



The Office of  
**Minnesota Attorney General Keith Ellison**  
helping people afford their lives and live with dignity and respect • [www.ag.state.mn.us](http://www.ag.state.mn.us)

June 16, 2021

VIA EDOCKETS

The Honorable James Mortenson  
Administrative Law Judge  
Office of Administrative Hearings  
P.O. Box 64620  
St. Paul, MN 55164-0620

**Re: *In the Matter of the Application of Walleye Wind, LLC for a Certificate of Need for the up to 110.8 MW Walleye Wind Project in Rock County, Minnesota***  
***In the Matter of the Application of Walleye Wind, LLC for a Site Permit for the up to 110.8 MW Walleye Wind Project in Rock County, Minnesota***  
**OAH Docket No. 5-2500-37275**  
**PUC Docket No. IP7026/CN-20-269, WS-20-384**

Dear Judge Mortenson:

Enclosed for filing, on behalf of the Minnesota Department of Commerce, Energy Environmental Review and Analysis (EERA) unit, please find EERA's redline revision to Walleye Wind, LLC's (Walleye Wind or Applicant) proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations in the above referenced matters. Summaries and rationales for substantive changes recommended by EERA are provided below.

**Throughout Proposed Findings:**

Throughout the report, EERA recommends that the term "Project Area" be replaced with two specific terms of art: "site" and "Project area." The term "site" refers to the area designated by Walleye Wind within the site boundary shown in its Site Permit Application and shown in the map accompanying the Draft Site Permit (DSP). The term "Project area" refers to a generalized geographic area not specifically bounded by either the site boundary or any generally recognized political boundary, such as in reference to Indian tribes with ties to the area or the area in which economic impacts may be experienced.

**Page 29, Finding No. 123:**

In EERA's view, NextEra Energy Resources' (NEER) efforts to develop recycling plans for blades and plans to donate turbine components to technical training programs are not material to a Site Permit decision. Any Site Permit will be issued to Walleye Wind, which was formed for the purpose of developing, constructing, operating, and decommissioning the proposed project.

As a result, EERA recommends that the report's decommissioning discussion focus on Walleye Wind.

123. With respect to concerns with recycling wind turbines, Walleye Wind explained that planned decommissioning methods are provided in Walleye Wind's Decommissioning Plan. According to Walleye Wind, with recent advancements in the reuse of fiberglass, now virtually all wind turbine components can be recycled. When turbines are decommissioned, crews will separate components, and, wherever possible, recycle the components in the region where the wind farm is located. ~~Recognizing there was a need to recycle wind turbine blades to keep them out of local landfills, Walleye Wind worked with blade manufacturers and suppliers to develop a plan to ensure blades from our wind projects would be recycled. Walleye Wind also frequently donates decommissioned turbine components to colleges and wind technician programs across the country to provide students with hands-on job training.~~

**Page 34, Finding No. 143:**

EERA recommends that references to Walleye Wind's outreach to Indian tribes be eliminated from Finding No. 143 because this communication is unrelated to demographics and population density. That important topic is instead addressed in the cultural resources section (Finding Nos. 243–247). Finally, a brief discussion of the demographic impacts of the project's permanent jobs should be added to the finding.

143. The Project is not anticipated to significantly change the demographics of the Project ~~or Rock County area.~~ The addition of approximately four permanent O&M staff will not result in a significant change to the demographics of the Project area. ~~For example, the Project will avoid impacts to resources important to Native American tribes by working with area tribes to identify and avoid these resources during design and construction. Walleye Wind contacted thirty-one Native American tribes with expected ancestral ties to the Project area of which thirteen responded. None of the respondents indicated a concern with the Project's location.~~ No additional mitigation measures for population density are proposed as the Project is not expected to impact the demographics of the local community

**Pages 38 – 39, Findings Nos. 161, 162, and 168:**

Findings Nos. 161, 162, and 168 should be revised to clarify that the project is anticipated, but not guaranteed to meet the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) noise standards.

Although Walleye Wind's modeling suggests that the project will not exceed noise standards, the models do not offer conclusive proof that the noise standards will be met. Once the project is operational, Walleye Wind will be required to monitor sound levels to ensure compliance with the MPCA standards.

161. The highest ~~predicted-worst-case-modeled~~ Project Only L<sub>50</sub> sound level at a modeling receptor is 47 dBA. L<sub>50</sub> is the sound level exceeded 50% of the time. It is the median level observed during the measurement period. The highest modeled Project Only L<sub>50</sub> sound level at a non-participant receptor is 45 dBA. Accordingly, total sound levels (Project + Existing Non-Project + non-wind-turbine ambient) ~~will-are expected to~~ meet the Minnesota limit of 50 dBA when non-wind-turbine ambient sound levels are less than or equal to 47 dBA. The ~~predicted-modeled~~ total sound levels are shown for when ambient (non-wind-turbine) L<sub>50</sub> sound levels are 35, 40, 45, 47, and 50 dBA. As found in the ambient measurement study, ambient nighttime sound levels can exceed 47 dBA. Non-wind-turbine ambient sound levels can fluctuate due to sound sources such as ground-level winds, vehicular traffic, birds, and vegetation rustle, all of which have the potential to cause ambient sound levels to be equal to or exceed the MPCA L<sub>50</sub> nighttime limit of 50 dBA. In these instances, the ~~project-related~~ increase to the non-wind-turbine ambient sound level will be zero to two decibels since the highest modeled Project-Only sound level is 47 dBA. Under conditions where two sound levels have the same or very similar characteristics a 2-dBA change is imperceptible to the average person.

162. Compliance with MPCA standards ~~setbacks~~ will also be accomplished through establishing setbacks for turbines of at least 1,400 feet from residential developments, except for two turbines, which would be located approximately 1,325 feet and 1,355 feet from receptors, respectively. The Applicant will also conduct a post-construction sound level measurement program to evaluate compliance with respect to MPCA noise standards ~~and verify the modeling~~. Additionally, consistent with the 3 rotor distance (3 RD) and 5 rotor distance (5 RD) setback requirement, properties not participating in the Project are to have turbines set back at least 1,251 feet (381 m) (3 RD) from their property in non-prevailing wind directions and at least 2,085 feet (636 m) (5 RD) from their property in prevailing wind directions for the GE 2.82 MW turbine model. For the GE 2.32 MW turbine model, properties not participating in the Project are to have turbines set back at least 1,146 feet (349 m) (3 RD) from their property in non-prevailing wind directions and at least 1,910 feet (582 m) (5 RD) from their property in prevailing wind directions.

168. Thus, the record shows that Project ~~meets or exceeds is~~ anticipated to meet the MPCA state noise standards

**Page 42, Finding No. 177:**

Finding No. 177 should be updated to clarify that five of the receptors that may experience more than 30 hours of annual shadow flicker are participating landowners as of November 2020. As EERA's post-hearing comments explained, the Commission's permit language regarding shadow flicker only differentiates between participating and non-participating residents.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, EERA recommends that the discussion of landowners that Walleye Wind has targeted for participation be removed from the finding.

177. With respect to the shadow flicker produced by the Project, a Project-specific shadow flicker analysis was conducted using the software package, WindPRO version 3.3. The WindPRO modeling was further refined by incorporating sunshine probabilities and wind turbine operational estimates by wind direction over the course of a year. The values produced by this further refinement are known as the "expected" shadow flicker. The predicted expected annual shadow flicker duration for the 443 receptors in Minnesota ranged from 0 hours, 0 minutes per year to 45 hours, 49 minutes per year. The maximum expected shadow flicker was at a participating receptor (#331). The maximum expected worst-case annual shadow flicker at a non-participating receptor (#84) is 38 hours, 36 minutes. While the maximum expected worst-case annual shadow flicker at a targeted receptor (#94) is 42 hours, 34 minutes. Eleven receptors in Minnesota are expected to have over 30 hours of flicker per year, ~~four-five~~ of which are non-were identified as participating receptors in the revised site permit application.

**Pages 43 - 44, Finding Nos. 181–182:**

EERA opposes Walleye Wind's proposed modification to EERA's suggested amendment to Section 7.2 of the DSP. The Shadow Flicker Management Plan's purpose is to avoid, minimize, and mitigate shadow flicker at a receptor. It is unclear what kind of "mutual agreement" would not be considered mitigation. Additionally, EERA is concerned that a "mutual agreement" outside of the scope of the Shadow Flicker Management Plan may not be transferable to future landowners of the nonparticipating parcels. Given these concerns, EERA recommends the following revisions to Finding Nos. 181 and 182.

181. Walleye Wind confirmed that DOC-EERA's proposed edits and additions to Section 7.2 of the to the DSP are acceptable.

---

<sup>1</sup> EERA Hearing Comments on Walleye Wind at 4 (May 20, 2021) (eDocket No. 20215-174355-02).

Walleye Wind proposed with the addition of the following additional language: “In the event that Walleye Wind and a non-participant landowner with modelled expected shadow flicker of 30 hours or more a year reach a mutual agreement on the mitigation of the shadow flicker, Walleye Wind is not required to implement a Shadow Flicker Management Plan for that non-participant. Walleye Wind will notify the Commission of any such mutual agreement on the mitigation of shadow flicker.” In its letter filed on June 16, 2021, EERA responded, however, that it did not support Walleye Wind’s proposed addition to EERA’s proposed modification to Section 7.2 of the DSP. EERA stated that the intent of the Shadow Flicker Management Plan is to avoid, minimize, and mitigate the experience of shadow flicker at a receptor and that it is unclear to EERA what kind of mutual agreement would not be considered mitigation. EERA also expressed concern that a “mutual agreement” outside of the scope of the Shadow Flicker Management Plan may not be transferable to future landowners of the nonparticipating parcels.

182. The record shows that ~~such a provision addresses~~ the DOC-EERA's proposed change to DSP Section 7.2—without the additional language offered by Walleye Wind—is a reasonable mitigation measure. ~~concerns with potential impacts on non-participating landowners and allows Walleye Wind to address any concerns directly with the landowner. Therefore, Walleye Wind has demonstrated that it will reasonably mitigate impacts from shadow flicker.~~

**Pages 45 - 46, Finding No. 191:**

EERA recommends that Finding No. 191 incorporate additional information regarding the proposed mitigation for microwave communication interference.

191. To mitigate the Project’s impact to communication system, Walleye Wind will ~~implement a buffer of~~ place all turbines at least 74 meters around outside of the Worst Case Fresnel Zone (WCFZ) calculated for each microwave beam path. Turbines are located outside of these buffers to mitigate any impact on the signal. In addition, while impacts to AM/FM radio are not anticipated, due to the distance between existing radio towers and the Project, Walleye Wind will address any reception impacts which may arise following construction of the Project on a case-by-case basis. If impacts do occur, additions or changes to transmitters, receivers, or amplifiers can also be made to communication systems to minimize impacts. Further, in the unlikely event that land mobile licenses experience impacts to coverage due to the Project, Walleye Wind will address

these issues on a case-by-case basis. If interference does occur, additions or changes to transmitters, receivers, or amplifiers can also be made to communication systems to minimize impacts.

**Pages 57–58, Finding Nos. 241–242:**

Finding Nos. 241 and 242 should be revised to clarify the status of Walleye Wind’s efforts to minimize impacts on rare and unique natural resources. The findings also should be revised to incorporate a Site Permit condition intended to mitigate impacts on the Topeka Shiner, a type of minnow that lives in small to mid-size prairie streams, as recommended by the Department of Natural Resources (DNR). Commission-issued permits (e.g., Prairie Rose and Stoneray site permits) for other projects in the general area also include special conditions addressing the Topeka Shiner.<sup>2</sup> The language shown below is generally consistent with those permits.

241. ~~To mitigate the Project’s impact on rare and unique natural resources, Walleye Wind started by designing siting has sited and designed the Project and implementing mitigation measures to avoid, or minimize, or mitigate the impacts to rare and unique natural resources, similar with its strategy to do the same with wildlife. Therefore, the following mitigation measures build on those already committed to protect wildlife: (1) employing BMPs to minimize the impact on the Topeka shiner; (2) developing a WCS/ABPP that establishes standards for minimizing impacts to eagles and other avian species during construction and operation; and (3) developing a Native Prairie Protection Plan that will address steps taken to avoid impacts to native prairie habitats and mitigation plans should impacts be deemed unavoidable. In addition to the mitigation methods proposed by Walleye Wind and identified in the DSP, Minnesota DNR recommends a condition restricting work in or near streams during the active Topeka Shiner spawning season and implementation of USFWS recommendations for protection of waters inhabited by the Topeka Shiner. DOC-EERA proposed the permit incorporate a special condition related to the Topeka Shiner:~~

**6.1 Topeka Shiner**

~~The permittee shall avoid work at stream crossings or within stream channels between May 15 and July 31, if streamflow is present in the stream. In addition, the Permittee shall follow the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)~~

---

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., *In re Appl. of Prairie Rose Wind, LLC for a Large Wind Energy Conversion System Site Permit in Rock & Pipestone Cntys.*, Docket No. IP-6830/WS-10-425, ORDER at 27, 54 (Sept. 16, 2011); *In re Appl. of Stoneray Power Partners, LLC for a Large Wind Energy Conversion Site Permit for a 105 MW Wind Project in Pipestone & Murray Cntys.*, Docket No. IP-6646/WS-13-216, OAH Report at 30 (Mar. 13, 2014).

recommendations on avoiding and minimizing impacts to the Topeka Shiner. The USFWS recommendations (Attachment 4) shall be made available to all contractors and their employees.

242. In addition, Sections 4.6, 4.7, 7.1, and 7.5 of the DSP impose conditions to monitor and mitigate the Project's potential impacts on rare and unique natural resources. Thus, based on Walleye Wind's mitigation measures combined with the conditions on the DSP and the additional special condition on the Topeka Shiner, the Project's impact on rare and unique natural resources will not be significant.

**Page 59, Finding No. 245:**

EERA recommends that Finding No. 245 be revised to acknowledge that cultural and archaeological resources may be discovered during project construction despite Walleye Wind's efforts to avoid impacting them.

245. Although Walleye Wind has designed the Project to avoid a direct impact to cultural and archaeological resources and will coordinate with Tribal Historic Preservation Offices to avoid impacts to TCPs, it is possible that despite these efforts construction of the process may result in inadvertent discovery of previously unidentified cultural or archaeological resources. ~~in~~ In the event ~~during construction that~~ a previously unidentified resource is discovered during the construction of the Project, Walleye Wind will implement its Unanticipated Discovery Plan which ~~required~~ requires reporting and coordination with the applicable agency.

**Page 61, Finding No. 251:**

Consistent with the recommended revisions to Finding Nos. 181 and 182 discussed above, the reference to Walleye Wind's revision to EERA's proposed changes to Section 7.2 of the DSP should be eliminated from Finding No. 251.

251. The ALJ finds that DOC-EERA's proposed revisions to Section 7.2 of the DSP, ~~with the Applicant's minor revision~~, is reasonable and will appropriately mitigate impacts from shadow flicker.

**Pages 61 - 62, Finding Nos. 253-254:**

Finding Nos. 253 and 254 should be revised to incorporate EERA's recommended permit condition relating to the Topeka Shiner.

253. Walleye Wind also stated that it is agreeable to MnDNR's proposed new condition, and would recommend it read: "The Permittee shall not conduct any stream crossing activities from mid-May through Mid-August, if streamflow is present in the stream." In its June 16, 2020 comments, DOC-EERA proposed a special condition addressing the Topeka Shiner.

**6.1 Topeka Shiner**

The permittee shall avoid work at stream crossings or within stream channels between May 15 and July 31, if streamflow is present in the stream. In addition, the Permittee shall follow the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) recommendations on avoiding and minimizing impacts to the Topeka Shiner. The USFWS recommendations (Attachment 4) shall be made available to all contractors and their employees

254. The ALJ finds that the addition of MnDNR's requested permit condition as proposed by ~~the Applicant~~ DOC-EERA is reasonable.

**Page 63, Finding 260:**

EERA recommends that Finding 260 be revised to better describe the purpose of post-construction noise modeling. As discussed above, post-construction monitoring will test modeling results and assumptions. It is not known at this time whether the post-construction monitoring will confirm the results of the pre-construction noise modeling.

260. Walleye Neighbors assert that Section 4.3 inappropriately allows Walleye Wind to use a 0.5 ground attenuation factor and does not require verification of the use of NRO mode. As noted above, it is an industry standard to use a 0.5 ground attenuation factor, which has been recognized by the Commission in issuing recent Site Permits where such a ground factor was used. Further, under Section 7.4 of the DSP, Walleye Wind is required to conduct a post construction sound study to demonstrate compliance with MPCA's sound requirements, which will ~~confirm and~~ test modeling results and assumptions. Similarly, Walleye Wind has already committed to use NRO, as required, to comply with MPCA's sound requirements. Therefore, the requirement to conduct a post



construction sound study to verify compliance with MPCA's sound requirements, coupled with its commitment to use NRO, as required, negates any need to modify Section 4.3 as requested by Walleye Neighbors.

**Pages 64 - 65, Finding No. 266:**

EERA recommends that Finding No. 266, which addresses shadow flicker for non-participating landowners, be amended for consistency with revised Finding Nos. 181 and 182.

266. Walleye Neighbors assert that Section 7.2 on shadow flicker should prohibit the allowance of shadow flicker over 30 hours annually. Acceptance of DOC's edits to Section 7.2 as revised herein adequately addresses the issue of non-participants experiencing shadow flicker over 30 hours, ~~with the understanding that Walleye Wind can mutually agree with non-participants on a mitigation plan that allows for that residence to experience more than 30 hours of shadow flicker.~~ A similar mitigation and consultation process was recently approved by the Commission in issuing a Site Permit. With the additions of DOC-EERA ~~and Walleye Wind~~ to Section 7.2, there is no need to further revise this Section of the DSP.

**Page 66, Finding No. 270:**

Finding No. 270 should be revised to clarify that Walleye Neighbors' request is outside the scope of this proceeding and that the Commission may open such a docket at its discretion.

270. Walleye Neighbors request that the Commission open a docket to review its complaint procedures set forth in Section 9 of the DSP. This request is beyond the scope of this proceeding. ~~Although the~~ The Commission has the discretion to open such a docket if it so desires, ~~there is no evidence in this record that support the need for such a proceeding.~~

**Page 67, Finding 275:**

Finding No. 275 should be revised to clarify the EERA's proposed changes to the DSP are reasonable without the further revisions suggested by Walleye Wind. As previously explained, EERA is concerned about the nature and transferability of shadow flicker mitigation mutual agreements that exist beyond the scope of the Shadow Flicker Management Plan contained within the Site Permit.

275. Based upon the record, the ALJ finds that the proposed changes to the DSP from the DOC-EERA, ~~as revised by Walleye~~

~~Wind are reasonable, as well as the proposed condition by MnDNR that is acceptable to Walleye Wind.~~ The proposed conditions of those opposing the Project to move wind turbines farther away from the South Dakota border and the proposed conditions of the Walleye Neighbors are not supported by the record in this proceeding, and, therefore, not adopted.

**Page 68, Conclusion of Law No. 7:**

Minnesota Rule 7849.1800 requires that the Commission determine that the environmental report produced by EERA and the evidence in the record address the issues identified in the environmental scoping document before rendering a final decision on an application for a certificate of need. Consistent with this requirement, EERA recommends that following language be incorporated as a conclusion of law.

7. DOC-EERA conducted an appropriate environmental analysis for the Project. The environmental report and evidence in the record addressed the issues identified in the environmental report scoping decision issued on February 3, 2021. The ALJ concludes that the Commission should accept the environmental report as complete pursuant to Minn. R. 7849.1800.

Thank you for your consideration of these recommended additions and revisions.

Sincerely,

/s/ Richard Dornfeld

\_\_\_\_\_  
RICHARD DORNFELD

Assistant Attorney General

(651) 757-1327 (Voice)

(651) 297-1235 (Fax)

richard.dornfeld@ag.state.mn.us

*Attorney for Minnesota Department of Commerce,  
Energy Environmental Review and Analysis*

**AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE**

**Re: *In the Matter of the Application of Walleye Wind, LLC for a Certificate of Need for the up to 110.8 MW Walleye Wind Project in Rock County, Minnesota*  
*In the Matter of the Application of Walleye Wind, LLC for a Site Permit for the up to 110.8 MW Walleye Wind Project in Rock County, Minnesota*  
OAH Docket No. 5-2500-37275  
PUC Docket No. IP7026/CN-20-269, WS-20-384**

STATE OF MINNESOTA    )  
  ) ss.  
COUNTY OF RAMSEY    )

I, Liz Soderstrom, hereby state that on June 16, 2021, I filed, by electronic eDockets, the attached **Letter to Judge Mortenson and EERA’s redline revision to Walleye Wind, LLC’s Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Recommendation**, and eServed or sent by U.S. Mail, as noted, to all parties on the attached service lists.

See attached service lists.

I declare under penalty of perjury that everything I have stated in this document is true and correct.

*/s/ Liz Soderstrom*  
LIZ SODERSTROM

**SERVICE LIST**  
**PUC Docket No. IP7026/CN-20-269**

Generic Notice	Commerce Attorneys	commerce.attorneys@ag.state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-DOC	445 Minnesota Street Suite 1400 St. Paul, MN 55101	Electronic Service	Yes
Kate	Fairman	kate.frantz@state.mn.us	Department of Natural Resources	Box 32 500 Lafayette Rd St. Paul, MN 551554032	Electronic Service	No
Annie	Felix Gerth	annie.felix-gerth@state.mn.us		Board of Water & Soil Resources 520 Lafayette Rd Saint Paul, MN 55155	Electronic Service	No
Sharon	Ferguson	sharon.ferguson@state.mn.us	Department of Commerce	85 7th Place E Ste 280 Saint Paul, MN 551012198	Electronic Service	No
Lucas	Franco	lfranco@liunagro.com	LIUNA	81 Little Canada Rd E Little Canada, MN 55117	Electronic Service	No
Kari	Howe	kari.howe@state.mn.us	DEED	332 Minnesota St, #E200 1ST National Bank Bldg St. Paul, MN 55101	Electronic Service	No
Michael	Kaluzniak	mike.kaluzniak@state.mn.us	Public Utilities Commission	Suite 350 121 Seventh Place East St. Paul, MN 55101	Electronic Service	No
Ray	Kirsch	Raymond.Kirsch@state.mn.us	Department of Commerce	85 7th Place E Ste 500 St. Paul, MN 55101	Electronic Service	No
Karen	Kromar	karen.kromar@state.mn.us	MN Pollution Control Agency	520 Lafayette Rd Saint Paul, MN 55155	Electronic Service	No
Brian	Meloy	brian.meloy@stinson.com	STINSON LLP	50 S 6th St Ste 2600 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No
James	Mortenson	james.mortenson@state.mn.us	Office of Administrative Hearings	PO BOX 64620 St. Paul, MN 55164-0620	Electronic Service	Yes
Generic Notice	Residential Utilities Division	residential.utilities@ag.state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-RUD	1400 BRM Tower 445 Minnesota St St. Paul, MN 551012131	Electronic Service	Yes
Stephan	Roos	stephan.roos@state.mn.us	MN Department of Agriculture	625 Robert St N Saint Paul, MN 55155-2538	Electronic Service	No
Will	Seuffert	Will.Seuffert@state.mn.us	Public Utilities Commission	121 7th PI E Ste 350 Saint Paul, MN 55101	Electronic Service	Yes

Janet	Shaddix Elling	jshaddix@janetshaddix.com	Shaddix And Associates	7400 Lyndale Ave S Ste 190 Richfield, MN 55423	Electronic Service	No
Suzanne	Steinhauer	suzanne.steinhauer@state.mn.us	Department of Commerce	85 7th Place East Suite 500 St. Paul, MN 55101	Electronic Service	No
Cynthia	Warzecha	cynthia.warzecha@state.mn.us	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources	500 Lafayette Road Box 25 St. Paul, Minnesota 55155-4040	Electronic Service	No

**SERVICE LIST**  
**PUC Docket No. IP7026/WS-20-384**

Generic Notice	Commerce Attorneys	commerce.attorneys@ag.state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-DOC	445 Minnesota Street Suite 1400 St. Paul, MN 55101	Electronic Service	Yes
Sharon	Ferguson	sharon.ferguson@state.mn.us	Department of Commerce	85 7th Place E Ste 280 Saint Paul, MN 551012198	Electronic Service	No
Lucas	Franco	lfranco@liunagro.com	LIUNA	81 Little Canada Rd E Little Canada, MN 55117	Electronic Service	No
STACY	KOTCH EGSTAD	Stacy.Kotch@state.mn.us	MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	395 John Ireland Blvd. St. Paul, MN 55155	Electronic Service	No
Brian	Meloy	brian.meloy@stinson.com	STINSON LLP	50 S 6th St Ste 2600 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No
James	Mortenson	james.mortenson@state.mn.us	Office of Administrative Hearings	PO BOX 64620 St. Paul, MN 55164-0620	Electronic Service	Yes
Generic Notice	Residential Utilities Division	residential.utilities@ag.state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-RUD	1400 BRM Tower 445 Minnesota St St. Paul, MN 551012131	Electronic Service	Yes
Will	Seuffert	Will.Seuffert@state.mn.us	Public Utilities Commission	121 7th Pl E Ste 350 Saint Paul, MN 55101	Electronic Service	Yes
Janet	Shaddix Elling	jshaddix@janetshaddix.com	Shaddix And Associates	7400 Lyndale Ave S Ste 190 Richfield, MN 55423	Electronic Service	No
Mike	Weich	Mike.Weich@nexteraenergy.com	Dodge County Wind, LLC	700 Universe Blvd Juno Beach, FL 33408	Electronic Service	No