



414 Nicollet Mall
Minneapolis, MN 55401

August 1, 2025

—Via Electronic Filing—

The Honorable Ann C. O'Reilly
Administrative Law Judge
Court of Administrative Hearings
P.O. Box 64620
St. Paul, MN 55164-0620

Re: Response to Public Comments

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION FOR A ROUTE PERMIT FOR THE
MANKATO TO MISSISSIPPI RIVER 345 kV TRANSMISSION PROJECT IN
SOUTHERN MINNESOTA
CAH DOCKET NO. 65-2500-40099
MPUC DOCKET NO. E002/TL-23-157

Dear Judge O'Reilly:

In accordance with the Third Prehearing Order, Northern States Power Company, doing business as Xcel Energy (Xcel Energy, Applicant, or the Company), provides this response to public comments. Xcel Energy appreciates the participation of the public and other stakeholders in the Route Permit proceeding for the Mankato – Mississippi River Transmission Line Project (Project). During the most recent comment period, comments were filed by a number of state agencies and local government units including, the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MnDNR), the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT), the interagency Vegetation Management Planning Working Group (VMPWG), Blue Earth County, Dodge County, and the City of Madison Lake. Xcel Energy responds to each of these comments in turn as well as providing an update related to its route preference for Segment 4 of the Project.

A. Response to Public Comments – Segment 4 Route Preference

During the public hearings and the written comment period, a number of comments were made regarding the route for the proposed Project, potential impacts, and potential mitigation measures. In its Direct Testimony, Xcel Energy stated its

The Honorable Ann C. O'Reilly

August 1, 2025

Page 2

preference for the route designated as “Route Option B”¹ in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for Segments 1 and 2 of the 345 kV portion of the Project and the route designated as “Route Option A”² in the FEIS for Segment 4, the 161 kV portion of the Project.³

Since the public hearings, Xcel Energy has continued to analyze route and alignment alternatives for the Project and has now determined that it also supports selection of the route designated as “Route Option D” in the EIS for Segment 4. Route Option D is also referred to as the CapX Co-Locate Option and involves constructing the new 161 kV line parallel to the existing CapX Hampton – La Crosse 345 kV line.⁴ Route Option D has the fewest number of residences within 500 feet of the proposed centerline of the four end-to-end route options for Segment 4 and is the shortest route alternative.⁵ The CapX Co-Locate also parallels existing transmission lines for 84 percent of its length.⁶ In Direct Testimony, Company witness Ellen Heine noted, however, that this route option would not share right-of-way with the existing 345/345 kV line, resulting in an approximately 250 foot wide transmission line right-of-way.⁷ In comparison, Route Option A, which was the route preferred by the Company in its Direct Testimony, would be double-circuited with existing transmission lines for 74.6 percent of its length as compared to 0 percent for Route Option D.⁸ As shown by this brief analysis, and the detailed analysis prepared in the FEIS, both Route Option A and D have different impacts but both minimize human and environmental impacts and comply with the statutory routing criteria. Given this further analysis, including a review of the recent public comments, Xcel Energy now supports both Route Options A and D for Segment 4.

¹ Route Option B includes the Segment 1 North (with Route Segment 18), Segment 2 North and Connector Segment 2G, and Segment 2 South. A map of Route Option B is provided as Addendum 1 to Xcel Energy’s Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Recommendations filed today.

² Route Option A is the Segment 4 West Modification that then follows the south-south option east of U.S. Highway 52. A map of Route Option A is provided as Addendum 1 to Xcel Energy’s Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Recommendations filed today.

³ Ex. Xcel-29 at 20:8-21:6 (E. Heine Direct Testimony and Schedules). There is only one route under consideration for Segment 3 as this segment involves either converting an existing 161/345 kV line to 345/345 kV operation or adding a new 345 kV circuit to existing double-circuit structures. This segment was permitted by the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission as part of the CapX2020 Hampton – La Crosse Project in 2012.

⁴ Ex. EERA-10 at 794 (FEIS).

⁵ Ex. EERA-10 at 795 (FEIS).

⁶ Ex. EERA-10 at 795 (FEIS).

⁷ Ex. Xcel-29 at Schedule 2 Page 4 of 6 (E. Heine Direct Testimony).

⁸ Ex. EERA-10 at 795 (FEIS).

B. Response to State Agencies and Local Governments

1. MnDNR

In its June 10, 2025 comments, the MnDNR identified its route preferences by Project segment and proposed special route permit conditions.⁹

a. Route Preferences

For Segments 1 and 2, the MnDNR stated its preference for Route Segment 17, also referred to as the Highway 14 Option or Route Option C in the FEIS.¹⁰ The MnDNR stated it preferred this route option as it “mitigated potential impacts on native plant communities, state-administered lands, and public waters.”¹¹ Xcel Energy’s preferred route for Segments 1 and 2, Route Option A, does cross MnDNR Wildlife Management Areas (WMA), an Aquatic Management Area, and a Scientific and Natural Area. However, impacts are anticipated to be minimal as Route Option A crosses these areas in locations where the Project could be double-circuited with existing transmission line, or where impacts could be avoided depending upon the location of the final alignment.¹²

With regard to the MnDNR’s comment that Route Option C minimizes impacts to public waters, the FEIS notes that while Route Option A has the most water course crossings, Route Option A would cross approximately half of these watercourses in locations where the new 345 kV line will be double-circuited with existing transmission lines.¹³ Route Option A’s Public Water Inventory (PWI)/wetland crossings are also located in areas where the new 345 kV line is proposed to be double-circuited with existing transmission lines.¹⁴

The MnDNR also stated its support for Segment 2 South, as opposed to Segment 2 North, because Segment 2 South avoids impacts to the Faribault WMA. However, as noted in the EIS, “if Segment 2 North were selected, impacts to the Faribault WMA could be avoided depending upon the location of the final alignment.”¹⁵

⁹ MnDNR Letter (Comment Letter) (June 10, 2025) (eDocket No. [20256-219807-01](#)).

¹⁰ See Ex. EERA-10 at 518 (FEIS).

¹¹ MnDNR Letter at 1 (Comment Letter) (June 10, 2025) (eDocket No. [20256-219807-01](#)).

¹² Ex. EERA-10 at 523 (FEIS).

¹³ Ex. EERA-10 at 523 (FEIS).

¹⁴ Ex. EERA-10 at 523 (FEIS).

¹⁵ Ex. EERA-10 at 327 (FEIS).

This is because this WMA abuts the anticipated alignment for Segment 2 North along its property boundary.¹⁶ In comparison, the alignment for Segment 2 South crosses the WMA but would do so in a location where the Project could be double-circuited with an existing 161 kV transmission line.

For Segment 4, the MnDNR supports selection of the CapX Co-Locate Option. As discussed above, Xcel Energy also supports selection of the CapX Co-Locate Option (or Route Option D) in addition to Route Option A.

b. Proposed Route Permit Conditions

MnDNR also proposed several special conditions to the Route Permit in its June 10, 2025 comment letter. Xcel Energy includes the text of MnDNR's proposed permit conditions followed by the Company's response:

- **MnDNR Proposed Permit Condition:** Multiple Natural Heritage Reviews have been completed for the Project (MCE 2023-00832, 2025-00029, and 2025-00030). The MnDNR recommends including a special permit condition that the Applicant will comply with applicable requirements related to state-listed endangered and threatened species in accordance with Minnesota's Endangered Species Statute (Minnesota Statutes, section 84.0895) and associated Rules (Minnesota Rules, part 6212.1800 to 6212.2300 and 6134). This includes following the conditions listed in the Natural Heritage letters to minimize or avoid impacts to state-listed species and other rare resources that have the potential to be impacted by the Project.
 - **Xcel Energy's Response:** The Sample Route Permit includes a requirement in Section 5.5.2 that addresses this proposed condition by requiring the permittee to demonstrate that it has obtained all necessary permits, authorizations, and approvals and to comply with the conditions of those permits.¹⁷
- **MnDNR Proposed Permit Condition:** Calcareous fens have been documented in the vicinity of the Project. The MnDNR requests a special

¹⁶ Ex. EERA-10 at 327 (FEIS).

¹⁷ Ex. EERA-10 at Appendix H (FEIS).

permit condition, similar to the one proposed in Docket No. 23-159, that the Applicant must work with the MnDNR to determine if any impacts will occur during any phase of the Project. If the Project is anticipated to impact any calcareous fens, the Applicant must develop a Calcareous Fen Management Plan in coordination with the MnDNR, as specified in Minn. Stat. § 103G.223.

- **Xcel Energy's Response:** The Company does not object to this condition.
- **MnDNR Proposed Permit Condition:** Several MBS Sites of Biodiversity Significance and MnDNR Native Plant Communities have been documented throughout the Project. The Natural Heritage letter addresses actions to mitigate disturbance to these ecologically significant areas which have been adequately addressed in the DEIS.
 - **Xcel Energy's Response:** The sample Route Permit includes a requirement in Section 5.5.2 that addresses this proposed condition by requiring the permittee to demonstrate that it has obtained all necessary permits, authorizations, and approvals and to comply with the conditions of those permits.¹⁸
- **MnDNR Proposed Permit Condition:** We recommend that coordination with USFWS regarding avoidance and permitting of federally protected species on the selected route be included as a permit condition.
 - **Xcel Energy's Response:** The Company has been engaged in ongoing coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) regarding the Project. The sample Route Permit includes a requirement in Section 5.5.2 that addresses this proposed condition by requiring the permittee to demonstrate that it has obtained all necessary permits, authorizations, and approvals and to comply with the conditions of those permits.¹⁹

¹⁸ Ex. EERA-10 at Appendix H (FEIS).

¹⁹ Ex. EERA-10 at Appendix H (FEIS).

The Honorable Ann C. O'Reilly

August 1, 2025

Page 6

- **MnDNR Proposed Permit Condition:** To prevent avian collisions due to visibility issues, the MnDNR recommends including a special permit condition, similar to Docket No. 22-415, that the Applicant will coordinate with the MnDNR to determine appropriate locations for avian flight diverters after the route is finalized. Generally, the avian flight diverters will be needed at river crossings, fragmented forested patches, and near lakes and wetlands. The use of avian flight diverters minimizes the number of bird collisions with the transmission lines. Standard transmission line design shall incorporate adequate spacing of conductors and grounding devices in accordance with Avian Power Line Interaction Committee standards to eliminate the risk of electrocution to raptors with larger wingspans that may simultaneously come in contact with a conductor and grounding devices.
 - **Xcel Energy's Response:** The Company does not object to this condition.
- **MnDNR Proposed Permit Condition:** The MnDNR recommends continued coordination with the Vegetation Management Plan Working Group (VMPWG) to refine the Project's Vegetation Management Plan (VMP). The MnDNR also supports a special permit condition to require the Applicant to develop a VMP in coordination with the VMPWG. The VMP should specifically address vegetation removal timing and avoiding removal in floodplains and near designated trout streams.
 - **Xcel Energy's Response:** The Company looks forward to working together with the VMPWG on a final VMP. However, Xcel Energy does not agree that “[t]he VMP should specifically address vegetation removal timing and avoiding removal in floodplains and near designated trout streams.” With respect to vegetation removal timing, this would only be relevant if there were specific areas with protected species where removal timing was required to be specified to avoid impacts. As to avoiding removal in floodplains and near designated trout streams, the Company will try to avoid removing vegetation from these areas but cannot guarantee that removal will be avoided if it is necessary for construction or operation of the Project.

- **MnDNR Proposed Permit Condition:** Due to entanglement issues with small animals, the MnDNR recommends including a special permit condition, similar to Docket No. 22-415, that erosion control blankets be limited to “bio-netting” or “natural netting” types, and specifically not products containing plastic mesh netting or other plastic components. Hydro-mulch products may contain small synthetic (plastic) fibers to aid in its matrix strength. These loose fibers could potentially re-suspend and make their way into waterways.
 - **Xcel Energy's Response:** The Company does not object to this condition.
- **MnDNR Proposed Permit Condition:** The MnDNR recommends including a special permit condition, similar to the one ordered in Docket No. 22-415, to avoid products containing calcium chloride or magnesium chloride, which are often used for dust control. Chloride products that are released into the environment do not break down and instead accumulate to levels that are toxic to plants and wildlife.
 - **Xcel Energy's Response:** The Company does not object to this condition.
- **MnDNR Proposed Permit Condition:** The MnDNR recommends including a special permit condition, similar to Docket No. 22-415, to utilize downlit and shielded lighting and minimize blue hue to reduce harm to birds, insects, and other animals. Potential Project impacts related to illuminated facilities can be avoided or minimized by using shielded and downward facing lighting and lighting that minimizes blue hue.
 - **Xcel Energy's Response:** The Company does not object to this condition.
- **MnDNR Proposed Permit Condition:** The Project crosses multiple MnDNR-administered lands that will require a utility license from the MnDNR. The utility license review will identify potential natural resource and recreation concerns. The utility license to cross state lands review also determines deed, contract, funding, or other restrictions on state lands. Such restrictions could impact licensing and routing of the transmission

line. Some MnDNR-administered lands have been purchased using funds that put restrictions on the lands. Before the MnDNR can grant a utility license over state lands with a funding restriction, our agency must receive written approval from the funding provider. The MnDNR will identify if and where there are funding restrictions on state lands. The funding provider review can take up to a year or more after which approval may or may not be granted.

- **Xcel Energy's Response:** The Company will apply for all required MnDNR permits for the Project. The sample Route Permit includes a requirement in Section 5.5.2 that addresses this proposed condition by requiring the permittee to demonstrate that it has obtained all necessary permits, authorizations, and approvals and to comply with the conditions of those permits.²⁰
- **MnDNR Proposed Permit Condition:** Public waters are designated as such to indicate the lakes, wetlands, and watercourses over which MnDNR has regulatory jurisdiction. The Project proposes to cross multiple public waters, so a MnDNR Public Waters Work Permit or a MnDNR License to Cross would be required.
 - **Xcel Energy's Response:** The Company will apply for all required MnDNR permits for the Project. The sample Route Permit includes a requirement in Section 5.5.2 that addresses this proposed condition by requiring the permittee to demonstrate that it has obtained all necessary permits, authorizations, and approvals and to comply with the conditions of those permits.²¹
- **MnDNR Proposed Permit Condition:** A MnDNR Water Appropriation Permit is required for dewatering activities during construction if the water pumped exceeds 10,000 gallons in a day and/or one million gallons in one year. The MnDNR General Permit for Temporary Appropriation may be used for the dewatering if the dewatering volume is less than 50 million gallons and the time of the appropriation is less than one year. A MnDNR Water Appropriation

²⁰ Ex. EERA-10 at Appendix H (FEIS).

²¹ Ex. EERA-10 at Appendix H (FEIS).

Permit can be applied for in the MnDNR Permitting and Reporting System (MPARS).

- **Xcel Energy's Response:** The Company will apply for all required MnDNR permits for the Project. The sample Route Permit includes a requirement in Section 5.5.2 that addresses this proposed condition by requiring the permittee to demonstrate that it has obtained all necessary permits, authorizations, and approvals and to comply with the conditions of those permits.²²

2. MnDOT

On June 10, 2025, MnDOT filed comments.²³ In its comments, MnDOT proposed several revisions to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Xcel Energy appreciates the comments provided by MnDOT. Xcel Energy also notes that MnDOT's comments highlight the construction and maintenance issues associated with Route Segment 17, also referred to as the Highway 14 Option or Route Option C, which parallels existing MnDOT right-of-way. For example, Xcel Energy would be required to relocate any structures that conflict with a state transportation project. Xcel Energy looks forward to continued coordination with MnDOT, particularly on the construction and maintenance issues identified by MnDOT for Route Segment 17. Xcel Energy will continue to work with MnDOT staff on analyzing impacts and mitigation for Route Segment 17, including the preparation of a Constructability Report, which is anticipated to be completed in the next several months.

3. VMPWG

The VMPWG filed comments on June 10, 2025 on the VMP, included as Appendix V to Xcel Energy's Application for a Certificate of Need and Route Permit.²⁴ In its comments, the VMPWG requested numerous additions to the VMP. The VMPWG states that it does not recommend any action by the Commission at this time but that it is providing comments to help with the finalization the VMP.

²² Ex. EERA-10 at Appendix H (FEIS).

²³ Comments (Minnesota Department of Transportation) (June 10, 2025) (eDocket No. [20256-219799-01](#)).

²⁴ Hearing Comments (Minnesota Interagency Vegetation Management Planning Working Group) (June 10, 2025) (eDocket No. [20256-219785-01](#)).

The Honorable Ann C. O'Reilly

August 1, 2025

Page 10

Xcel Energy looks forward to working with the VMPWG to finalize the VMP for the Project. The Company agrees that certain additions proposed by the VMPWG are appropriate and can be incorporated into the VMP, such as defining goals and objectives and including additional detail on Project location and components once the final route is selected. However, certain additions proposed by the VMPWG are duplicative of information already included in other permits or are unnecessary. For example, several additions proposed by the VMPWG will be addressed or required by the Route Permit or other state-issued permits, including outlining that the Project will use MnDNR wildlife-friendly erosion controls. Thus, these items do not need to be added to the VMP. Additionally, the VMPWG recommends that Xcel Energy define ecological management areas based on the different vegetation communities that will be crossed by the route and provide specific construction, management, and restoration sections for each area. This is a significant undertaking for a 130-mile long Project and would provide limited value given that there will not be much difference in the BMPs proposed for each area unless it is a wetland or an area with rare or sensitive resources. These areas will be called out separately in the final VMP once a route is selected.²⁵ Xcel Energy appreciates the comments by the VMPWG and looks forward to working with VMPWG to finalize the VMP.

4. Blue Earth County

On June 17, 2025, Blue Earth County filed comments stating that it anticipates that Xcel Energy will execute a Haul Road Use and Temporary Access Agreement with the County for construction of the Project.²⁶ Blue Earth County also discussed potential impacts of several route options on future construction projects involving county roads, and requirements for transmission lines pursuant to its ordinances. Xcel Energy confirms that it intends to execute a Haul Road Use and Temporary Access Agreement with the County. Xcel Energy also appreciates the comments provided by Blue Earth County regarding its ordinances. However, the Company notes that, pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 216I.18, subd. 1, a Route Permit “supersedes and preempts all zoning, building, or land use rules, regulations, or ordinances promulgated by regional, county, local and special purpose government.”

²⁵ Ex. Xcel-15 at Appendix V at 4 (Application).

²⁶ Public Comment (Blue Earth County Public Works Department) (June 17, 2025) (eDocket No. [20256-219968-01](#)).

The Honorable Ann C. O'Reilly
August 1, 2025
Page 11

5. Dodge County

Dodge County filed comments on May 29, 2025, stating that it was not made aware of Route Segment 17, also referred to as the Highway 14 Option or Route Option C, until it received the Commission's May 13, 2025 Notice of Informational Meetings, Public and Evidentiary Hearings, and Availability of Draft Environmental Impact Statement in the mail on May 16, 2025 and that it needs additional time to submit comments.²⁷ Xcel Energy appreciates Dodge County's continued involvement in this proceeding. Xcel Energy also notes that it sent a February 2025 letter to stakeholders, including the Dodge County Administrator, informing them of the EIS Scoping Alternatives, which included Route Segment 17.²⁸

6. City of Madison Lake

In its comments filed on May 29, 2025, the City of Madison Lake expressed various concerns with Segment 1 South and requested that Segment 1 North be selected.²⁹ The City's concerns included potential impacts on the development of several properties and to the City's long-term development objectives. As noted in Xcel Energy's Post-Hearing Brief filed today, the Company's preferred route for Segment 1 is Segment 1 North rather than Segment 1 South. Xcel Energy notes that Segment 1 North avoids the impacts outlined in the City's comments.

Please contact me at 612.330.6073 or ellen.l.heine@xcelenergy.com if you have any questions regarding this filing.

Sincerely,

/s/ Ellen Heine

ELLEN HEINE
PRINCIPAL SITING AND PERMITTING AGENT

cc: Service List

²⁷ Public Comment (Dodge County) (May 29, 2025) (eDocket No. [20256-219808-01](#)).

²⁸ Ex. Xcel-29 at Schedule 4 (E. Heine Direct Testimony and Schedules).

²⁹ Public Comment (City of Madison Lake) (May 29, 2025) (eDocket No. [20255-219331-01](#)).

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION FOR
A ROUTE PERMIT FOR THE MANKATO TO
MISSISSIPPI RIVER 345 KV TRANSMISSION
PROJECT IN SOUTHERN MINNESOTA

CAH DOCKET No. 65-2500-40099
MPUC DOCKET No. E002/TL-23-157

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Gustav Gerhardson certifies that on the 1st day of August, 2025, on behalf Minnesota Power, he efiled a true and correct copy of the **Response to Public Comments** by posting the same on [eDockets](#). Said filing is also served as designated on the attached Service List on file with the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission in the above-referenced docket number.

/s/ Gustav Gerhardson

Gustav Gerhardson

#	First Name	Last Name	Email	Organization	Agency	Address	Delivery Method	Alternate Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
1	Katherine	Arnold	katherine.arnold@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		No	23-157Official CC Service List	
2	Michael W.	Chase	mwchase_kenyon@yahoo.com	Citizens for Environmental Rights and Safety	6201 480th St. Kenyon MN, 55946 United States	Electronic Service		No	23-157Official CC Service List	
3	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	23-157Official CC Service List	
4	Brent	Dauk	brentdauk@aol.com		140 438th Ave Moose Lake MN, 56063 United States	Electronic Service		No	23-157Official CC Service List	
5	Richard	Davis	richard.davis@state.mn.us	Department of Commerce	85 7th Place East Suite 500 Saint Paul MN, 55101 United States	Electronic Service		No	23-157Official CC Service List	
6	Seth	DeMerritt	seth.demerritt@centerpointenergy.com	CenterPoint Energy Minnesota Gas	505 Nicollet Mall Minneapolis MN, 55402 United States	Electronic Service		No	23-157Official CC Service List	
7	Bret	Eknes	bret.eknes@state.mn.us	Public Utilities Commission	Suite 350 121 7th Place East St. Paul MN, 55101-2147 United States	Electronic Service		No	23-157Official CC Service List	
8	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	23-157Official CC Service List	
9	Ellen	Heine	ellen.l.heine@xcelenergy.com	Xcel Energy	414 Nicollet Mall, MP-8 Minneapolis MN, 55401 United States	Electronic Service		No	23-157Official CC Service List	
10	Abigail	Hencheck	ahencheck@mncenter.org	Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy	1919 University Ave W Suite 515 St. Paul MN, 55104 United States	Electronic Service		No	23-157Official CC Service List	
11	Valerie	Herring	vherring@taftlaw.com	Taft Stettinius & Hollister LLP	2200 IDS Center 80 S. Eighth Street Minneapolis MN, 55402	Electronic Service		No	23-157Official CC Service List	

#	First Name	Last Name	Email	Organization	Agency	Address	Delivery Method	Alternate Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
						United States				
12	Jason	Loos	jason.loos@centerpointenergy.com	CenterPoint Energy Resources Corp.		505 Nicollet Mall 3rd Floor Minneapolis MN, 55402 United States	Electronic Service		No	23-157Official CC Service List
13	Jamie	MacAlister	jamie.macalister@state.mn.us		Department of Commerce	85 7th Place East, Ste. 500 St. Paul MN, 55101 United States	Electronic Service		No	23-157Official CC Service List
14	Ann	O'Reilly	ann.oreilly@state.mn.us		Office of Administrative Hearings	PO Box 64620 St. Paul MN, 55101 United States	Electronic Service		Yes	23-157Official CC Service List
15	Carol A.	Overland	overland@legalelectric.org	Legalectric - Overland Law Office		1110 West Avenue Red Wing MN, 55066 United States	Electronic Service		No	23-157Official CC Service List
16	Cezar	Panait	cezar.panait@state.mn.us		Public Utilities Commission	121 7th Place East Suite 350 St. Paul MN, 55101 United States	Electronic Service		No	23-157Official CC Service List
17	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	23-157Official CC Service List
18	Christine	Schwartz	regulatory.records@xcelenergy.com	Xcel Energy		414 Nicollet Mall, MN1180-07-MCA Minneapolis MN, 55401-1993 United States	Electronic Service		No	23-157Official CC Service List
19	Janet	Shaddix Elling	jshaddix@janetshaddix.com	Shaddix And Associates		7400 Lyndale Ave S Ste 190 Richfield MN, 55423 United States	Electronic Service		Yes	23-157Official CC Service List
20	Jeffrey	Small	jsmall@misoenergy.org			MISO P.O. Box 4202 Carmel IN, 46082-4202 United States	Electronic Service		No	23-157Official CC Service List
21	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	23-157Official CC Service List
22	Emily	Suppes	emily.suppes@centerpointenergy.com	CenterPoint Energy		505 Nicollet Mall Minneapolis	Electronic Service		No	23-157Official CC

#	First Name	Last Name	Email	Organization	Agency	Address	Delivery Method	Alternate Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
				Minnesota Gas		MN, 55402 United States				Service List
23	Amelia	Vohs	avohs@mncenter.org	Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy		1919 University Avenue West Suite 515 St. Paul MN, 55104 United States	Electronic Service	No	23-157Official CC Service List	