)
- [PSC REF 590022](#) - public-redacted customer agreement (Related acquisition Docket 6630-BS-103)
- ~~PSC REF 598230 - procurement agreement (Related acquisition Docket 6630-BS-103) was removed~~
- [PSC REF 598382](#) - public hearing transcript (Docket 9835-CE-100)

[Back to Table of Contents](#)