



Minnesota Public Utilities Commission

PUC Agenda Meeting

Tuesday, July 1, 2025

10:00 AM

INTRODUCTION

DECISION ITEMS

1. [Details 2024-144](#)

* IP7135/GS-22-57;

Primergy (Northern Crescent) Solar, LLC

IP7135/ESS-24-238

In the Matter of the Joint Application of Northern Crescent Solar LLC for a Solar Energy Generating System Site Permit and a Battery Energy Storage System Site Permit for the up to 150 MW Northern Crescent Solar and 50 MW Storage Project in Faribault County, Minnesota.

1. Should the Commission adopt the Administrative Law Judge's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Recommendation?
2. Should the Commission find that the environmental assessment and the record created at the public hearing adequately address the issues identified in the scoping decision?
3. Should the Commission issue a site permit for the up to 150-megawatt Northern Crescent Solar Energy Generating System?
4. Should the Commission issue a site permit for the up to 50 MW battery energy storage system? (PUC: **Lobby**)

Attachments:

[Briefing Papers](#)

2. [Details 2024-110](#)*** IP7114/GS-23-414; Iron Pine Solar Power, LLC
IP7114/TL-23-415**

In the Matter of the Application of Iron Pine Solar Power, LLC for a Site Permit for the Iron Pine Solar Project in Pine County, Minnesota;

In the Matter of the Application of Iron Pine Solar Power, LLC for a Route Permit for a 230 kV Transmission Line in Pine County, Minnesota.

1. Should the Commission adopt the ALJ's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Recommendation?
2. Should the Commission find that the environmental assessment and the record created at the public hearings adequately address the issues identified in the scoping decision?
3. Should the Commission issue a site permit for the 325-megawatt Iron Pine Solar Energy Generating System?
4. Should the Commission issue a route permit for the 230 kV Transmission Line?
(PUC: **Harvieux**)

Attachments:[Briefing Papers revised](#)[Iron Pine Route Permit All Attachments](#)[Iron Pine Site Permit All Attachments - Revised](#)**3. [Details 2025-110](#)***** E015/S-25-138 Minnesota Power**

In the Matter of Minnesota Power's Petition for Approval of its Capital Structure and Authorization to Issue Securities.

Should the Commission approve Minnesota Power's proposed 2025 capital structure and grant permission to issue securities? (PUC: **Bonnett, Andringa**)

Attachments:[Briefing Papers](#)**4. [Details 2025-111](#)*****PULLED******* ~~E002/M-25-27~~ ~~Northern States Power Co. d/b/a Xcel Energy~~**

In the Matter of Northern States Power Co. d/b/a Xcel Energy's 2024 Annual Safety, Reliability, and Service Quality Report.

Should the Commission approve Xcel's proposals on remote reconnection on disconnected customers during extreme heat events and air quality alerts? (PUC: **McShane**)

5. [Details 2025-117](#)**E999/M-25-99****Minnesota Transmission Owners**

*5A. In the Matter of the 2025 Biennial Transmission Projects Report.

1. Should the Commission approve the Department's request for additional Funding under Minnesota Statute 216B.62, Subd. 8? (PUC: **Eknes**)

**5B. In the Matter of the 2025 Biennial Transmission Projects Report.

1. What methodology should the Commission direct affected transmission owners to use in calculating the payback period of grid enhancing technologies (GETs) as directed by Minnesota Session Laws, 2024, Chapter 127, Article 42, Section 52?
2. What payback period value should the Commission set as the threshold at which a GETs project must be included in the implementation plan portion of a transmission owner's GETs Report?
3. Should the Commission request or require transmission owners to evaluate the cost effectiveness or payback periods of GETs projects addressing locations likely to experience high levels of congestion during the next five years (Subd. 2, clause 3), in addition to those with existing congestion (Subd. 2, clause 1)? (PUC: **Ricker**)

Attachments:[Briefing Papers-5A](#)[Briefing Papers-5B](#)[Briefing Papers Attachment 1 - 5B](#)[25-99 GETs Payback Period Ham DOs](#)**ADJOURNMENT**

* One star indicates that an agenda item is not disputed.

** Two stars indicate that an agenda item is disputed and there may be legal, procedural, or policy issues to be resolved.

*** Three stars indicate a complex or lengthy disputed agenda item that may have significant legal, procedural, or policy issues to be resolved.

Please note: For the complete record, please see eDockets.