

Model resolution: Statewide moratorium on 765 kV transmission lines

For any town, village, city or county board. This resolution asks the Governor and the Legislature for a pause and a study. It does not ask a board to oppose a project, so a board can adopt it whether or not it has already adopted an opposition resolution. The Vernon County Board adopted the original text on October 22, 2026. Fill every blank, pick the bracketed option that fits, and delete every bracketed note before adoption. Before your meeting, check whether FERC has ruled on the complaint in Docket EL25-109 (search the docket at elibrary.ferc.gov) and change the fourth WHEREAS if it has. When your board adopts the resolution, send the signed copy to info@no765line.org and we will add it to the public resolution tracker.

Pick the project clause that fits your community. MariBell and BECI are two separate proposals with separate developers and separate routes. Name the one that crosses or borders your community, or name both as two projects. Never join the two names with a slash.

	MariBell	BECI
Developers	Dairyland Power Cooperative and GridLiance Heartland, LLC	Midcontinent Grid Solutions (MGS), a joint venture of Transource Energy and BHE Transmission
Route	Marion, Minnesota to Bell Center, Wisconsin	Bell Center, Wisconsin to the Illinois state line

RESOLUTION NO. ____

A Resolution Urging the Governor and the State Legislature to Enact a Statewide Moratorium on 765 kV Transmission Lines in Wisconsin

WHEREAS, [**MariBell** (its Wisconsin route crosses Vernon and Crawford counties): a 765 kV transmission line known as MariBell, developed by Dairyland Power Cooperative and GridLiance Heartland, LLC, is proposed to be constructed through _____ County] / [**BECI** (no route has been filed yet): a 765 kV transmission line known as BECI is proposed by Midcontinent Grid Solutions within a study area that includes _____ County] / [**Statewide** (use this if neither applies, or to name both): two separate 765 kV transmission lines, known as MariBell and BECI, are proposed in Wisconsin]; and

WHEREAS, Wisconsin's existing transmission lines operate at up to 345 kV, and a 765 kV line would carry more than twice that voltage (1); and

WHEREAS, [MariBell is | BECI is | both projects are] part of a group of transmission projects that the Midcontinent Independent System Operator (MISO) approved on December 12, 2024 and labeled "Tranche 2.1" (2), and MISO's stakeholder process designates no sector for the affected landowners and host communities that must bear the siting burdens of MISO-approved transmission projects (3); and

WHEREAS, on July 30, 2025, the utility commissions of five states within MISO's territory filed a complaint with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) asking it to find that MISO violated its tariff and to remove the Tranche 2.1 projects from the "Multi-Value Project" category, the category that spreads their costs across MISO's Midwest subregion, including Wisconsin (4), and as of October 2026 FERC had not ruled on that complaint (Docket No. EL25-109-000) (4); and

WHEREAS, in a July 15, 2024 memo to MISO on the methods used to estimate the benefits of the Tranche 2 projects, MISO's own Independent Market Monitor wrote that the resource assumptions behind them were "extremely unrealistic" and that "the proposed methodologies are likely to lead to substantially over-estimated benefits" (5); and

WHEREAS, William Hogan, Raymond Plank Professor of Global Energy Policy, Emeritus, at the Harvard Kennedy School, testified for the five state commissions that "[r]easonable estimates of the alternative futures and the associated costs would produce a substantial change in the MISO cost-benefit analysis wherein the costs of the proposed transmission would not be justified by the estimated benefits" (6); and

WHEREAS, the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin (PSC) is legally charged with independently deciding whether to grant a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity allowing [MariBell | BECI | each project] to be constructed; and

WHEREAS, on September 9, 2025, the PSC joined the Illinois, Michigan and Minnesota utility commissions in comments asking FERC to dismiss the five-state complaint; those comments state that "[t]he Tranche 2.1 portfolio reflects states' resource plans," and that the commissions "are unable to speak in detail about the projects that make up the Tranche 2.1 portfolio, due to the fact that Tranche 2.1 projects may be, will be, or currently are before state regulators for further approval," and that "individual projects cannot be addressed given the timing of this complaint" (7); and

WHEREAS, under Wisconsin's former "Advance Plan" process, utilities filed plans for Public Service Commission approval and a new transmission line had to be in substantial compliance with the most recent approved plan; 1997 Wisconsin Act 204, enacted in 1998, repealed that requirement and replaced the Advance Plan with a "strategic energy assessment" (8); and

WHEREAS, the economic, social, and environmental consequences of such decisions underscore the importance of fair processes and rigorous regulatory review before additional treasured areas of our State, such as [the Driftless region / name your area], are further burdened with additional major transmission lines; and

WHEREAS, the [Town/Village/City/County] Board finds:

1. Since the Advance Plan requirement was repealed, no Wisconsin law requires a new high-voltage transmission line to be in substantial compliance with an approved statewide plan, and the state siting policy the PSC must apply says only that existing utility corridors "should" be used first, "to the greatest extent feasible" (9); together these raise serious questions that our State and its Legislature should address before allowing the approval of additional major high-voltage transmission lines;
2. The Independent Market Monitor's criticism of MISO's benefit methods and the five-state complaint about how the Tranche 2.1 projects are classified and paid for present serious questions that must be objectively addressed and resolved in the public interest;

[Optional: a board may add its own finding here, in its own words, about what the PSC's filing means to the board. Vernon County's adopted resolution, linked on the resolution tracker, shows how one board worded its findings. Delete this note if you add nothing.]

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the [Town/Village/City/County] Board of _____ therefore calls on the Wisconsin Legislature to immediately enact a moratorium on the consideration or approval of any 765 kV Transmission line(s) in Wisconsin until the Legislature has convened a fairly-constituted Legislative Council Special Committee, acting in an open and democratic process, charged with making recommendations for:

- a. electricity resource planning for the State of Wisconsin;
- b. much needed Public Service Commission reform;
- c. and for future transmission line policy that includes local stakeholders.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the clerk send a copy of this resolution to the Governor, to [State Senator _____] and [State Representative _____], and to _____ County officials.

BOARD ACTION: Adopted by a recorded vote of ____ aye, ____ nay, ____ absent, ____ abstaining, at a duly noticed meeting held on _____, 2026.

[TOWN/VILLAGE/CITY/COUNTY] OF _____

Title	Name	Signature	Date
Chair / President / Mayor			
Clerk			

Sources

1. Public Service Commission of Wisconsin, "Stray Voltage Phase I and Phase II Combined Database Summary" (Jan. 26, 2006), p. 36: transmission voltages "may range up to as high as 345,000 Volts AC ... in Wisconsin." <https://psc.wi.gov/SiteAssets/svUpdate2006.pdf>

2. MISO, "MISO Board approves historic transmission plan..." (Dec. 12, 2024). <https://www.misoenergy.org/meet-miso/media-center/2024/miso-board-approves-historic-transmission-plan-to-strengthen-grid-reliability/>

BECI: MISO, BECI Selection Report (Jan. 6, 2026), p. 1 (Projects 26, 30 and 31). <https://cdn.misoenergy.org/BECI%20Selection%20Report734487.pdf>

MariBell: MariBell Transmission Project FAQ: "The proposed transmission line would span portions of Olmsted, Mower, Fillmore and Houston counties in Minnesota and Vernon and Crawford counties in Wisconsin. The segment is part of a larger North Rochester – Columbia transmission project that was approved by the Midcontinent Independent System Operator (MISO) in December 2024." <https://www.maribelltransmission.com/faq>

BECI study area: Midcontinent Grid Solutions, BECI Project fact sheet: "The BECI Project study area includes Crawford, Richland, Sauk, Columbia, Dodge, Dane, Jefferson, Walworth, and Rock counties." https://mgs-projects.com/BECI_ASSETS/resources/Fact%20Sheet.pdf

3. MISO, Engage page: "eleven groups representing specific industry sectors" (seven member sectors and four non-member sectors; none is designated for landowners or local governments; "Municipals" means municipal utilities). <https://www.misoenergy.org/engage/>

4. Complaint of the Concerned Commissions (North Dakota, Montana, Arkansas, Mississippi and Louisiana), FERC Docket EL25-109-000, filed July 30, 2025, eLibrary accession 20250730-5091; p. 1 (violation of the MISO Tariff) and p. 51 (relief: "direct the Board to declassify Tranche 2.1 projects as MVPs"). Status: complainants' letter of Sept. 25, 2026 (accession 20260925-5055) says "the Commission has yet to issue an Order"; no order found on Oct. 25, 2026.

5. Potomac Economics (MISO Independent Market Monitor), memo to MISO re Tranche 2 benefits methodologies, July 15, 2024, p. 1. <https://cdn.misoenergy.org/IMM%20Memo%20re%20Tranche2%20Benefits%20Methodologies646681.pdf>

6. Testimony of William W. Hogan, Exhibit 1 to the complaint (accession 20250730-5091), at 43:15-18; title at 1:7-9. <https://www.hks.harvard.edu/faculty/william-hogan>

7. Comments of the Illinois Commerce Commission, Michigan Public Service Commission, Minnesota Public Utilities Commission, and Public Service Commission of Wisconsin in Opposition to the Complaint of the Concerned Commissions, FERC Docket EL25-109-000, Sept. 9, 2025, accession 20250909-5178, pp. 4-5.

8. 1997 Wisconsin Act 204 (enacted April 28, 1998), Sections 31, 39 and 69 (Section 69 repeals Wis. Stat. § 196.491(3)(d)1, the "substantial compliance with the most recent advance plan" test).
<https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/1997/related/acts/204.pdf>

9. Wis. Stat. § 1.12(6): "it is the policy of this state that, to the greatest extent feasible that is consistent with economic and engineering considerations, reliability of the electric system, and protection of the environment, the following corridors should be utilized in the following order of priority: (a) Existing utility corridors. (b) Highway and railroad corridors. (c) Recreational trails ... (d) New corridors." Wis. Stat. § 196.025(1m): "The commission shall implement the policy specified in s. 1.12 (6) in making all decisions, orders, and rules affecting the siting of new electric transmission facilities."
<https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/statutes/statutes/1/12> and
<https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/statutes/statutes/196/025>