

BEFORE THE MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Katie J. Sieben  
Hwikwon Ham  
Audrey C. Partridge  
Joseph K. Sullivan  
John A. Tuma

Chair  
Commissioner  
Commissioner  
Commissioner  
Commissioner

the Matter of the Application of Northern States  
Power Company d/b/a Xcel Energy for an up to  
135.5 MW Battery Energy Storage System Site  
Permit for the Blue Lake Battery Energy  
Storage Project in Scott County, Minnesota

SERVICE DATE: August 12, 2025

DOCKET NO. E-002/ESS-25-214

The above-entitled matter has been considered by the Commission and the following disposition made:

- 1. Accepted Xcel Energy's site permit application as substantially complete pending additional public information on construction and operating costs.**
- 2. Did not appoint an advisory task force for the site permit application at this time.**
- 3. Requested a full ALJ report with findings, conclusions, and recommendations for the project's public hearing.**

The Commission agrees with and adopts the attached recommendations.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION

*Juan Coleman* for

Mike Bull  
Acting Executive Secretary



To request this document in another format such as large print or audio, call 651.296.0406 (voice). Persons with a hearing or speech impairment may call using their preferred Telecommunications Relay Service or email [consumer.puc@state.mn.us](mailto:consumer.puc@state.mn.us) for assistance.

**BEFORE THE MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

**ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE PERMITTING STAFF  
COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Blue Lake Energy Storage Project**

*DOCKET NO. E002/ESS-25-214*

---

**Date:** July 11, 2025

**Staff:** Suzanne Steinhauer | 651-201-2253 | [suzane.steinhauer@state.mn.us](mailto:suzane.steinhauer@state.mn.us)

**In the Matter of the Application of Northern States Power Company d/b/a Xcel Energy for an up to 135.5 MW Battery Energy Storage System Site Permit for the Blue Lake Battery Energy Storage Project in Scott County, Minnesota.**

**Issues Addressed:** These comments and recommendations address the completeness of the site permit application, the presence of contested issues of fact, the need for an advisory task force, and consideration of procedural requirements.

Documents Attached:

- (1) Project Overview Map
- (2) Table 1. Application Completeness Requirements
- (3) Table 2. Draft Permitting and Environmental Review Schedule

Additional documents and information can be found on eDockets: <https://www.edockets.state.mn.us/ESS-25-214>.with select information on the Commission's website for the project: <https://puc.eip.mn.gov/web/project/16354>

This document can be made available in alternative formats (i.e., large print or audio) by calling 651-296-1504. Persons with a hearing or speech impairment may call using their preferred telecommunications relay service.

---

## Introduction and Background

On June 20, 2025, Xcel Energy d/b/a Northern States Power (Xcel Energy) filed a site permit application with the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (Commission) to construct and operate an up to 150 megawatt (MW) energy storage facility in Olmsted County, Minnesota.<sup>1</sup>

On June 27, 2025, the Commission issued a notice soliciting comments on the completeness of the site permit application, the presence of contested issues of fact, the need for an advisory task force, consideration of procedural requirements, and whether the Executive Secretary should authorize the applicant to initiate consultation with Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), and other issues or concerns related to the matter.<sup>2</sup>

## Project Purpose

Xcel Energy indicates that the project will help meet its need for approximately 600 MW of energy storage capacity by 2030 and provide renewable integration, grid support and resilience, and improved power quality.<sup>3</sup>

## Project Description

Xcel Energy proposes to construct and operate a battery energy storage system (BESS) with a nominal power rating of up to 135.5 MW alternating current (AC) with approximately 542 megawatt-hours (MWh) of energy capacity on a site of approximately 11.9 acres in the city of Shakopee in Scott County, Minnesota. In addition to battery energy storage enclosures, the facility will also include inverters and transformers, electrical feeder lines, a project substation, one or more stormwater drainage basins, and fencing surrounding the perimeter of the facility. The facility will be connected to the electric grid through a 115 kilovolt tap line of less than 500 feet between the project substation and Xcel Energy's adjacent Blue Lake Substation.<sup>4</sup>

Xcel Energy filed a generator interconnection agreement (GIA) application for the project with the Midcontinent Independent System Operator (MISO) in May 2024 and anticipates signing a GIA in early the second quarter of 2025.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Xcel Energy, *Application for a Site Permit for the Blue Lake Energy Storage Project*, June 20, 2025, 2024, eDockets Numbers [20256-220093-02](#), [20256-220093-03](#), [20256-220093-04](#), [20256-220093-05](#), [20256-220093-06](#), [20256-220093-07](#), [20256-220093-08](#), [20256-220093-09](#), [20256-220093-10](#), [20256-220093-11](#), [20256-220093-12](#), [20256-220093-13](#), [20256-220093-14](#), 20256-220093-15 (Trade Secret)[herein after Site Permit Application or SPA].

<sup>2</sup> Commission, Notice of Comment Period on Application Completeness, June 27, 2025, eDockets Number. [20256-220363-01](#)

<sup>3</sup> SPA, p. 6

<sup>4</sup> SPA, pp. 14-17

<sup>5</sup> SPA, p. 17

Xcel Energy anticipates that construction on the project will begin in early 2026 and be completed in time to begin operating in the second quarter of 2027.<sup>6</sup> Xcel Energy's estimated capital and annual operating costs are filed as trade secret and are not publicly available.<sup>7</sup>

## Regulatory Process and Procedures<sup>8</sup>

In Minnesota, no person may construct an energy storage system (ESS), defined as a facility capable of operating at a capacity of 10 MW or more<sup>9</sup> without a site permit from the Commission.<sup>10</sup> The proposed project will have a nominal power rating of up to 135.5 MW AC and therefore requires a site permit from the Commission. As an ESS facility, the site permit application qualifies for Commission review under the alternative permitting process described in Minnesota Statute 216E.04.<sup>11</sup>

The project does not require a certificate of need from the Commission because the Project is exempt under Minn. Stat. 216B.243, subd. 8(9).

## Site Permit Application Acceptance

Site permit applications for large electric power facilities must provide information about the applicant, a description of the project, and discussion of potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures.<sup>12</sup> Review under the alternative permitting process does not require an applicant to propose alternative sites in their permit application. However, if the applicant has evaluated and rejected alternative sites they must describe these rejected alternatives and the reasons for rejecting them in their application.<sup>13</sup>

The Commission may accept an application as complete, reject an application and require additional information to be submitted, or accept an application as complete upon filing of supplemental information.<sup>14</sup> The environmental review and permitting process begins when the Commission determines that a permit application is complete; the Commission has six months (or nine months, with just cause) from the date of this determination to reach a permit decision.<sup>15</sup>

## Environmental Review

Site permit applications are subject to environmental review conducted by Commission Energy Infrastructure Permitting (EIP) staff. Projects proceeding under the alternative permitting process

---

<sup>6</sup> SPA, p. 9

<sup>7</sup> SPA, p. 18, Appendix K

<sup>8</sup> The Energy Infrastructure Permitting Act took effect on July 1, 2025. As this matter was filed prior to July 1, 2025, it will continue to be reviewed under Minn. Stat. § 216E (2023) and Minnesota Rules Chapter 7850.

<sup>9</sup> Minnesota Statute 216E.01, subd. 3a.

<sup>10</sup> Minnesota Statute 216E.03, subd. 1.

<sup>11</sup> Minnesota Statute 216E.04, Subd. 2 (noting those projects that are eligible to proceed under an alternative permitting process).

<sup>12</sup> Minnesota Rules 7850.1900 and 7850.3100.

<sup>13</sup> Minnesota Rule 7850.3100.

<sup>14</sup> Minnesota Rule 7850.3200.

<sup>15</sup> Minnesota Statute 216E.04, Subd. 7.

require the preparation of an environmental assessment (EA).<sup>16</sup> An EA is a document which describes the potential human and environmental impacts of a proposed project and possible mitigation measures. The EA will evaluate any site proposed by the applicant and any other site identified by the Commission.<sup>17</sup> A public information and scoping meeting is held to solicit comments on the scope of the EA. An EA is the only state environmental review document required for site permit applications reviewed under the alternative permitting process.

### **Advisory Task Force**

The Commission may appoint an advisory task force to aid the environmental review process. An advisory task force must include representatives of local governmental units in the project area. A task force assists staff with identifying impacts and mitigation measures to be evaluated in the EA and expires upon issuance of the EA scoping decision.<sup>18</sup>

The Commission is not required to appoint an advisory task force for every project. If the Commission does not appoint a task force, citizens may request that one be appointed. If such a request is made, the Commission must determine at a subsequent meeting if a task force should be appointed or not. The decision whether to appoint an advisory task force does not need to be made at the time of application acceptance; however, it should be made as soon as practicable to ensure its charge can be completed prior to issuance of the EA scoping decision.

### **Public Hearing**

Site permit applications under the alternative permitting process require that a public hearing be held in the project area after the EA for the project has been completed and released.<sup>19</sup> The hearing is typically presided over by an administrative law judge (ALJ) from the Office of Administrative Hearings. The Commission may request that the ALJ provide solely a summary of public testimony. Alternately, the Commission may request that the ALJ provide a full report with findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations regarding the project.

### **Staff Analysis and Comments**

Staff provides the following analysis and comments in response to the Commission's notice requesting comments on completeness and other issues related to Xcel Energy's site permit application.

#### **Application Completeness**

Staff previously reviewed a draft of the application and believes that its comments on the draft application and supporting materials were substantially addressed in the application filed on June 20, 2025.

Staff evaluated the application against the completeness requirements of Minnesota Rule 7850.3100 (Table 1). For the most part, the application contains information with respect to these requirements.

---

<sup>16</sup> Minnesota Rule 7850.3700.

<sup>17</sup> Minnesota Statute 216E.04, subd. 5

<sup>18</sup> Minnesota Rule 7850.3600.

<sup>19</sup> Minnesota Rule 7850.3800.

However, the application does not provide public estimates for the project's anticipated capital and operating costs in the body of the application. Appendix K, filed as a non-public document does contain summary information on the project's capital and operating costs. Minnesota Rule 7850.1900, subp. 1.H, requires site permit applications to contain "a cost analysis of the large electric power generating plant at each proposed site, including the costs of constructing and operating the facility that are dependent on design and site."

Staff recommends the Commission accept the application as substantially complete once Xcel Energy provides a public filing with a high level breakout of anticipated construction costs (identifying engineering and design, procurement, construction, development (including land acquisition and permitting), and financing as well as anticipated annual operations and maintenance costs.

Staff also requests the Commission direct the applicant to continue to work with staff and provide supplemental information as necessary throughout the environmental review and permitting process.

### Advisory Task Force

Staff has analyzed the merits of establishing an advisory task force for the Blue Lake BESS project. Based on the information known at this time, staff believes that an advisory task force is not warranted for the project.

In analyzing the need for an advisory task force for the project staff considered four characteristics: project size, project complexity, known or anticipated controversy, and sensitive resources.

- **Project Size.** The project will utilize a relatively small area of land – approximately 12 acres – on a site that is currently owned by Xcel Energy. This project-size factor weighs against a task force.
- **Project Complexity.** With respect to the storage technology, land use, and tap line, the project is not complex. Land use in the project vicinity is predominantly industrial and the topography is relatively flat. There are no special construction techniques or operational features that make the project complex. This project-complexity factor weighs against a task force.
- **Known or Anticipated Controversy.** To date, staff has received no specific comments concerning the project, and there are currently no public comments in the record. Although the stand-alone energy storage facility is a relatively novel proposal in Minnesota, staff is not aware of any controversy associated with the project at this time.

Xcel Energy reports outreach to local governments, state and federal agencies, and tribes. The public will have opportunities to raise concerns and issues during scoping and the public hearing. Staff will assist citizens and governmental units in understanding the environmental review process and how to best identify issues to be addressed and site alternatives to be considered in the EA.

- **Sensitive Natural Resources.** The land use at the BESS site is currently industrial and barren land.<sup>20</sup> The site is within the potential range of two federally listed species (Northern long-eared bat and rusty patch bumble bee), one federally proposed endangered species (Tri-colored bat),

---

<sup>20</sup> SPA p. 74

one federally proposed threatened species (monarch butterfly), and a federally designated non-essential experimental population of whooping crane. There is no suitable bald eagle nesting habitat within the site and no stick nests were observed during a site visit. Although there are no state-listed endangered species within or adjacent to the site, a Minnesota Biological Survey site of high biodiversity significance (Dean's Lake) overlays approximate 42.7 acres (approximately 63 percent) of the site and contains three dry barren oak savanna (southern) native plant communities.<sup>21</sup> While there is potential for sensitive natural resources to occur within or near the Project, the record on the location of these resources and potential mitigation measures can be developed in consultation with natural resource agencies. On the whole, potential impacts to sensitive natural resources weigh neither for nor against a task force.

Based on the above analysis staff believes that an advisory task force is not warranted for the project.

### **Contested Issue of Fact**

Based on its review of Xcel Energy's application and the record to date, staff has not identified any contested issues of fact. Staff is unaware of any issues or concerns associated with the application or project that require a contested case hearing.

### **Procedural Requirements**

Staff recommends that the Commission request a full ALJ report for the project's public hearing. Staff believes that a full ALJ report with recommendations provides an unbiased, efficient, and transparent method to air and resolve any issues that may emerge as the record is developed. Requiring a full ALJ report reduces the burden on staff and helps to ensure that the Commission has a robust record on which to base its decision. Staff has provided a draft schedule concept for the Blue Lake permitting process, which includes a full ALJ report with findings, conclusions, and recommendations (see [Table 2](#)).

### **EIP Staff Recommendations**

Staff recommends that:

- The Commission accept Xcel Energy's site permit application as substantially complete pending additional public information on construction and operating costs.
- The Commission not appoint an advisory task force for the site permit application at this time.
- The Commission request a full ALJ report with findings, conclusions, and recommendations for the project's public hearing.

---

<sup>21</sup> SPA, pp. 109 - 114

Figure 1. Snowshoe BESS Project Overview Map



Table 1. Site Permit Application Completeness Requirements

Authority	Required Information	Application Location	EERA Staff Comments
<b>Minnesota Rule 7850.1900, Subpart 1 - Site Permit Application for Large Electric Generating Plant</b>			
A.	A statement of proposed ownership of the facility at the time of filing the application and after commercial operation;	1.2,3	Northern States Power Company d/b/a Xcel Energy
B.	The precise name of any person or organization to be initially named as permittee or permittees and the name of any other person to whom the permit may be transferred if transfer of the permit is contemplated;	1.2.1	Northern States Power Company, a Minnesota corporation
C.	At least two proposed sites for the proposed large electric power generating plant and identification of the applicant's preferred site and the reasons for the preference;	2.2	As an energy storage system seeking permitting under the alternative permitting process of Minnesota Statute 216E.04, alternative sites are not required under this process.
D.	A description of the proposed large electric power generating plant and all associated facilities, including the size and type of the facility;	2.1 – 2.4, Section 4, Figure 2	Information is provided to satisfy this requirement.
E.	The environmental information required under subpart 3;	See Minnesota Rule 7850.1900, Subpart 3 below.	
F.	The names of the owners of the property for each proposed site;	1.1, Map 2	Information is provided to satisfy this requirement.
G.	The engineering and operational design for the large electric power generating plant at each of the proposed sites;	Section 4, Figure 2	Information is provided to satisfy this requirement.
H.	A cost analysis of the large electric power generating plant at each proposed site, including the costs of constructing and operating the facility that are dependent on design and site;	2.5, Appendix K (trade secret)	Cost information is not public.

Authority	Required Information	Application Location	EERA Staff Comments
I.	An engineering analysis of each of the proposed sites, including how each site could accommodate expansion of generating capacity in the future;	3.3	Information is provided to satisfy this requirement.
J.	Identification of transportation, pipeline, and electrical transmission systems that will be required to construct, maintain, and operate the facility;	4.1 -4.3, Figure 2,	Information is provided to satisfy this requirement.
K.	A listing and brief description of federal, state, and local permits that may be required for the project at each proposed site;	1.4; Table 1.4	Information is provided to satisfy this requirement.
L.	A copy of the certificate of need for the project from the Commission or documentation that an application for a certificate of need has been submitted or is not required;	1.5	The project is exempt from the certificate of need requirement.
<b>Minn. R. 7850.1900, subp. 3 - Environmental Information</b>			
A.	A description of the environmental setting for each site;	5.1	Information is provided to satisfy this requirement.
B.	A description of the effects of construction and operation of the facility on human settlement, including, but not limited to, public health and safety, displacement, noise, aesthetics, socioeconomic impacts, cultural values, recreation, and public services;	5.2 Maps 2, 3, 4, 6	Information is provided to satisfy this requirement.
C.	A description of the effects of the facility on land-based economies, including, but not limited to, agriculture, forestry, tourism, and mining;	5.3	Information is provided to satisfy this requirement.
D.	A description of the effects of the facility on archaeological and historic resources;	5.4 Appendix G	Information is provided to satisfy this requirement.
E.	A description of the effects of the facility on the natural environment, including effects on air and water quality resources and flora and fauna;	5.5, Maps 5-9, Appendices C, D, H, I, & J	Information is provided to satisfy this requirement.

Authority	Required Information	Application Location	EERA Staff Comments
F.	A description of the effects of the facility on rare and unique natural resources;	5.5.8, Map 9, Appendix J	Information is provided to satisfy this requirement.
G.	Identification of human and natural environmental effects that cannot be avoided if the facility is approved at a specific site or route; and	5.6	Information is provided to satisfy this requirement.
H.	A description of measures that might be implemented to mitigate the potential human and environmental impacts identified in items A to G and the estimated costs of such mitigative measures.	3.1.2, Section 5 Appendices D – J	Information is provided to satisfy this requirement.

Table 2. Draft Permitting Process Concept Schedule

Permitting Day*	Process Step	Responsible Party
<b>Application Filed to Application Acceptance</b>		
-	Site Permit Application Filed	Applicant
	Comment Period on Application Completeness	PUC/Agencies/Public
	Reply Comment Period	Applicant
	Supplemental Comments	PUC/Agencies/Public
	Consideration of Application Acceptance	PUC
<b>Acceptance to Permit Decision</b>		
1	Application Acceptance Order	PUC
5	Public Information and Scoping Meeting Notice	PUC
30	Public Information and Scoping Meeting	PUC
40	Scoping Comment Period Closes	PUC
60	Scoping Decision Issued	PUC
170	EA Issued   Notice of EA Availability and Public Hearing	PUC
190	Public Hearing	PUC/ OAH/ Applicant
200	Public Hearing Comment Period Closes	PUC
210	Responses to Hearing Comments	PUC/ Applicant
220	Proposed Findings of Fact (FOF)	Applicant
230	Reply Comments/Technical Analysis	PUC
260	FOF, Conclusions of Law, and Recommendations	OAH
275	Exceptions to ALJ Report	Applicant/PUC
310	Consideration of Site Permit	PUC

\*All timeframes are hypothetical and will change. Meetings and hearings will occur over multiple days.

## RE: PUC EIP Supplemental Comments on Application Completeness

Blue Lake Storage Project

**PUC Docket No.** E002/ESS-25-214

In its July 11, 025, comments Minnesota Public Utilities Commission Energy Infrastructure Permitting (EIP) staff recommended that the Commission find Xcel Energy’s application for the Blue Lake Energy Storage Project substantially complete pending additional information on construction and operating costs.<sup>1</sup>

Xcel Energy filed reply comments on application completeness on July 18, 2025.<sup>2</sup> Xcel Energy’s reply comments re-iterated that it considers the cost information to be protected information and appropriately filed that information as a trade secret in Appendix K of the application. The reply comments cited to other Xcel Energy site permit applications that did not provide public cost information. While noting its position that public cost information is not required for applications to be considered complete, Xcel Energy did provide a high level estimate of capital and operating costs.

Although Xcel Energy has characterized project costs as protected information in other applications, EIP staff notes that applications for other energy storage systems have provided public cost information in various formats.<sup>3</sup> EIP staff also notes that although public cost information was not provided in Xcel Energy’s applications for the Sherco Solar Project or the Sherco 3 Solar Project, Department of Commerce staff<sup>4</sup> requested information from the company and provided that information in the environmental assessments prepared for those projects.<sup>5</sup> EIP staff will request similar information for the Environmental Assessment for the proposed Blue Lake Energy Storage Project.

---

<sup>1</sup> Commission EIP staff, Staff Comments on Application Completeness, July 11, 2025. eDocket ID: [20257-220868-01](#)

<sup>2</sup> Xcel Energy, July 18, 2025, Completeness Reply Comments, eDocket ID: [20257-221145-01](#)

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., Crane Energy Storage, LLC and Sandhill Energy Storage, LLC, *Joint Site Permits Application to the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission for Crane and Sandhill Energy Storage Projects*, (Dockets IP-7148/ESS-24-406, IP-7149/ESS-24-407), March 5, 2025, eDocket ID: [20253-216062-02](#), at p. 16; North Star Energy Storage, LLC, February 28, 2025, (Docket IP-7155/ESS-25-123) *Site Permit Application to the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission for the North Star Battery Energy Storage System Project*, eDocket ID: [20252-215915-02](#), at p.14; Midwater BESS, LLC, November 19, 2025, (Dockets IP-7138/ESS-24-294, IP-7138/TL-24-295)-*Midwater Energy Storage Project: Joint Application to the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission for a Site Permit and a Route Permit* eDocket ID: [202411-212161-01](#), at pp. 28-29; Snowshoe BESS, LLC, *Application to the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission for a Site Permit*, October 7, 2024, (Docket IP-7138/ESS-24-279), eDocket ID: [202410-210785-02](#), at pp. 16-17.

<sup>4</sup> On July 1, 2025, Department of Commerce Energy Environmental Review and Analysis (DOC EERA) unit staff moved to the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission Energy Infrastructure Permitting (PUC EIP) unit as directed by state law (Laws of Minn. 2024, ch.126, art. 7).

<sup>5</sup> Department of Commerce, *Sherco Solar Project Environmental Assessment*, March 1, 2022, eDocket ID: [20223-183816-05](#), at p. 33; Department of Commerce, *Environmental Assessment: Sherco Solar 3 Project*, April 22, 2024, eDocket ID: [20244-205757-01](#), at pp. 22-23.

EIP staff appreciates the cost information provided by Xcel Energy in its reply comments recommends the Commission find the application substantially complete, which will allow the environmental review and permitting process to begin.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Suzanne Lamb Steinhauer". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large initial 'S'.

Suzanne Lamb Steinhauer  
Environmental Review Project Manager

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Robin Benson, hereby certify that I have this day, served a true and correct copy of the following document to all persons at the addresses indicated below or on the attached list by electronic filing, electronic mail, courier, interoffice mail or by depositing the same enveloped with postage paid in the United States mail at St. Paul, Minnesota.

### **Minnesota Public Utilities Commission ORDER**

Docket Number: **E-002/ESS-25-214**

Dated this **12th** day of **August, 2025**

/s/ Robin Benson

<b>#</b>	<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Email</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Delivery Method</b>	<b>Alternate Delivery Method</b>	<b>View Trade Secret</b>	<b>Service List Name</b>
1	Matthew	Brodin	mbrodin@allete.com	Minnesota Power		30 West Superior Street Duluth MN, 55802 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
2	Christina	Brusven	cbrusven@fredlaw.com	Fredrikson Byron		60 S 6th St Ste 1500 Minneapolis MN, 55402-4400 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
3	Mike	Bull	mike.bull@state.mn.us		Public Utilities Commission	121 7th Place East, Suite 350 St. Paul MN, 55101 United States	Electronic Service		Yes	ESS-25-214
4	Jordan	Clitty	jordan.r.clitty@xcelenergy.com	Northern States Power Company dba Xcel Energy-Elec		414 Nicollet Mall Minneapolis MN, 55401 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
5	John	Coffman	john@johncoffman.net	AARP		871 Tuxedo Blvd. St, Louis MO, 63119-2044 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
6	Generic	Commerce Attorneys	commerce.attorneys@ag.state.mn.us		Office of the Attorney General - Department of Commerce	445 Minnesota Street Suite 1400 St. Paul MN, 55101 United States	Electronic Service		Yes	ESS-25-214
7	George	Crocker	gwilc@nawo.org	North American Water Office		5093 Keats Avenue Lake Elmo MN, 55042 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
8	Christopher	Droske	christopher.droske@minneapolismn.gov	Northern States Power Company dba Xcel Energy-Elec		661 5th Ave N Minneapolis MN, 55405 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
9	John	Farrell	jfarrell@llsr.org	Institute for Local Self-Reliance		2720 E. 22nd St Institute for Local Self-Reliance Minneapolis MN, 55406 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
10	Sharon	Ferguson	sharon.ferguson@state.mn.us		Department of Commerce	85 7th Place E Ste 280 Saint Paul MN, 55101-2198 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
11	Adam	Heinen	aheinen@dakotaelectric.com	Dakota Electric Association		4300 220th St W Farmington MN, 55024 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214

<b>#</b>	<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Email</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Delivery Method</b>	<b>Alternate Delivery Method</b>	<b>View Trade Secret</b>	<b>Service List Name</b>
12	Michael	Hoppe	lu23@ibew23.org	Local Union 23, I.B.E.W.		445 Etna Street Ste. 61 St. Paul MN, 55106 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
13	Alan	Jenkins	aj@jenkinsatlaw.com	Jenkins at Law		2950 Yellow tail Ave. Marathon FL, 33050 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
14	Richard	Johnson	rick.johnson@lawmoss.com	Moss & Barnett		150 S. 5th Street Suite 1200 Minneapolis MN, 55402 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
15	Sarah	Johnson Phillips	sjphillips@stoel.com	Stoel Rives LLP		33 South Sixth Street Suite 4200 Minneapolis MN, 55402 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
16	Richard	Kolodziejski	rkolodziejski@ncsrcc.org	North Central States Regional Council of Carpenters		700 Olive St St. Paul MN, 55130 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
17	Peder	Larson	plarson@larkinhoffman.com	Larkin Hoffman Daly & Lindgren, Ltd.		8300 Norman Center Drive Suite 1000 Bloomington MN, 55437 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
18	Alicia	LaValla	alavalla@fredlaw.com	Fredrikson & Byron, P.A.		60 South Sixth St Ste 1500 Minneapolis MN, 55402-4400 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
19	Kavita	Maini	kmairi@wi.rr.com	KM Energy Consulting, LLC		961 N Lost Woods Rd Oconomowoc WI, 53066 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
20	Stacy	Miller	stacy.miller@minneapolismn.gov	City of Minneapolis		350 S. 5th Street Room M 301 Minneapolis MN, 55415 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
21	David	Moeller	dmoeller@allete.com	Minnesota Power			Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
22	Andrew	Moratzka	andrew.moratzka@stoel.com	Stoel Rives LLP		33 South Sixth St Ste 4200 Minneapolis MN, 55402 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
23	David	Niles	david.niles@avantenergy.com	Minnesota Municipal Power Agency		220 South Sixth Street Suite 1300 Minneapolis MN, 55402 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214

<b>#</b>	<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Email</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Delivery Method</b>	<b>Alternate Delivery Method</b>	<b>View Trade Secret</b>	<b>Service List Name</b>
24	Carol A.	Overland	overland@legalelectric.org	Legalelectric - Overland Law Office		1110 West Avenue Red Wing MN, 55066 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
25	Generic Notice	Residential Utilities Division	residential.utilities@ag.state.mn.us		Office of the Attorney General - Residential Utilities Division	1400 BRM Tower 445 Minnesota St St. Paul MN, 55101-2131 United States	Electronic Service		Yes	ESS-25-214
26	Kevin	Reuther	kreuther@mncenter.org	MN Center for Environmental Advocacy		26 E Exchange St, Ste 206 St. Paul MN, 55101-1667 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
27	Nathaniel	Runke	nrunke@local49.org			611 28th St. NW Rochester MN, 55901 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
28	Christine	Schwartz	regulatory.records@xcelenergy.com	Xcel Energy		414 Nicollet Mall, MN1180-07-MCA Minneapolis MN, 55401-1993 United States	Electronic Service		Yes	ESS-25-214
29	Bria	Shea	bria.e.shea@xcelenergy.com	Xcel Energy		414 Nicollet Mall Minneapolis MN, 55401 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
30	Ken	Smith	ken.smith@districtenergy.com	District Energy St. Paul Inc.		76 W Kellogg Blvd St. Paul MN, 55102 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
31	Byron E.	Starns	byron.starns@stinson.com	STINSON LLP		50 S 6th St Ste 2600 Minneapolis MN, 55402 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
32	Lauren	Steinhaeuser	lauren.steinhaeuser@xcelenergy.com	Northern States Power Company dba Xcel Energy		414 Nicollet Mall, 401-08 Minneapolis MN, 55401 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
33	James M	Strommen	jstrommen@kennedy-graven.com	Kennedy & Graven, Chartered		150 S 5th St Ste 700 Minneapolis MN, 55402 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
34	Carla	Vita	carla.vita@state.mn.us	MN DEED		Great Northern Building 12th Floor 180 East Fifth Street St. Paul MN, 55101 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214

#	First Name	Last Name	Email	Organization	Agency	Address	Delivery Method	Alternate Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
35	Joseph	Windler	jw.indler@winthrop.com	Winthrop & Weinstine		225 South Sixth Street, Suite 3500 Minneapolis MN, 55402 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
36	Kurt	Zimmerman	kwz@ibew160.org	Local Union #160, IBEW		2909 Anthony Ln St Anthony Village MN, 55418-3238 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214
37	Patrick	Zomer	pat.zomer@lawmoss.com	Moss & Barnett PA		150 S 5th St #1200 Minneapolis MN, 55402 United States	Electronic Service		No	ESS-25-214