MINNESOTA
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Batch E-Filing for Docket 24-352 - 20 Comments

1. Christopher Carlson
2. Dave Zentner
3. Dr. Amy Kireta
4. Dr. Arne Kildegaard
5. Dr. Michael Overend
6. Elton Brown
7. Emily Pini-Fay
8. Gail Linnerson
9. Heidi Fossen
10. Mr. Joshua Houdek
11. Kali Goblirsch
12. Mr. Ken Pearson
13. Mr. Larry Bogolub
14. Loni Kemp
15. Lyla Brown
16. Mrs. Lynn Anderson
17. Ms. ML Wilm
18. Robert Larsen
19. Terry Shaw
20. Tricia Connell

From:	c_carlson@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of christopher carlson
To:	Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject:	Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date:	Friday, September 12, 2025 8:33:26 AM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on the question of what “carbon-free” electric energy means in Minnesota. The decisions and governance frameworks we put in place now for the energy transition will reverberate decades into the future. It is your duty to hold the line and make sure that the definition of “carbon free” is not watered down, harming Minnesota communities, the climate, and our future innovative society.

Will Minnesota's “carbon-free” future live up to its legislative intent—an energy system that is truly clean, healthy, and equitable, which allows all our communities to thrive? Or will it be a vehicle for monopoly utilities and powerful polluting industries to advance a range of false solutions that pad their bottom lines at the expense of our communities and ecosystems?

As you wrestle with these questions, it's critical that you listen to the full range of voices who will be impacted by your decisions. I am very concerned to see that this comment period around the definition of “carbon free” has become a forum for polluting and extractive industry to push a wide range of their pet false solutions.

The Commission should not entertain a life cycle analysis that is contrary to the law and clear guidance from the legislature. Engaging in this analysis is a complicated and frivolous waste of time that could be better spent establishing clear paths to compliance for our utilities.

I ask that PUC reject the following false solution boondoggles for inclusion in the definition of “carbon free” technologies:

- Costly, inefficient, and polluting technologies that emit carbon when electricity is generated like burning wood and garbage for energy.
- Carbon Capture and Sequestration, the fossil fuel industry's favorite taxpayer-funded scheme to delay the transition to real decarbonization.
- Dirty hydrogen generated from methane provided and processed by the gas industry.

I further demand that the PUC prioritize the following considerations in Minnesota's definition of carbon-free energy:

- Recognize the urgent need to halt the expansion of fossil fuel resources.
- Recognize that anything that burns fuel which emits carbon cannot be “carbon-free” under the 100 percent standard.
- Only include technologies or methods that result in real-zero emissions, such as solar and wind energy.
- Not support and incentivize the continued use of fossil fuels or increase fossil fuel infrastructure, either directly or indirectly (e.g., burning consumer trash, which contains significant amounts of plastics and other carbon-heavy material, hydrogen blending with gas burning for “partial compliance,” or CCS, which is used to extract more oil).
- Align with plans for a just transition for fossil fuel and extractive-dependent communities.
- End the environmental injustice and racism that impose pollution costs on poorer communities to serve electricity

to wealthy individuals and industries.

We have a window of opportunity for Minnesota to be a leader in building an energy system that recognizes that no communities are expendable and where we invest in and plan for the drawdown of fossil fuels and other carbon-intensive energy production, use, and infrastructure.

Sincerely,
christopher carlson
Minnetonka, MN 55345-6413
c_carlson@gmx.com

From: dzentnermn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dave Zentner
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 8:34:05 AM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on the question of what “carbon-free” electric energy means in Minnesota. The decisions and governance frameworks we put in place now for the energy transition will reverberate decades into the future. It is your duty to hold the line and make sure that the definition of “carbon free” is not watered down, harming Minnesota communities, the climate, and our future innovative society.

Will Minnesota's “carbon-free” future live up to its legislative intent—an energy system that is truly clean, healthy, and equitable, which allows all our communities to thrive? Or will it be a vehicle for monopoly utilities and powerful polluting industries to advance a range of false solutions that pad their bottom lines at the expense of our communities and ecosystems?

As you wrestle with these questions, it's critical that you listen to the full range of voices who will be impacted by your decisions. I am very concerned to see that this comment period around the definition of “carbon free” has become a forum for polluting and extractive industry to push a wide range of their pet false solutions.

The Commission should not entertain a life cycle analysis that is contrary to the law and clear guidance from the legislature. Engaging in this analysis is a complicated and frivolous waste of time that could be better spent establishing clear paths to compliance for our utilities.

I ask that PUC reject the following false solution boondoggles for inclusion in the definition of “carbon free” technologies:

- Costly, inefficient, and polluting technologies that emit carbon when electricity is generated like burning wood and garbage for energy.
- Carbon Capture and Sequestration, the fossil fuel industry's favorite taxpayer-funded scheme to delay the transition to real decarbonization.
- Dirty hydrogen generated from methane provided and processed by the gas industry.

I further demand that the PUC prioritize the following considerations in Minnesota's definition of carbon-free energy:

- Recognize the urgent need to halt the expansion of fossil fuel resources.
- Recognize that anything that burns fuel which emits carbon cannot be “carbon-free” under the 100 percent standard.
- Only include technologies or methods that result in real-zero emissions, such as solar and wind energy.
- Not support and incentivize the continued use of fossil fuels or increase fossil fuel infrastructure, either directly or indirectly (e.g., burning consumer trash, which contains significant amounts of plastics and other carbon-heavy material, hydrogen blending with gas burning for “partial compliance,” or CCS, which is used to extract more oil).
- Align with plans for a just transition for fossil fuel and extractive-dependent communities.
- End the environmental injustice and racism that impose pollution costs on poorer communities to serve electricity

to wealthy individuals and industries.

We have a window of opportunity for Minnesota to be a leader in building an energy system that recognizes that no communities are expendable and where we invest in and plan for the drawdown of fossil fuels and other carbon-intensive energy production, use, and infrastructure.

Sincerely,
Dave Zentner
Duluth, MN 55803-2221
dzentnermn@gmail.com

From: akireta@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Amy Kireta
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: 100% Carbon Free Energy for Minnesotans [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 11:52:43 AM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

It is critical that we carefully consider and conserve the meaning of "carbon-free".

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on the question of what “carbon-free” electric energy means in Minnesota. The decisions and governance frameworks we put in place now for the energy transition will reverberate decades into the future. It is your duty to hold the line and make sure that the definition of “carbon free” is not watered down, harming Minnesota communities, the climate, and our future innovative society.

Will Minnesota's “carbon-free” future live up to its legislative intent—an energy system that is truly clean, healthy, and equitable, which allows all our communities to thrive? Or will it be a vehicle for monopoly utilities and powerful polluting industries to advance a range of false solutions that pad their bottom lines at the expense of our communities and ecosystems?

As you wrestle with these questions, it's critical that you listen to the full range of voices who will be impacted by your decisions. I am very concerned to see that this comment period around the definition of “carbon free” has become a forum for polluting and extractive industry to push a wide range of their pet false solutions.

The Commission should not entertain a life cycle analysis that is contrary to the law and clear guidance from the legislature. Engaging in this analysis is a complicated and frivolous waste of time that could be better spent establishing clear paths to compliance for our utilities.

I ask that PUC reject the following false solution boondoggles for inclusion in the definition of “carbon free” technologies:

- Costly, inefficient, and polluting technologies that emit carbon when electricity is generated like burning wood and garbage for energy.
- Carbon Capture and Sequestration, the fossil fuel industry's favorite taxpayer-funded scheme to delay the transition to real decarbonization.
- Dirty hydrogen generated from methane provided and processed by the gas industry.

I further demand that the PUC prioritize the following considerations in Minnesota's definition of carbon-free energy:

- Recognize the urgent need to halt the expansion of fossil fuel resources.
- Recognize that anything that burns fuel which emits carbon cannot be “carbon-free” under the 100 percent standard.
- Only include technologies or methods that result in real-zero emissions, such as solar and wind energy.
- Not support and incentivize the continued use of fossil fuels or increase fossil fuel infrastructure, either directly or indirectly (e.g., burning consumer trash, which contains significant amounts of plastics and other carbon-heavy material, hydrogen blending with gas burning for “partial compliance,” or CCS, which is used to extract more oil).

- Align with plans for a just transition for fossil fuel and extractive-dependent communities.
- End the environmental injustice and racism that impose pollution costs on poorer communities to serve electricity to wealthy individuals and industries.

We have a window of opportunity for Minnesota to be a leader in building an energy system that recognizes that no communities are expendable and where we invest in and plan for the drawdown of fossil fuels and other carbon-intensive energy production, use, and infrastructure.

Sincerely,
Dr. Amy Kireta
Two Harbors, MN 55616-1114
akireta@d.umn.edu

From: kildegac@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Arne Kildegaard
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 8:57:08 AM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on the question of what “carbon-free” electric energy means in Minnesota. The decisions and governance frameworks we put in place now for the energy transition will reverberate decades into the future. It is your duty to hold the line and make sure that the definition of “carbon free” is not watered down, harming Minnesota communities, the climate, and our future innovative society.

Will Minnesota's “carbon-free” future live up to its legislative intent—an energy system that is truly clean, healthy, and equitable, which allows all our communities to thrive? Or will it be a vehicle for monopoly utilities and powerful polluting industries to advance a range of false solutions that pad their bottom lines at the expense of our communities and ecosystems?

As you wrestle with these questions, it's critical that you listen to the full range of voices who will be impacted by your decisions. I am very concerned to see that this comment period around the definition of “carbon free” has become a forum for polluting and extractive industry to push a wide range of their pet false solutions.

The Commission should not entertain a life cycle analysis that is contrary to the law and clear guidance from the legislature. Engaging in this analysis is a complicated and frivolous waste of time that could be better spent establishing clear paths to compliance for our utilities.

I ask that PUC reject the following false solution boondoggles for inclusion in the definition of “carbon free” technologies:

- Costly, inefficient, and polluting technologies that emit carbon when electricity is generated like burning wood and garbage for energy.
- Carbon Capture and Sequestration, the fossil fuel industry's favorite taxpayer-funded scheme to delay the transition to real decarbonization.
- Dirty hydrogen generated from methane provided and processed by the gas industry.

I further demand that the PUC prioritize the following considerations in Minnesota's definition of carbon-free energy:

- Recognize the urgent need to halt the expansion of fossil fuel resources.
- Recognize that anything that burns fuel which emits carbon cannot be “carbon-free” under the 100 percent standard.
- Only include technologies or methods that result in real-zero emissions, such as solar and wind energy.
- Not support and incentivize the continued use of fossil fuels or increase fossil fuel infrastructure, either directly or indirectly (e.g., burning consumer trash, which contains significant amounts of plastics and other carbon-heavy material, hydrogen blending with gas burning for “partial compliance,” or CCS, which is used to extract more oil).
- Align with plans for a just transition for fossil fuel and extractive-dependent communities.
- End the environmental injustice and racism that impose pollution costs on poorer communities to serve electricity

to wealthy individuals and industries.

We have a window of opportunity for Minnesota to be a leader in building an energy system that recognizes that no communities are expendable and where we invest in and plan for the drawdown of fossil fuels and other carbon-intensive energy production, use, and infrastructure.

Sincerely,
Dr. Arne Kildegaard
Farwell, MN 56327-8109
kildegac@morris.umn.edu

From:	drmoverend@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Overend
To:	Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject:	Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date:	Friday, September 12, 2025 1:22:13 PM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on the question of what “carbon-free” electric energy means in Minnesota. The decisions and governance frameworks we put in place now for the energy transition will reverberate decades into the future. It is your duty to hold the line and make sure that the definition of “carbon free” is not watered down, harming Minnesota communities, the climate, and our future innovative society.

The global warming that is threatening our planet is primarily due to burning fossil fuels and is augmented by other sources of greenhouse gas emissions.

Minnesota imported $24 billion of fossil fuels in 2024 to power a majority of Minnesota’s economy.

We can only address global warming by eliminating every possible source of greenhouse gas emissions as rapidly as possible. There is no rational alternative to this action.

We have the renewable generation and storage technology available that can be cost-effectively scaled to meet this challenge, but it will require the firm implementation of the process prescribed by our legislators to meet our 100% clean energy by 2040 goal.

No Carbon emissions means exactly that, No Carbon emissions!

Will Minnesota's “carbon-free” future live up to its legislative intent—an energy system that is truly clean, healthy, and equitable, which allows all our communities to thrive? Or will it be a vehicle for monopoly utilities and powerful polluting industries to advance a range of false solutions that pad their bottom lines at the expense of our communities and ecosystems?

As you wrestle with these questions, it's critical that you listen to the full range of voices who will be impacted by your decisions. I am very concerned to see that this comment period around the definition of “carbon free” has become a forum for polluting and extractive industry to push a wide range of their pet false solutions.

The Commission should not entertain a life cycle analysis that is contrary to the law and clear guidance from the legislature. Engaging in this analysis is a complicated and frivolous waste of time that could be better spent establishing clear paths to compliance for our utilities.

I ask that PUC reject the following false solution boondoggles for inclusion in the definition of “carbon free” technologies:

- Costly, inefficient, and polluting technologies that emit carbon when electricity is generated like burning wood and garbage for energy.
- Carbon Capture and Sequestration, the fossil fuel industry's favorite taxpayer-funded scheme to delay the transition to real decarbonization.

- Dirty hydrogen generated from methane provided and processed by the gas industry.

I further demand that the PUC prioritize the following considerations in Minnesota's definition of carbon-free energy:

- Recognize the urgent need to halt the expansion of fossil fuel resources.
- Recognize that anything that burns fuel which emits carbon cannot be “carbon-free” under the 100 percent standard.
- Only include technologies or methods that result in real-zero emissions, such as solar and wind energy.
- Not support and incentivize the continued use of fossil fuels or increase fossil fuel infrastructure, either directly or indirectly (e.g., burning consumer trash, which contains significant amounts of plastics and other carbon-heavy material, hydrogen blending with gas burning for “partial compliance,” or CCS, which is used to extract more oil).
- Align with plans for a just transition for fossil fuel and extractive-dependent communities.
- End the environmental injustice and racism that impose pollution costs on poorer communities to serve electricity to wealthy individuals and industries.

We have a window of opportunity for Minnesota to be a leader in building an energy system that recognizes that no communities are expendable and where we invest in and plan for the drawdown of fossil fuels and other carbon-intensive energy production, use, and infrastructure.

Sincerely,
Dr. Michael Overend
Cohasset, MN 55721-8960
drmoverend@gmail.com

From:	ewbrown2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elton Brown
To:	Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject:	Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date:	Friday, September 12, 2025 9:07:19 AM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on the question of what “carbon-free” electric energy means in Minnesota. The decisions and governance frameworks we put in place now for the energy transition will reverberate decades into the future. It is your duty to hold the line and make sure that the definition of “carbon free” is not watered down, harming Minnesota communities, the climate, and our future innovative society.

Will Minnesota's “carbon-free” future live up to its legislative intent—an energy system that is truly clean, healthy, and equitable, which allows all our communities to thrive? Or will it be a vehicle for monopoly utilities and powerful polluting industries to advance a range of false solutions that pad their bottom lines at the expense of our communities and ecosystems?

As you wrestle with these questions, it's critical that you listen to the full range of voices who will be impacted by your decisions. I am very concerned to see that this comment period around the definition of “carbon free” has become a forum for polluting and extractive industry to push a wide range of their pet false solutions.

The Commission should not entertain a life cycle analysis that is contrary to the law and clear guidance from the legislature. Engaging in this analysis is a complicated and frivolous waste of time that could be better spent establishing clear paths to compliance for our utilities.

I ask that PUC reject the following false solution boondoggles for inclusion in the definition of “carbon free” technologies:

- Costly, inefficient, and polluting technologies that emit carbon when electricity is generated like burning wood and garbage for energy.
- Carbon Capture and Sequestration, the fossil fuel industry's favorite taxpayer-funded scheme to delay the transition to real decarbonization.
- Dirty hydrogen generated from methane provided and processed by the gas industry.

I further demand that the PUC prioritize the following considerations in Minnesota's definition of carbon-free energy:

- Recognize the urgent need to halt the expansion of fossil fuel resources.
- Recognize that anything that burns fuel which emits carbon cannot be “carbon-free” under the 100 percent standard.
- Only include technologies or methods that result in real-zero emissions, such as solar and wind energy.
- Not support and incentivize the continued use of fossil fuels or increase fossil fuel infrastructure, either directly or indirectly (e.g., burning consumer trash, which contains significant amounts of plastics and other carbon-heavy material, hydrogen blending with gas burning for “partial compliance,” or CCS, which is used to extract more oil).
- Align with plans for a just transition for fossil fuel and extractive-dependent communities.
- End the environmental injustice and racism that impose pollution costs on poorer communities to serve electricity

to wealthy individuals and industries.

We have a window of opportunity for Minnesota to be a leader in building an energy system that recognizes that no communities are expendable and where we invest in and plan for the drawdown of fossil fuels and other carbon-intensive energy production, use, and infrastructure.

Sincerely,
Elton Brown
Ely, MN 55731-8162
ewbrown2@me.com

From: Emily Pini-Fay
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Comment on Docket 24-352
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 11:48:42 AM

Hello,

My name is Emily Pini-Fay and I live in Minnetonka, Minnesota. I'm writing in regards to Docket 24-352. I oppose biomass, "renewable" natural gas, or trash burning being incorrectly labeled as "carbon free." I would like lawmakers to adhere to the popular and legitimately won carbon neutrality goals our state set in 2023, when the Minnesota legislature passed the 100% Carbon Free Standard law (Minn. Stat. 216B.1691).

Thank you,
Emily Pini-Fay
Minnetonka, MN

From: glinnerkin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gail Linnerson
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 10:14:06 AM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on the question of what “carbon-free” electric energy means in Minnesota. The decisions and governance frameworks we put in place now for the energy transition will reverberate decades into the future. It is your duty to hold the line and make sure that the definition of “carbon free” is not watered down, harming Minnesota communities, the climate, and our future innovative society.

Will Minnesota's “carbon-free” future live up to its legislative intent—an energy system that is truly clean, healthy, and equitable, which allows all our communities to thrive? Or will it be a vehicle for monopoly utilities and powerful polluting industries to advance a range of false solutions that pad their bottom lines at the expense of our communities and ecosystems?

As you wrestle with these questions, it's critical that you listen to the full range of voices who will be impacted by your decisions. I am very concerned to see that this comment period around the definition of “carbon free” has become a forum for polluting and extractive industry to push a wide range of their pet false solutions.

The Commission should not entertain a life cycle analysis that is contrary to the law and clear guidance from the legislature. Engaging in this analysis is a complicated and frivolous waste of time that could be better spent establishing clear paths to compliance for our utilities.

I ask that PUC reject the following false solution boondoggles for inclusion in the definition of “carbon free” technologies:

- Costly, inefficient, and polluting technologies that emit carbon when electricity is generated like burning wood and garbage for energy.
- Carbon Capture and Sequestration, the fossil fuel industry's favorite taxpayer-funded scheme to delay the transition to real decarbonization.
- Dirty hydrogen generated from methane provided and processed by the gas industry.

I further demand that the PUC prioritize the following considerations in Minnesota's definition of carbon-free energy:

- Recognize the urgent need to halt the expansion of fossil fuel resources.
- Recognize that anything that burns fuel which emits carbon cannot be “carbon-free” under the 100 percent standard.
- Only include technologies or methods that result in real-zero emissions, such as solar and wind energy.
- Not support and incentivize the continued use of fossil fuels or increase fossil fuel infrastructure, either directly or indirectly (e.g., burning consumer trash, which contains significant amounts of plastics and other carbon-heavy material, hydrogen blending with gas burning for “partial compliance,” or CCS, which is used to extract more oil).
- Align with plans for a just transition for fossil fuel and extractive-dependent communities.
- End the environmental injustice and racism that impose pollution costs on poorer communities to serve electricity

to wealthy individuals and industries.

We have a window of opportunity for Minnesota to be a leader in building an energy system that recognizes that no communities are expendable and where we invest in and plan for the drawdown of fossil fuels and other carbon-intensive energy production, use, and infrastructure.

Sincerely,
Gail Linnerson
Saint Paul, MN 55107-3208
glinnerkin@aol.com

From:	hfossen@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Heidi Fossen
To:	Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject:	Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date:	Friday, September 12, 2025 8:18:23 AM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on the question of what “carbon-free” electric energy means in Minnesota. The decisions and governance frameworks we put in place now for the energy transition will reverberate decades into the future. It is your duty to hold the line and make sure that the definition of “carbon free” is not watered down, harming Minnesota communities, the climate, and our future innovative society.

Will Minnesota's “carbon-free” future live up to its legislative intent—an energy system that is truly clean, healthy, and equitable, which allows all our communities to thrive? Or will it be a vehicle for monopoly utilities and powerful polluting industries to advance a range of false solutions that pad their bottom lines at the expense of our communities and ecosystems?

As you wrestle with these questions, it's critical that you listen to the full range of voices who will be impacted by your decisions. I am very concerned to see that this comment period around the definition of “carbon free” has become a forum for polluting and extractive industry to push a wide range of their pet false solutions.

The Commission should not entertain a life cycle analysis that is contrary to the law and clear guidance from the legislature. Engaging in this analysis is a complicated and frivolous waste of time that could be better spent establishing clear paths to compliance for our utilities.

I ask that PUC reject the following false solution boondoggles for inclusion in the definition of “carbon free” technologies:

- Costly, inefficient, and polluting technologies that emit carbon when electricity is generated like burning wood and garbage for energy.
- Carbon Capture and Sequestration, the fossil fuel industry's favorite taxpayer-funded scheme to delay the transition to real decarbonization.
- Dirty hydrogen generated from methane provided and processed by the gas industry.

I further demand that the PUC prioritize the following considerations in Minnesota's definition of carbon-free energy:

- Recognize the urgent need to halt the expansion of fossil fuel resources.
- Recognize that anything that burns fuel which emits carbon cannot be “carbon-free” under the 100 percent standard.
- Only include technologies or methods that result in real-zero emissions, such as solar and wind energy.
- Not support and incentivize the continued use of fossil fuels or increase fossil fuel infrastructure, either directly or indirectly (e.g., burning consumer trash, which contains significant amounts of plastics and other carbon-heavy material, hydrogen blending with gas burning for “partial compliance,” or CCS, which is used to extract more oil).
- Align with plans for a just transition for fossil fuel and extractive-dependent communities.
- End the environmental injustice and racism that impose pollution costs on poorer communities to serve electricity

to wealthy individuals and industries.

We have a window of opportunity for Minnesota to be a leader in building an energy system that recognizes that no communities are expendable and where we invest in and plan for the drawdown of fossil fuels and other carbon-intensive energy production, use, and infrastructure.

Sincerely,
Heidi Fossen
Breckenridge, MN 56520-9407
hfossen@hotmail.com

From:	joshua.houdek@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joshua Houdek
To:	Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject:	Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date:	Friday, September 12, 2025 12:06:44 PM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on the question of what “carbon-free” electric energy means in Minnesota. The decisions and governance frameworks we put in place now for the energy transition will reverberate decades into the future. It is your duty to hold the line and make sure that the definition of “carbon free” is not watered down, harming Minnesota communities, the climate, and our future innovative society.

Will Minnesota's “carbon-free” future live up to its legislative intent—an energy system that is truly clean, healthy, and equitable, which allows all our communities to thrive? Or will it be a vehicle for monopoly utilities and powerful polluting industries to advance a range of false solutions that pad their bottom lines at the expense of our communities and ecosystems?

As you wrestle with these questions, it's critical that you listen to the full range of voices who will be impacted by your decisions. I am very concerned to see that this comment period around the definition of “carbon free” has become a forum for polluting and extractive industry to push a wide range of their pet false solutions.

The Commission should not entertain a life cycle analysis that is contrary to the law and clear guidance from the legislature. Engaging in this analysis is a complicated and frivolous waste of time that could be better spent establishing clear paths to compliance for our utilities.

I ask that PUC reject the following false solution boondoggles for inclusion in the definition of “carbon free” technologies:

- Costly, inefficient, and polluting technologies that emit carbon when electricity is generated like burning wood and garbage for energy.
- Carbon Capture and Sequestration, the fossil fuel industry's favorite taxpayer-funded scheme to delay the transition to real decarbonization.
- Dirty hydrogen generated from methane provided and processed by the gas industry.

I further demand that the PUC prioritize the following considerations in Minnesota's definition of carbon-free energy:

- Recognize the urgent need to halt the expansion of fossil fuel resources.
- Recognize that anything that burns fuel which emits carbon cannot be “carbon-free” under the 100 percent standard.
- Only include technologies or methods that result in real-zero emissions, such as solar and wind energy.
- Not support and incentivize the continued use of fossil fuels or increase fossil fuel infrastructure, either directly or indirectly (e.g., burning consumer trash, which contains significant amounts of plastics and other carbon-heavy material, hydrogen blending with gas burning for “partial compliance,” or CCS, which is used to extract more oil).
- Align with plans for a just transition for fossil fuel and extractive-dependent communities.
- End the environmental injustice and racism that impose pollution costs on poorer communities to serve electricity

to wealthy individuals and industries.

We have a window of opportunity for Minnesota to be a leader in building an energy system that recognizes that no communities are expendable and where we invest in and plan for the drawdown of fossil fuels and other carbon-intensive energy production, use, and infrastructure.

Sincerely,
Mr. Joshua Houdek
Minneapolis, MN 55417-1308
joshua.houdek@sierraclub.org

From: kaligoblirsch@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kali Goblirsch
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 1:31:55 PM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on the question of what “carbon-free” electric energy means in Minnesota. The decisions and governance frameworks we put in place now for the energy transition will reverberate decades into the future. It is your duty to hold the line and make sure that the definition of “carbon free” is not watered down, harming Minnesota communities, the climate, and our future innovative society.

Will Minnesota's “carbon-free” future live up to its legislative intent—an energy system that is truly clean, healthy, and equitable, which allows all our communities to thrive? Or will it be a vehicle for monopoly utilities and powerful polluting industries to advance a range of false solutions that pad their bottom lines at the expense of our communities and ecosystems?

As you wrestle with these questions, it's critical that you listen to the full range of voices who will be impacted by your decisions. I am very concerned to see that this comment period around the definition of “carbon free” has become a forum for polluting and extractive industry to push a wide range of their pet false solutions.

The Commission should not entertain a life cycle analysis that is contrary to the law and clear guidance from the legislature. Engaging in this analysis is a complicated and frivolous waste of time that could be better spent establishing clear paths to compliance for our utilities.

I ask that PUC reject the following false solution boondoggles for inclusion in the definition of “carbon free” technologies:

- Costly, inefficient, and polluting technologies that emit carbon when electricity is generated like burning wood and garbage for energy.
- Carbon Capture and Sequestration, the fossil fuel industry's favorite taxpayer-funded scheme to delay the transition to real decarbonization.
- Dirty hydrogen generated from methane provided and processed by the gas industry.

I further demand that the PUC prioritize the following considerations in Minnesota's definition of carbon-free energy:

- Recognize the urgent need to halt the expansion of fossil fuel resources.
- Recognize that anything that burns fuel which emits carbon cannot be “carbon-free” under the 100 percent standard.
- Only include technologies or methods that result in real-zero emissions, such as solar and wind energy.
- Not support and incentivize the continued use of fossil fuels or increase fossil fuel infrastructure, either directly or indirectly (e.g., burning consumer trash, which contains significant amounts of plastics and other carbon-heavy material, hydrogen blending with gas burning for “partial compliance,” or CCS, which is used to extract more oil).
- Align with plans for a just transition for fossil fuel and extractive-dependent communities.
- End the environmental injustice and racism that impose pollution costs on poorer communities to serve electricity

to wealthy individuals and industries.

We have a window of opportunity for Minnesota to be a leader in building an energy system that recognizes that no communities are expendable and where we invest in and plan for the drawdown of fossil fuels and other carbon-intensive energy production, use, and infrastructure.

Sincerely,
Kali Goblirsch
Minneapolis, MN 55407-1666
kaligoblirsch@gmail.com

From: pearson.ken@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ken Pearson
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 8:57:58 AM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on the question of what “carbon-free” electric energy means in Minnesota. The decisions and governance frameworks we put in place now for the energy transition will reverberate decades into the future. It is your duty to hold the line and make sure that the definition of “carbon free” is not watered down, harming Minnesota communities, the climate, and our future innovative society.

Will Minnesota's “carbon-free” future live up to its legislative intent—an energy system that is truly clean, healthy, and equitable, which allows all our communities to thrive? Or will it be a vehicle for monopoly utilities and powerful polluting industries to advance a range of false solutions that pad their bottom lines at the expense of our communities and ecosystems?

As you wrestle with these questions, it's critical that you listen to the full range of voices who will be impacted by your decisions. I am very concerned to see that this comment period around the definition of “carbon free” has become a forum for polluting and extractive industry to push a wide range of their pet false solutions.

The Commission should not entertain a life cycle analysis that is contrary to the law and clear guidance from the legislature. Engaging in this analysis is a complicated and frivolous waste of time that could be better spent establishing clear paths to compliance for our utilities.

I ask that PUC reject the following false solution boondoggles for inclusion in the definition of “carbon free” technologies:

- Costly, inefficient, and polluting technologies that emit carbon when electricity is generated like burning wood and garbage for energy.
- Carbon Capture and Sequestration, the fossil fuel industry's favorite taxpayer-funded scheme to delay the transition to real decarbonization.
- Dirty hydrogen generated from methane provided and processed by the gas industry.

I further demand that the PUC prioritize the following considerations in Minnesota's definition of carbon-free energy:

- Recognize the urgent need to halt the expansion of fossil fuel resources.
- Recognize that anything that burns fuel which emits carbon cannot be “carbon-free” under the 100 percent standard.
- Only include technologies or methods that result in real-zero emissions, such as solar and wind energy.
- Not support and incentivize the continued use of fossil fuels or increase fossil fuel infrastructure, either directly or indirectly (e.g., burning consumer trash, which contains significant amounts of plastics and other carbon-heavy material, hydrogen blending with gas burning for “partial compliance,” or CCS, which is used to extract more oil).
- Align with plans for a just transition for fossil fuel and extractive-dependent communities.
- End the environmental injustice and racism that impose pollution costs on poorer communities to serve electricity

to wealthy individuals and industries.

We have a window of opportunity for Minnesota to be a leader in building an energy system that recognizes that no communities are expendable and where we invest in and plan for the drawdown of fossil fuels and other carbon-intensive energy production, use, and infrastructure.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ken Pearson
Golden Valley, MN 55422-4713
pearson.ken@comcast.net

From: lbogolub@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Larry Bogolub
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 2:01:25 PM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on the question of what “carbon-free” electric energy means in Minnesota. The decisions and governance frameworks we put in place now for the energy transition will reverberate decades into the future. It is your duty to hold the line and make sure that the definition of “carbon free” is not watered down, harming Minnesota communities, the climate, and our future innovative society.

Will Minnesota's “carbon-free” future live up to its legislative intent—an energy system that is truly clean, healthy, and equitable, which allows all our communities to thrive? Or will it be a vehicle for monopoly utilities and powerful polluting industries to advance a range of false solutions that pad their bottom lines at the expense of our communities and ecosystems?

As you wrestle with these questions, it's critical that you listen to the full range of voices who will be impacted by your decisions. I am very concerned to see that this comment period around the definition of “carbon free” has become a forum for polluting and extractive industry to push a wide range of their pet false solutions.

The Commission should not entertain a life cycle analysis that is contrary to the law and clear guidance from the legislature. Engaging in this analysis is a complicated and frivolous waste of time that could be better spent establishing clear paths to compliance for our utilities.

I ask that PUC reject the following false solution boondoggles for inclusion in the definition of “carbon free” technologies:

- Costly, inefficient, and polluting technologies that emit carbon when electricity is generated like burning wood and garbage for energy.
- Carbon Capture and Sequestration, the fossil fuel industry's favorite taxpayer-funded scheme to delay the transition to real decarbonization.
- Dirty hydrogen generated from methane provided and processed by the gas industry.

I further demand that the PUC prioritize the following considerations in Minnesota's definition of carbon-free energy:

- Recognize the urgent need to halt the expansion of fossil fuel resources.
- Recognize that anything that burns fuel which emits carbon cannot be “carbon-free” under the 100 percent standard.
- Only include technologies or methods that result in real-zero emissions, such as solar and wind energy.
- Not support and incentivize the continued use of fossil fuels or increase fossil fuel infrastructure, either directly or indirectly (e.g., burning consumer trash, which contains significant amounts of plastics and other carbon-heavy material, hydrogen blending with gas burning for “partial compliance,” or CCS, which is used to extract more oil).
- Align with plans for a just transition for fossil fuel and extractive-dependent communities.
- End the environmental injustice and racism that impose pollution costs on poorer communities to serve electricity

to wealthy individuals and industries.

We have a window of opportunity for Minnesota to be a leader in building an energy system that recognizes that no communities are expendable and where we invest in and plan for the drawdown of fossil fuels and other carbon-intensive energy production, use, and infrastructure.

Sincerely,
Mr. Larry Bogolub
Ely, MN 55731-8135
lbogolub@comcast.net

From:	harpist-airship0l@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Loni Kemp
To:	Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject:	Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date:	Friday, September 12, 2025 10:32:35 AM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on the question of what “carbon-free” electric energy means in Minnesota. The decisions and governance frameworks we put in place now for the energy transition will reverberate decades into the future. It is your duty to hold the line and make sure that the definition of “carbon free” is not watered down, harming Minnesota communities, the climate, and our future innovative society.

Will Minnesota's “carbon-free” future live up to its legislative intent—an energy system that is truly clean, healthy, and equitable, which allows all our communities to thrive? Or will it be a vehicle for monopoly utilities and powerful polluting industries to advance a range of false solutions that pad their bottom lines at the expense of our communities and ecosystems?

As you wrestle with these questions, it's critical that you listen to the full range of voices who will be impacted by your decisions. I am very concerned to see that this comment period around the definition of “carbon free” has become a forum for polluting and extractive industry to push a wide range of their pet false solutions.

The Commission should not entertain a life cycle analysis that is contrary to the law and clear guidance from the legislature. Engaging in this analysis is a complicated and frivolous waste of time that could be better spent establishing clear paths to compliance for our utilities.

I ask that PUC reject the following false solution boondoggles for inclusion in the definition of “carbon free” technologies:

- Costly, inefficient, and polluting technologies that emit carbon when electricity is generated like burning wood and garbage for energy.
- Carbon Capture and Sequestration, the fossil fuel industry's favorite taxpayer-funded scheme to delay the transition to real decarbonization.
- Dirty hydrogen generated from methane provided and processed by the gas industry.

I further demand that the PUC prioritize the following considerations in Minnesota's definition of carbon-free energy:

- Recognize the urgent need to halt the expansion of fossil fuel resources.
- Recognize that anything that burns fuel which emits carbon cannot be “carbon-free” under the 100 percent standard.
- Only include technologies or methods that result in real-zero emissions, such as solar and wind energy.
- Not support and incentivize the continued use of fossil fuels or increase fossil fuel infrastructure, either directly or indirectly (e.g., burning consumer trash, which contains significant amounts of plastics and other carbon-heavy material, hydrogen blending with gas burning for “partial compliance,” or CCS, which is used to extract more oil).
- Align with plans for a just transition for fossil fuel and extractive-dependent communities.
- End the environmental injustice and racism that impose pollution costs on poorer communities to serve electricity

to wealthy individuals and industries.

We have a window of opportunity for Minnesota to be a leader in building an energy system that recognizes that no communities are expendable and where we invest in and plan for the drawdown of fossil fuels and other carbon-intensive energy production, use, and infrastructure.

Sincerely,
Loni Kemp
Canton, MN 55922-1548
harpist-airship0l@icloud.com

From: lylabrown@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lyla Brown
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 8:48:26 AM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on the question of what “carbon-free” electric energy means in Minnesota. The decisions and governance frameworks we put in place now for the energy transition will reverberate decades into the future. It is your duty to hold the line and make sure that the definition of “carbon free” is not watered down, harming Minnesota communities, the climate, and our future innovative society.

Will Minnesota's “carbon-free” future live up to its legislative intent—an energy system that is truly clean, healthy, and equitable, which allows all our communities to thrive? Or will it be a vehicle for monopoly utilities and powerful polluting industries to advance a range of false solutions that pad their bottom lines at the expense of our communities and ecosystems?

As you wrestle with these questions, it's critical that you listen to the full range of voices who will be impacted by your decisions. I am very concerned to see that this comment period around the definition of “carbon free” has become a forum for polluting and extractive industry to push a wide range of their pet false solutions.

The Commission should not entertain a life cycle analysis that is contrary to the law and clear guidance from the legislature. Engaging in this analysis is a complicated and frivolous waste of time that could be better spent establishing clear paths to compliance for our utilities.

I ask that PUC reject the following false solution boondoggles for inclusion in the definition of “carbon free” technologies:

- Costly, inefficient, and polluting technologies that emit carbon when electricity is generated like burning wood and garbage for energy.
- Carbon Capture and Sequestration, the fossil fuel industry's favorite taxpayer-funded scheme to delay the transition to real decarbonization.
- Dirty hydrogen generated from methane provided and processed by the gas industry.

I further demand that the PUC prioritize the following considerations in Minnesota's definition of carbon-free energy:

- Recognize the urgent need to halt the expansion of fossil fuel resources.
- Recognize that anything that burns fuel which emits carbon cannot be “carbon-free” under the 100 percent standard.
- Only include technologies or methods that result in real-zero emissions, such as solar and wind energy.
- Not support and incentivize the continued use of fossil fuels or increase fossil fuel infrastructure, either directly or indirectly (e.g., burning consumer trash, which contains significant amounts of plastics and other carbon-heavy material, hydrogen blending with gas burning for “partial compliance,” or CCS, which is used to extract more oil).
- Align with plans for a just transition for fossil fuel and extractive-dependent communities.
- End the environmental injustice and racism that impose pollution costs on poorer communities to serve electricity

to wealthy individuals and industries.

We have a window of opportunity for Minnesota to be a leader in building an energy system that recognizes that no communities are expendable and where we invest in and plan for the drawdown of fossil fuels and other carbon-intensive energy production, use, and infrastructure.

Sincerely,
Lyla Brown
Two Harbors, MN 55616-0018
lylabrown@proton.me

From: lynna95@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lynn Anderson
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 9:01:37 AM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on the question of what “carbon-free” electric energy means in Minnesota. The decisions and governance frameworks we put in place now for the energy transition will reverberate decades into the future. It is your duty to hold the line and make sure that the definition of “carbon free” is not watered down, harming Minnesota communities, the climate, and our future innovative society.

Will Minnesota's “carbon-free” future live up to its legislative intent—an energy system that is truly clean, healthy, and equitable, which allows all our communities to thrive? Or will it be a vehicle for monopoly utilities and powerful polluting industries to advance a range of false solutions that pad their bottom lines at the expense of our communities and ecosystems?

As you wrestle with these questions, it's critical that you listen to the full range of voices who will be impacted by your decisions. I am very concerned to see that this comment period around the definition of “carbon free” has become a forum for polluting and extractive industry to push a wide range of their pet false solutions. This is not what we want.

The Commission should not entertain a life cycle analysis that is contrary to the law and clear guidance from the legislature. Engaging in this analysis is a complicated and frivolous waste of time that could be better spent establishing clear paths to compliance for our utilities.

I ask that PUC reject the following false solution boondoggles for inclusion in the definition of “carbon free” technologies:

- Costly, inefficient, and polluting technologies that emit carbon when electricity is generated like burning wood and garbage for energy. --This makes no sense.
- Carbon Capture and Sequestration, the fossil fuel industry's favorite taxpayer-funded scheme to delay the transition to real decarbonization.
- Dirty hydrogen generated from methane provided and processed by the gas industry.

I further demand that the PUC prioritize the following considerations in Minnesota's definition of carbon-free energy:

- Recognize the urgent need to halt the expansion of fossil fuel resources.
- Recognize that anything that burns fuel which emits carbon cannot be “carbon-free” under the 100 percent standard.
- Only include technologies or methods that result in real-zero emissions, such as solar and wind energy. Battery storage can be used to store energy when the sun doesn't shine and the wind doesn't blow. These solutions are already in use in other parts of America.
- Not support and incentivize the continued use of fossil fuels or increase fossil fuel infrastructure, either directly or indirectly (e.g., burning consumer trash, which contains significant amounts of plastics and other carbon-heavy

material, hydrogen blending with gas burning for “partial compliance,” or CCS, which is used to extract more oil).
- Align with plans for a just transition for fossil fuel and extractive-dependent communities.
- End the environmental injustice and racism that impose pollution costs on poorer communities to serve electricity to wealthy individuals and industries.

We have a window of opportunity for Minnesota to be a leader in building an energy system that recognizes that no communities are expendable and where we invest in and plan for the drawdown of fossil fuels and other carbon-intensive energy production, use, and infrastructure.

Do what is morally right and fair for Minnesotans. Use this opportunity wisely by demonstrating strong leadership that prioritizes our health, well being, and a green energy future.
It's time to transition from fossil fuels and pollution.

Thank you,

Sincerely,
Mrs Lynn Anderson
Tamarack, MN 55787-4486
lynna95@att.net

From: walul3102@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of ML Wilm
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 8:20:39 AM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on the question of what “carbon-free” electric energy means in Minnesota. The decisions and governance frameworks we put in place now for the energy transition will reverberate decades into the future. It is your duty to hold the line and make sure that the definition of “carbon free” is not watered down, harming Minnesota communities, the climate, and our future innovative society.

Will Minnesota's “carbon-free” future live up to its legislative intent—an energy system that is truly clean, healthy, and equitable, which allows all our communities to thrive? Or will it be a vehicle for monopoly utilities and powerful polluting industries to advance a range of false solutions that pad their bottom lines at the expense of our communities and ecosystems?

As you wrestle with these questions, it's critical that you listen to the full range of voices who will be impacted by your decisions. I am very concerned to see that this comment period around the definition of “carbon free” has become a forum for polluting and extractive industry to push a wide range of their pet false solutions.

The Commission should not entertain a life cycle analysis that is contrary to the law and clear guidance from the legislature. Engaging in this analysis is a complicated and frivolous waste of time that could be better spent establishing clear paths to compliance for our utilities.

I ask that PUC reject the following false solution boondoggles for inclusion in the definition of “carbon free” technologies:

- Costly, inefficient, and polluting technologies that emit carbon when electricity is generated like burning wood and garbage for energy.
- Carbon Capture and Sequestration, the fossil fuel industry's favorite taxpayer-funded scheme to delay the transition to real decarbonization.
- Dirty hydrogen generated from methane provided and processed by the gas industry.

I further demand that the PUC prioritize the following considerations in Minnesota's definition of carbon-free energy:

- Recognize the urgent need to halt the expansion of fossil fuel resources.
- Recognize that anything that burns fuel which emits carbon cannot be “carbon-free” under the 100 percent standard.
- Only include technologies or methods that result in real-zero emissions, such as solar and wind energy.
- Not support and incentivize the continued use of fossil fuels or increase fossil fuel infrastructure, either directly or indirectly (e.g., burning consumer trash, which contains significant amounts of plastics and other carbon-heavy material, hydrogen blending with gas burning for “partial compliance,” or CCS, which is used to extract more oil).
- Align with plans for a just transition for fossil fuel and extractive-dependent communities.
- End the environmental injustice and racism that impose pollution costs on poorer communities to serve electricity to wealthy individuals and industries.

We have a window of opportunity for Minnesota to be a leader in building an energy system that recognizes that no

communities are expendable and where we invest in and plan for the drawdown of fossil fuels and other carbon-intensive energy production, use, and infrastructure.

Sincerely,
Ms. ML Wilm
Minneapolis, MN 55406-1865
walul3102@gmail.com

From: deucelarsen@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Larsen
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 2:01:29 PM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on the question of what “carbon-free” electric energy means in Minnesota. The decisions and governance frameworks we put in place now for the energy transition will reverberate decades into the future. It is your duty to hold the line and make sure that the definition of “carbon free” is not watered down, harming Minnesota communities, the climate, and our future innovative society.

Will Minnesota's “carbon-free” future live up to its legislative intent—an energy system that is truly clean, healthy, and equitable, which allows all our communities to thrive? Or will it be a vehicle for monopoly utilities and powerful polluting industries to advance a range of false solutions that pad their bottom lines at the expense of our communities and ecosystems?

As you wrestle with these questions, it's critical that you listen to the full range of voices who will be impacted by your decisions. I am very concerned to see that this comment period around the definition of “carbon free” has become a forum for polluting and extractive industry to push a wide range of their pet false solutions.

The Commission should not entertain a life cycle analysis that is contrary to the law and clear guidance from the legislature. Engaging in this analysis is a complicated and frivolous waste of time that could be better spent establishing clear paths to compliance for our utilities.

I ask that PUC reject the following false solution boondoggles for inclusion in the definition of “carbon free” technologies:

- Costly, inefficient, and polluting technologies that emit carbon when electricity is generated like burning wood and garbage for energy.
- Carbon Capture and Sequestration, the fossil fuel industry's favorite taxpayer-funded scheme to delay the transition to real decarbonization.
- Dirty hydrogen generated from methane provided and processed by the gas industry.

I further demand that the PUC prioritize the following considerations in Minnesota's definition of carbon-free energy:

- Recognize the urgent need to halt the expansion of fossil fuel resources.
- Recognize that anything that burns fuel which emits carbon cannot be “carbon-free” under the 100 percent standard.
- Only include technologies or methods that result in real-zero emissions, such as solar and wind energy.
- Not support and incentivize the continued use of fossil fuels or increase fossil fuel infrastructure, either directly or indirectly (e.g., burning consumer trash, which contains significant amounts of plastics and other carbon-heavy material, hydrogen blending with gas burning for “partial compliance,” or CCS, which is used to extract more oil).
- Align with plans for a just transition for fossil fuel and extractive-dependent communities.
- End the environmental injustice and racism that impose pollution costs on poorer communities to serve electricity

to wealthy individuals and industries.

We have a window of opportunity for Minnesota to be a leader in building an energy system that recognizes that no communities are expendable and where we invest in and plan for the drawdown of fossil fuels and other carbon-intensive energy production, use, and infrastructure.

Sincerely,
Robert Larsen
Redwood Falls, MN 56283-8302
deucelarsen@gmail.com

From: dowanwin0049@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Terry Shaw
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 11:03:41 AM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on the question of what “carbon-free” electric energy means in Minnesota. The decisions and governance frameworks we put in place now for the energy transition will reverberate decades into the future. It is your duty to hold the line and make sure that the definition of “carbon free” is not watered down, harming Minnesota communities, the climate, and our future innovative society.

Will Minnesota's “carbon-free” future live up to its legislative intent—an energy system that is truly clean, healthy, and equitable, which allows all our communities to thrive? Or will it be a vehicle for monopoly utilities and powerful polluting industries to advance a range of false solutions that pad their bottom lines at the expense of our communities and ecosystems?

As you wrestle with these questions, it's critical that you listen to the full range of voices who will be impacted by your decisions. I am very concerned to see that this comment period around the definition of “carbon free” has become a forum for polluting and extractive industry to push a wide range of their pet false solutions.

The Commission should not entertain a life cycle analysis that is contrary to the law and clear guidance from the legislature. Engaging in this analysis is a complicated and frivolous waste of time that could be better spent establishing clear paths to compliance for our utilities.

I ask that PUC reject the following false solution boondoggles for inclusion in the definition of “carbon free” technologies:

- Costly, inefficient, and polluting technologies that emit carbon when electricity is generated like burning wood and garbage for energy.
- Carbon Capture and Sequestration, the fossil fuel industry's favorite taxpayer-funded scheme to delay the transition to real decarbonization.
- Dirty hydrogen generated from methane provided and processed by the gas industry.

I further demand that the PUC prioritize the following considerations in Minnesota's definition of carbon-free energy:

- Recognize the urgent need to halt the expansion of fossil fuel resources.
- Recognize that anything that burns fuel which emits carbon cannot be “carbon-free” under the 100 percent standard.
- Only include technologies or methods that result in real-zero emissions, such as solar and wind energy.
- Not support and incentivize the continued use of fossil fuels or increase fossil fuel infrastructure, either directly or indirectly (e.g., burning consumer trash, which contains significant amounts of plastics and other carbon-heavy material, hydrogen blending with gas burning for “partial compliance,” or CCS, which is used to extract more oil).
- Align with plans for a just transition for fossil fuel and extractive-dependent communities.
- End the environmental injustice and racism that impose pollution costs on poorer communities to serve electricity

to wealthy individuals and industries.

We have a window of opportunity for Minnesota to be a leader in building an energy system that recognizes that no communities are expendable and where we invest in and plan for the drawdown of fossil fuels and other carbon-intensive energy production, use, and infrastructure.

Sincerely,
Terry Shaw
Battle Lake, MN 56515-9132
dowanwin0049@hotmail.com

From: Tricia Connell
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Comment on docket number 24-352
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 10:31:37 AM

Hello,

I'm writing today as a Minnesota resident who is incredibly proud to be a citizen of this state. I wanted to reach out to the legislature and oppose the definition of "carbon free" energy being stretched to include biomass, renewable natural gas, and trash burning (docket number 24-352). These practices are not carbon neutral, will not benefit the state of Minnesota, and particularly, as they open up leeway for AI data centers to be established in Minnesota, will have very real and very negative effects on Minnesota's economy and environment.

Our federal government is making decisions that will put America as a whole behind in the race towards clean energy, and as a state we have the opportunity to pick up the slack. Let's make common sense decisions about actual renewable resources and not lie with our laws!

Your fellow Minnesotan,

Tricia Connell
Registration and Scholarship Lead
Concordia Language Villages
(218) 299-3699

ConcordiaLanguageVillages.org

Inspiring Courageous Global Citizens

Facebook | Instagram | LinkedIn | Pinterest | Twitter | YouTube