

March 8, 2022

Will Seuffert
Executive Secretary
Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
121 7th Place East, Suite 350
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2147

RE: **Comments of the Minnesota Commerce Department, Division of Energy Resources**
Docket No. IP7053/CN-21-112

Dear Mr. Seuffert:

Attached are the Comments of the Minnesota Commerce Department, Division of Energy Resources (Department), in the following matter:

Application of Hayward Solar LLC for a Certificate of Need for the up to 150 MW
Hayward Solar Project in Freeborn County, Minnesota.

The Petition was filed on May 5, 2021 by:

Jeremy P. Duehr
Fredrikson & Byron, P.A.
200 South Sixth Street, Suite 4000
Minneapolis, MN 55402

The Department recommends that the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (Commission) consider the impacts detailed in the Environmental Report, and, if the impacts are acceptable, **grant the Certificate of Need**. The Department is available to answer any questions the Commission may have.

Sincerely,

/s/ STEVE RAKOW
Analyst Coordinator

SR/ar
Attachment



Before the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission

Comments of the Minnesota Commerce Department Division of Energy Resources

Docket No. IP7053/CN-21-112

I. INTRODUCTION

A. EXEMPTION PETITION

On February 5, 2021 Hayward Solar LLC, a wholly owned indirect subsidiary of CD Clean Energy and Infrastructure VII JV, LLC (Hayward or the Company) filed the Company's *Request for Exemption from Certain Certificate of Need Application Content Requirements* (Exemption Petition).¹ The Exemption Petition requested that the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (Commission) approve the Company's proposed exemptions to filing requirements for an up to 150-MW solar generating plant in Freeborn County (Project).

On February 18, 2021 the Minnesota Commerce Department, Division of Energy Resources (Department or DOC-ERP) filed comments on the Exemption Petition.

On March 24, 2021 the Commission issued an order (Exemption Order) approving the Exemption Petition with modifications.

B. CERTIFICATE OF NEED PETITION

On May 5, 2021 Hayward filed the Company's *Application to the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission for a Certificate of Need for the up to 150 MW Hayward Solar Large Electric Generating Facility* (Petition).

On May 6, 2021 Hayward filed a letter with replacements for the figures provided with the Petition.

On May 7, 2021 the Commission issued its *Notice of Comment Periods on Application Completeness*.

On May 28, 2021 the Department filed comments on completeness of the Petition.

On June 11, 2021 Hayward filed reply comments.

¹ CD Clean Energy and Infrastructure VII JV LLC is a private equity fund established by Capital Dynamics. Capital Dynamics is an independent global asset management firm focusing on private assets including private equity, private credit, clean energy infrastructure and energy infrastructure credit. Since the establishment of Capital Dynamics' CEI business the CEI team has acquired, built, and now manages (as of 2018) 3.1 net GW of power generation capacity in North America and Europe.

On June 29, 2021 the Commission issued an order determining that Hayward's Petition is substantially complete and that Hayward's Petition will be evaluated using the Commission's informal comment process.

On October 15, 2021 Hayward filed the Company's *Certificate of Need Application and Site Permit Application Amendment*.

On February 15, 2022 the Commission issued its *Notice Of Comment Period on the Merits of the Certificate on Need Application* (Notice). The Notice specified that the following topics are open for comment:

- Should the Commission issue a certificate of need for the project?
- Is the proposed project needed and in the public interest?
- What are the costs and benefits of the proposed project?
- Are there any contested issues of fact with respect to the representations made in the applications?
- Are there other issues or concerns related to this matter?

Below are the comments of DOC-ERP regarding the merits of the Petition.

II. DEPARTMENT ANALYSIS

Minnesota Statutes § 216B.2421, subd. 2 (1) defines a large energy facility (LEF) as:

... any electric power generating plant or combination of plants at a single site with a combined capacity of 50,000 kilowatts or more and transmission lines directly associated with the plant that are necessary to interconnect the plant to the transmission system.

As the proposed Project would have a capacity of up to 150 MW (150,000 kilowatts), it qualifies as an LEF. Minnesota Statutes § 216B.243, subd. 2 states that "no large energy facility shall be sited or constructed in Minnesota without the issuance of a certificate of need by the Commission..." Therefore, a CN application must be approved by the Commission before the proposed Project can be sited or constructed.

There are several factors to be considered by the Commission in making a determination in CN proceedings. In general, these factors are located in different sections of Minnesota Statutes. Some of the general statutory criteria are reflected in a more specific way in Minnesota Rules, part 7849.0120. However, some statutory criteria do not appear to be reflected in rules. To clarify the analysis, DOC-ERP groups all of the statutory and rule criteria into one of five factor categories.² DOC-ERP addresses each of the statutory and rule criteria below. A cross-index matching the statutory and rule criteria to the section where each is addressed along with a summary of the Department's analysis is provided as Attachment 1.

² Need Analysis, Link to Planning Process, Alternative Analysis, Socioeconomic Analysis, and Policy Analysis.

DOC-ERP notes that we rely on the Environmental Assessment (EA) prepared by the Minnesota Department of Commerce, Energy Environmental Review and Analysis (DOC-EERA) for an analysis of the effects of the proposed Project and the alternatives upon the natural and socioeconomic environments. DOC-ERP recommends that the Commission consider the EA in making its determination.³

A. *NEED ANALYSIS*

Overall, the need analysis is governed by Minnesota Rules, part 7849.0120 (A), which states that a CN must be granted upon determining that:

The probable result of denial would be an adverse effect upon the future adequacy, reliability, or efficiency of energy supply to the applicant, to the applicant's customers, or to the people of Minnesota and neighboring states.

The rule lists five distinct criteria. The Department presents the analysis of the need for the proposed Project in two parts. The first part is designed to address the accuracy of the forecast underlying the claimed need. The second is designed to address any broader reliability needs. Each is addressed separately below.

1. *Forecast Analysis*

i. *Accuracy of the Forecast*

Minnesota Rules, part 7849.0120 A (1) states that, in assessing need, the Commission shall evaluate "the accuracy of the applicant's forecast of demand for the type of energy that would be supplied by the proposed facility." The Commission's September 23, 2021 *Order Granting Certificate of Need and Issuing Site Permit and Route Permit* (Plum Creek Order) in Docket Nos. IP6697/CN-18-699, IP6697/WS-18-700, and IP6697/TL-18-701 stated that:

Plum Creek did not use data from a PPA, IRP, or biennial transmission project report to demonstrate demand for the Project. However, under Minnesota statute and rules, there is no requirement that Plum Creek present a PPA, IRP, biennial transmission project report, or any other specific data to demonstrate demand. The Legislature contemplated that independent power producers would construct such projects and did not require them to enter into power purchase agreements before obtaining a certificate of need. Rather, the Commission may evaluate demand using any data it finds persuasive, on a case-by-case basis. Furthermore, because Plum Creek is an independent power producer and not a utility, the Commission granted it certain variances to provide alternative data

³ The Commission's Completeness Order required that that environmental review be conducted jointly (in the siting, routing, and need proceedings), to the extent practicable. As a result, an environmental assessment (EA) will be prepared to meet the requirements of both review processes.

when more appropriate, and the data provided is sufficient to demonstrate demand.

In this case, Plum Creek showed that utilities and commercial and industrial customers have reported strong clean energy goals above and beyond RES requirements, and additional renewable energy sources will be needed to meet that demand. Furthermore, utilities plan to retire coal-based generating units across the region in the coming years, and renewable energy sources are expected to fill some of the resulting capacity needs. These established goals and plans are strong evidence of a utility's intention for future energy development and can be used to demonstrate demand, especially when consistent with stated public policy goals. Citation omitted.

As in the Plum Creek Order, Hayward was granted an exemption to Minnesota Rules, part 7849.0270, which requires an applicant to provide information regarding its system peak demand and annual energy consumption.⁴ Hayward was instead required to provide regional demand, consumption, and capacity data to demonstrate the need.

First, in the Petition Hayward cites Northern States Power Company, doing business as Xcel Energy's (Xcel) resource plan which plans to add 3,500 MW cumulative utility scale solar resources by 2034. The Department notes that the current resource plan of Minnesota Power, an operating division of ALLETE, Inc. (MP) includes the addition of 200 MW of solar at MP generating sites.⁵ Under a properly designed bidding process Hayward's project may have the opportunity to compete against projects at MP's existing generation to meet the need. Thus, on-going resource plans show local utilities are now proposing to acquire large-scale solar resources.

Second, in the Petition Hayward cites to the fact that "retirements of coal-based generating units are expected across the MISO (Midcontinent independent System Operator, Inc.) region, and renewable generation resources are expected to fill the resulting capacity needs." This is consistent with the resource plans of Xcel and MP, both of which propose to retire existing coal plants. In addition, in a Supplemental Filing made on December 31, 2020 in Docket No. E017/RP-16-386 Otter Tail Power Company concluded that preliminary analysis showed that "capital investment in additional environmental controls at Coyote Station does not result in the lowest-cost mix of resources for our customers." Otter Tail's next resource plan is due September 1, 2021.

Third, Hayward cites to the fact that demand "is being drive by C&I consumers, who are increasingly entering into longer PPAs for renewable energy." While a PPA between an IPP and a customer is not regulated by the Commission, the Department is aware of some activity of this nature. For example, ALLETE Clean Energy (ACE) announced on February 10, 2021 that ACE signed "renewable energy sale

⁴ Order Point 1 of the Exemption Order.

⁵ See MP's petition in Docket No. E015/RP-21-33.

agreements with the Oshkosh Corporation and Hormel Foods for a combined 100 megawatts from its Caddo wind site under construction in Oklahoma.”⁶

Fourth, Hayward cites to the publicly stated clean energy goals of utilities in the region:

- Dairyland Power Cooperative is transitioning to a more diverse generation portfolio, with carbon reduction and system reliability stated as “central issues”;
- Great River Energy has a goal to serve its all-requirements member-owner cooperatives with energy that is 50 percent renewable by 2030;
- Minnesota Municipal Power Agency has a goal to have 100 percent renewable generation “when economical”;
- Minnkota Power Cooperative is committed to finding opportunities to reduce carbon emissions; and
- Rochester Public Utilities has a goal to transition to 100 percent renewable energy by 2030.

In summary, as in the Plum Creek Order, the proposed plans of MP and Xcel, the regional trend towards retirement of coal units, the existence of a market for projects being sold directly to C&I consumers, and the stated goals of regional utilities all indicate a market exists for new renewable energy. Therefore, the Department concludes that Hayward’s forecast of the need for the renewable energy expected to be produced by the proposed Project is reasonable.

ii. Overall State Energy Needs

Also related to the forecast analysis is Minnesota Rules, part 7849.0120 C (1) which states that the Commission is to consider “the relationship of the proposed facility, or a suitable modification thereof, to overall state energy needs.”

A review of the most recently filed IRPs indicates that Minnesotans are expected to have little change in their electricity requirements:

- Xcel’s IRP includes a 0.2 percent annual average energy growth rate for 2020 to 2034;⁷
- MP’s IRP includes a -0.4 percent annual average energy decline for 2019 to 2034;⁸ and
- OTP’s IRP includes a 0.46 percent annual average energy growth rate, prior to conservation programs.⁹

⁶ See ACE’s press release at <http://alletecleanenergy.com/Content/Documents/PressReleases/press-release-021021.pdf>.

⁷ See Xcel’s June 30, 2020 Supplement: 2020-2034 Upper Midwest Integrated Resource Plan at Attachment A, Table II-1 in Docket No. E002/RP-19-368.

⁸ See MP’s 2021 Integrated Resource Plan at page 21, filed February 1, 2021 in Docket No. E015/RP-21-33.

⁹ See OTP’s Application for Resource Plan Approval at page 15, filed September 1, 2021 in Docket No. E017/RP-21-339.

However, all three utilities are proposing retirements of large baseload coal units:

- Xcel is proposing to retire the Allen S. King and Sherburne County Generating Station unit 3;
- MP is proposing to retire Boswell Energy Center unit 3; and
- OTP is proposing to withdraw from OTP's 35 percent ownership interest in Coyote Station.

As a result, over time these and other utilities are planning on adding solar generating capacity. The proposed Project could help Minnesota meet its energy needs while supporting the state's renewable energy and GHG reduction goals (see Minnesota Statutes §§ 216B.1691 and 216H.02).

The Department notes that Minnesota Statutes § 216B.1691, subd. 2f requires Xcel, MP and OTP to generate or procure sufficient solar energy to serve at least 1.5% of total retail sales to Minnesota customers by the end of 2020 (the solar energy standard, or SES). Further, subdivision 2f(e) states "It is an energy goal of the state of Minnesota that, by 2030, ten percent of retail electric sales in Minnesota be generated by solar energy." Further, Minnesota Statutes § 216B.1691, subd. 2a (Minnesota's renewable energy standard, or RES) requires Xcel generate or procure 30% of retail sales from renewable energy by 2020. Other utilities must generate or procure 25% of retail sales from renewable energy by 2025. Solar energy qualifies for both the SES and RES. However, resources procured to meet the SES cannot be used to meet the RES¹⁰ and vice versa. The proposed Project could help Minnesota meet its energy needs while supporting the state's renewable energy and greenhouse gas emissions-reductions goals (see Minnesota Statutes §§ 216B.1691 and 216H.02).

In summary, the Department concludes that the proposed Project fits the state's overall energy needs.

2. *Reliability Analysis*

Minnesota Statutes § 216B.243, subd. 3 (5) states that, in assessing need, the Commission shall evaluate "the benefits of this facility, including its uses to ... increase reliability of energy supply in Minnesota and the region." Hayward will need to apply to the MISO in order to interconnect to the transmission grid. MISO engineers study the impact on the reliability of the electrical system of each addition to the grid and the Department relies upon MISO's analysis. Therefore, the Department concludes that this criterion will be met.

B. *LINK TO PLANNING PROCESS*

This section discusses the following aspects of this proposal:

- size, type and timing;
- renewable preference; and
- demand-side management (DSM) as an alternative to the proposed Project.

¹⁰ Minnesota Statutes § 216b.1691, subd. 2a.

1. *Size, Type, and Timing*

Minnesota Rules, part 7849.0120 B (1) states that the Commission is to consider “the appropriateness of the size, the type, and the timing of the proposed facility compared to those of reasonable alternatives.”

i. Size

Regarding size, the Department notes that, although collective information submitted by the utilities subject to the Minnesota RES indicates that there is sufficient energy in aggregate to meet the RES¹¹ and SES¹², this does not consider the potential need for additional renewable resources from individual utilities with insufficient energy to meet RES. Additional for renewable energy may also be required as power purchase agreements involving renewable resources expire. Additionally, utilities in neighboring states may have a need for renewable energy. If the proposed Project is granted a CN and is implemented, it will have to compete with the other renewable energy projects in the solar energy market to fulfill any needs.

Furthermore, the Petition stated that the proposed Project can take advantage of some economies of scale.¹³ However, the Petition also clarified that:

economies of scale (system size) do not affect the generation characteristics of the proposed facilities due to the fact that the efficiency of a PV system depends primarily on the characteristics of the individual modules and the inverter. This allows excellent flexibility to adjust system size for site specific constraints without impacting the facilities’ overall efficiencies.

Based on the discussion above regarding the forecasted solar energy needs for the region, and the Company’s economic incentives, the Department concludes that the proposed Project’s size is not excessive and therefore is reasonable.

ii. Type

The Commission’s Exemption Order granted Hayward an exemption to Minnesota Rules, part 7849.0250 (B) (1) – (3), and (5) and a partial exemption to data requirement (4), to the extent that the Rule requires discussion of non-renewable alternatives. Hayward stated that one goal of the proposed Project is to provide renewable energy that will help utilities satisfy Minnesota’s RES or SES. Given these factors, along with the preference for renewable resources in Minnesota Statutes, the

¹¹ See Docket Nos. E999/M-20-283 and E999/PR-20-12 .

¹² See Docket No. E999/M-20-283.

¹³ Larger solar projects can realize some economies of scale by spreading out the relatively fixed transaction, operation, and maintenance costs over the entire Project.

Department concludes that the proposed Project's type is reasonable. The Department notes that the Commission's assessment of the reasonableness of the Project's type will be further informed by the information to be contained in the EA, which will assess the environmental impacts of alternatives.

iii. Timing

Hayward stated that the Project is expected to be in-service and operational in 2023. The timing of the proposed Project generally coincides with some of the anticipated drivers for solar additions discussed in the forecast section above. For example, some coal units are retiring around 2023.

It is important to note that there is unlikely to be a one-to-one relationship between CN applications and Minnesota RES and SES obligations. More specifically, the Department notes that:

- there will likely not be a one-to-one match between CN applications based on the regional need for renewable generation and Minnesota utilities' RES and SES compliance level;
- additional renewable resources may be needed for certain Minnesota utilities to meet their 2025 – 2030 RES requirements due to capacity expirations;
- capacity additions are typically added in "chunks" due to the benefits of economies of scale;
- the solar investment tax credit is reduced from 26% in 2021 and 2022 to 22% in 2023, and then 10 percent in 2024 for commercial and utility scale installations, which could lead to earlier solar additions than might otherwise be the case; and
- there are uncertainties involved in accomplishing the associated transmission additions or upgrades needed for integrating the output of previously approved and variously located renewable generation projects.

Finally, the Department notes that Minnesota Rules, part 7849.0400 requires the recipient of a CN to notify the Commission if the proposed in-service date is delayed by more than one year. In summary, the Department concludes that the timing of the proposed Project is reasonable.

2. Renewable Preference

There are two sections of Minnesota Statutes that provide a preference for renewable resources in resource planning and resource acquisition decisions. First, Minnesota Statutes §216B.243, subd. 3a states that:

The Commission may not issue a certificate of need under this section for a large energy facility that generates electric power by means of a nonrenewable energy source, or that transmits electric power generated by means of a nonrenewable energy source, unless the applicant for the certificate has demonstrated to the Commission's satisfaction that it has explored the possibility of generating power by means of renewable energy sources and has demonstrated that the alternative selected is less expensive (including environmental costs) than power generated by a

renewable energy source. For purposes of this subdivision, “renewable energy source” includes hydro, wind, solar, and geothermal energy and the use of trees or other vegetation as fuel.

Second, Minnesota Statutes § 216B.2422, subd. 4 states that:

The Commission shall not approve a new or refurbished nonrenewable energy facility in an integrated resource plan or a certificate of need, pursuant to section 216B.243, nor shall the Commission allow rate recovery pursuant to section 216B.16 for such a nonrenewable energy facility, unless the utility has demonstrated that a renewable energy facility is not in the public interest.

Minnesota Statutes indicate a clear preference for renewable facilities; the proposed Project meets a renewable preference.

3. *DSM Analysis*

The Commission’s Exemption Order exempted Hayward from providing information on DSM programs, as required by Minnesota Rules, part 7849.0290, and the potential for reducing the need for this generation project because Hayward does not have retail customers and does not operate any DSM programs. However, it is unlikely that the regional needs for solar energy at the scale indicated by Hayward could be met through DSM programs. In fact, some of the needs, such as the RES or SES cannot be met by DSM.

C. *ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES*

Overall, the analysis of alternatives is governed by Minnesota Rules, part 7849.0120 B which states that a CN must be granted upon determining that “. . . a more reasonable and prudent alternative to the proposed facility has not been demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence on the record.” The rule then proceeds to list four distinct criteria. The Department breaks down its analysis of the alternatives to the proposed facility into four broad areas:

- alternatives analysis;
- reliability analysis;
- distributed generation (DG); and
- preference for an innovative energy project (IEP) as defined in Minnesota Statutes.

Each area is addressed separately below.

1. *Alternatives Analysis*

i. *Non-CN Facilities Analysis*

Minnesota Rules, part 7849.0120 A (4) states that the Commission is to consider “the ability of current facilities and planned facilities not requiring certificates of need to meet the future demand.” The primary alternatives to the proposed facilities are purchases from renewable facilities outside Minnesota or construction of renewable facilities in Minnesota that are small enough not to require a CN (less than 50 MW).

As an IPP, Hayward is a producer or seller, rather than purchaser, of electric generation. A renewable facility of less than 50 MW would not contribute as substantial an amount of renewable energy towards the Minnesota RES or towards a utility’s need for additional solar resources and would not benefit as much from economies of scale as the proposed Project.¹⁴ In addition, as an IPP Hayward has the incentive to site generation in an economically efficient manner inside or outside Minnesota. Further, the Department notes that any party wishing to do so may propose an alternative to the proposed facility; at this time, no party filed such a proposal in this proceeding. Therefore, the Department concludes that current and planned facilities not requiring a CN have not been demonstrated to be more reasonable than the proposed Project.

ii. *Cost Analysis*

Minnesota Rules, part 7849.0120 B (2) states that the Commission is to consider “the cost of the proposed facility and the cost of energy to be supplied by the proposed facility compared to the costs of reasonable alternatives and the cost of energy that would be supplied by reasonable alternatives.” In the Exemption Order the Commission granted Hayward an exemption to Minnesota Rules, part 7849.0250 (C), which requires an applicant to provide a description of alternatives that could provide electric power at the asserted level of need. Only details regarding renewable alternatives need be provided, including an estimate of the proposed Project’s effect on wholesale rates in Minnesota or the region.

The Department notes Hayward intends to sell the power produced from the proposed Project to a potential buyer, one possibly being an investor-owned utility (IOU) within Minnesota. In the event a PPA is reached with a Minnesota IOU, the Commission will have the opportunity to review the terms and costs associated with the PPA in its own proceeding. Additionally, a cost analysis from the Department would take place in that proceeding.

¹⁴ Note that, as discussed elsewhere, Hayward indicates that solar facilities do not obtain the same economies-of-scale as other generating facilities.

The Petition included a discussion of alternatives to the proposed Project, including, but not limited to wind, hydropower, biomass, and emerging technologies. Hayward relied on cost information from the U.S. Department of Energy's Energy Information Administration.¹⁵ Hayward concluded that solar energy resources are cost effective when compared with other renewable resources. However, wind provides energy but little capacity. In contrast, solar is a good capacity resource. Thus, Hayward concluded that these two technologies are complements and not substitutes.¹⁶ The Department concludes that the data provided by Hayward is reasonable and demonstrates solar energy's cost advantages and disadvantages relative to other new, renewable sources.

Hayward stated that the proposed Project's energy production would be modest in comparison to the annual energy consumption of Minnesota and the region. However, because the proposed Project would not be subject to fluctuations in fuel costs, the proposed Project could help stabilize or lower electricity prices in the state and region. The Department agrees that a solar facility the size of the proposed Project is not likely to have a significant effect on MISO wholesale prices. In aggregate, renewable resources such as wind and solar are dispatched "first" under MISO protocols since they have the lowest variable cost. Since pricing in the MISO market is based on the last (marginal) resource (typically natural gas or coal), electricity produced by solar facilities in aggregate can decrease the amount of natural gas, coal, or whatever resource is on the margin (the highest priced option) at a given time, that is used for generating electricity.

Based on the above, the Department concludes that the cost of the proposed Project and the cost of energy to be supplied by the proposed Project is reasonable compared to the costs of reasonable alternatives and the cost of energy that would be supplied by reasonable alternatives.

iii. Natural and Socioeconomic Environments Analysis

Minnesota Rules, part 7849.0120 B (3) states that the Commission is to consider "the effects of the proposed facility upon the natural and socioeconomic environments compared to the effects of reasonable alternatives." The proposed facility will have relatively minor pollution impacts. In addition, the Petition states that approximately 1,272 acres of predominately agricultural land would be permanently impacted by construction and installation of the proposed Project.

As an emission-free fuel, solar does not result in releases of CO₂, NO_x, etc. Therefore, consideration of the effects on the natural and socioeconomic environments using the Commission-approved externality values would not impact the overall cost analysis against the proposed Project. Therefore, the Department concludes that this sub-criterion has been met. However, and as noted above, the EA, being conducted concurrently in this proceeding will include a full analysis of the effects of the proposed Project and the alternatives upon the natural and socioeconomic environments.

¹⁵ See Table 4 on page 33 of the Petition.

¹⁶ In economics, complements are goods that are consumed together while goods that are substitutes are consumed instead of each other (one or the other but not both).

2. *Reliability Analysis*

Minnesota Rules, part 7849.0120 B (4) states that the Commission is to consider “the expected reliability of the proposed facility compared to the expected reliability of reasonable alternatives.” Hayward estimated that the proposed Project will have an availability of about 99 percent, which it stated is consistent with industry standards.¹⁷ Given such a high availability and MISO’s generation accreditation process, the Department concludes that the proposed Project will have a reliability similar to that of reasonable alternatives.

In addition, Hayward estimated an average expected annual net capacity factor of between approximately 23 and 27 percent.¹⁸ The Department confirmed that the proposed expected capacity factor is within the National Renewable Energy Laboratory’s Utility-Scale Energy Technology Capacity Factors range.¹⁹ Hayward stated that the Project would consist of a linear axis tracking system. The tracker rows tilt east-west to follow the sun throughout the day.

In summary, the Department concludes that this sub-criterion has been met.

3. *Distributed Generation Analysis*

Minnesota Statutes § 216B.2426 states that:

The Commission shall ensure that opportunities for the installation of distributed generation, as that term is defined in section 216B.169, subdivision 1, paragraph (c), are considered in any proceeding under section 216B.2422, 216B.2425, or 216B.243.

Minnesota Statutes § 216B.169 states:

For the purposes of this section, the following terms have the meanings given them...(c) “High-efficiency, low-emission, distributed generation” means a distributed generation facility of no more than ten megawatts of interconnected capacity that is certified by the commissioner under subdivision 3 as a high efficiency, low- emission facility.

The Department notes that no proposals for distributed generation as an alternative to the proposed Project have been filed in this proceeding. As previously stated, if a buyer is an IOU in Minnesota, the Commission will have the opportunity to review the resulting PPA or facility purchase to ensure that the price and terms are reasonable. Other potential, non-IOU buyers of the proposed Project’s output should have an incentive to use the lowest cost resource available. Non-IOU generation and

¹⁷ See the Petition at page 34.

¹⁸ See the Petition at page 14.

¹⁹ Accessed on June 4, 2021 at <https://www.nrel.gov/analysis/tech-cap-factor.html> and <https://openei.org/apps/TCDB/#blank>.

transmission utilities are non-profit, compete for distribution utility clients, and therefore have an incentive to reduce costs. Therefore, the Department concludes that a potential buyer of the proposed Project's output has the incentive to consider all resources available, including distributed generation. The Department concludes that the requirement to consider distributed generation has been met.

4. *Innovative Energy Project (IEP) Preference*

Minnesota Statutes § 216B.1694, subd. 2 (a) (4) states that an IEP:

... shall, prior to the approval by the commission of any arrangement to build or expand a fossil-fuel-fired generation facility, or to enter into an agreement to purchase capacity or energy from such a facility for a term exceeding five years, be considered as a supply option for the generation facility, and the commission shall ensure such consideration and take any action with respect to such supply proposal that it deems to be in the best interest of ratepayers.

As the proposed Project is not a fossil-fuel-fired generation facility, this statute does not apply.

D. *SOCIOECONOMIC ANALYSIS*

Overall, the socioeconomic analysis is governed by Minnesota Rules, part 7849.0120 C, which states that a CN must be granted upon determining that:

... by a preponderance of the evidence on the record, the proposed facility, or a suitable modification of the facility, will provide benefits to society in a manner compatible with protecting the natural and socioeconomic environments, including human health.

Hayward stated that the proposed Project would provide a large amount of renewable energy with minimal environmental impact, which will help meet the RES, SES, and other needs for solar energy resources. Further, Hayward stated that regional and national security and energy reliability can be enhanced through the development of diversified generation resources such as the proposed Project. The proposed Project would benefit the local economies through landowner lease and purchase payments, production taxes, jobs (both temporary construction and permanent operations and maintenance jobs), and other local spending. Finally, Hayward noted that the proposed Project would reduce the amount of agricultural land in Freeborn County by less than one percent.²⁰

²⁰ See the Petition at page 46.

As noted above, the Department relies on its EA for its socioeconomic analysis in a CN proceeding. The EA provides information related to Minnesota Rules, parts:

- 7849.0120 A (5) – the effect of the proposed facility, or a suitable modification thereof, in making efficient use of resources;
- 7849.0120 C (2) – the effects of the proposed facility, or a suitable modification thereof, upon the natural and socioeconomic environments compared to the effects of not building the facility;
- 7849.0120 C (3) – the effects of the proposed facility, or a suitable modification thereof, in inducing future development; and
- 7849.0120 C (4) – the socially beneficial uses of the output of the proposed facility, or a suitable modification thereof, including its uses to protect or enhance environmental quality.

The Department recommends that the Commission consider the EA filed by the Department’s Energy Environmental Review and Analysis staff in the Commission’s decision in this matter.

E. POLICY ANALYSIS

There are several remaining criteria in statutes and rules that are applicable to a CN but do not closely fit into the need, planning, alternatives, and socioeconomic categories discussed above. Therefore, these criteria are grouped into a final category of policy consideration. In this policy section, the Department addresses criteria related to:

- policies of other states and federal agencies;
- promotional practices;
- RES compliance;
- environmental cost planning;
- transmission planning compliance; and
- CO₂.

1. Other State and Federal Agencies

Minnesota Rules, part 7849.0120 D states that a CN must be granted on determining that:

the record does not demonstrate that the design, construction, or operation of the proposed facility, or a suitable modification of the facility, will fail to comply with relevant policies, rules, and regulations of other state and federal agencies and local governments.

Hayward indicated that the proposed Project serves overall state and regional energy needs and addresses federal and state renewable energy policies. Hayward further stated that the proposed Project would meet or exceed the requirements of all federal, state, and local environmental laws and

regulations.²¹ Hayward provided a table listing the potential permits and approvals needed for the proposed Project.²² The Department has no reason to believe that Hayward will fail to comply with the requirements of the listed federal, state, and local governmental agencies.

Further, the Department notes that state agencies authorized to issue permits for the proposed Project are required to present their position and participate in the public hearing process.²³ The Department observes that the Commission has consistently considered state agency input in its final CN decisions. Therefore, the Department concludes that the record at this time does not demonstrate that the design, construction, or operation of the proposed Project, or a suitable modification of the facilities, will fail to comply with relevant policies, rules, and regulations of other state and federal agencies and local governments.

2. *Promotional Practices*

Minnesota Rules, part 7849.0120 A (3) states that the Commission is to consider “the effects of promotional practices of the applicant that may have given rise to the increase in the energy demand, particularly promotional practices which have occurred since 1974.” In the Exemption Order, the Commission granted Hayward an exemption to Minnesota Rules, part 7849.0240, subp. 2 (B), which calls for the applicant to provide a summary of the promotional practices that may have given rise to the demand for the facility. The exemption was granted because Hayward does not have captive retail customers to consider. Nonetheless, Hayward stated that it has not engaged in promotional activities that could have given rise to the need for the electricity to be generated by the Project.²⁴ The Department concludes that this sub-criterion has been met.

3. *RES Compliance*

Minnesota Statutes § 216B.243, subd. 3 (10) states that the Commission shall evaluate “whether the applicant or applicants are in compliance with applicable provisions of sections 216B.1691 ...” Minnesota Statutes § 216B.1691 relates to Minnesota’s RES. Given that Hayward has no retail customers in Minnesota, the Department concludes that this statute does not apply.

4. *Environmental Cost Planning*

Minnesota Statutes § 216B.243, subd. 3 (12) states that the Commission shall evaluate “if the applicant is proposing a nonrenewable generating plant, the applicant's assessment of the risk of environmental costs and regulation on that proposed facility over the expected useful life of the plant, including a proposed means of allocating costs associated with that risk.” In this case, Hayward is proposing a renewable generation facility. Therefore, this statute does not apply.

²¹ See the Petition at page 20.

²² See Table 11 on pages 53 to 55 of the Petition; note that Table 11 is also labeled Table 12.

²³ See Minnesota Statutes § 216B.243, subd. 7.

²⁴ See the Petition at page 8.

5. *Transmission Planning Compliance*

Minnesota Statutes § 216B.243, subd. 3 (10) states that the Commission shall evaluate:

whether the applicant or applicants are in compliance with applicable provisions of section 216B.1691 and 216B.2425, subdivision 7, and have filed or will file by a date certain an application for certificate of need under this section or for certification as a priority electric transmission project under section 216B.2425 for any transmission facilities, or upgrades identified under section 216B.2425, subdivision 7.

Regarding transmission for the proposed Project, Hayward stated that, as an IPP, this statute does not apply to Hayward.²⁵

Regarding interconnection, Hayward stated that:

The Project will connect to the grid via the SMMPA [Southern Minnesota Municipal Power Agency] Line Tap an approximately 750-900-foot long 161 kV transmission line from the new SMMPA Switchyard to the existing SMMPA Hayward-Murphy Creek 161 kV HVTL [High Voltage Transmission Line]. The Project Gen-Tie Line (a 200-300 foot long 161 kV transmission line) will likely exit from the northwestern portion of the Project Substation and connects to the new SMMPA Switchyard.

Regarding new transmission, Hayward “has no plans to become involved in owning or operating transmission lines beyond the collection and feeder lines that will be needed for interconnection of the Project.”²⁶ Since Minnesota Statutes § 216B.2425 is applicable only to entities that own or operate electric transmission lines in Minnesota, the Department concludes that this statute does not apply.

6. *Carbon Dioxide Emissions*

Minnesota Statutes § 216H.03, subd. 3 states that “after August 1, 2009, no person shall construct within the state a new large energy facility that would contribute to statewide power sector carbon dioxide emissions.” The Department notes that the proposed Project will not contribute to statewide power sector CO₂ emissions.

²⁵ See the Petition at page 20.

²⁶ See the Petition at page 29.

III. COMMISSION NOTICE

Below the Department addresses the issues specified in the Notice. The first topic open for comment is “should the Commission issue a certificate of need for the project?” The Department recommends that, should the Commission find, after consideration of the EA, that the proposed facility “will provide benefits to society in a manner compatible with protecting the natural and socioeconomic environments, including human health,” the Commission issue a CN.

The second topic open for comment “is the proposed project needed and in the public interest?” Should the Commission find, after consideration of the EA, that the proposed facility “will provide benefits to society in a manner compatible with protecting the natural and socioeconomic environments, including human health,” the Department recommends that the Commission determine that the proposed project needed and in the public interest.

The third topic open for comment is “what are the costs and benefits of the proposed project?” The costs and benefits of the proposed project can be either non-monetary or financial in nature. Many of the costs and benefits of the proposed project related to the natural and socioeconomic environments will be evaluated in the EA. Non-monetary costs and benefits typically considered in the EA include noise, aesthetics, electric and magnetic fields, recreation, flora and fauna, and so on.²⁷ In addition to non-monetary costs and benefits, there are financial benefits and costs such as changes in property values (part of the EA), the impact on MISO market prices, and the impact on the retail rates of the utility buying the proposed project’s energy and capacity.

The fourth topic open for comment is “are there any contested issues of fact with respect to the representations made in the applications?” The Department does not have any contested issues of fact.

The final topic open for comment is “are there other issues or concerns related to this matter?” The Department does not have any other issues or concerns related to this matter.

²⁷ See the Department’s November 30, 2021 *Environmental Assessment Scoping Decision*. Note that non-monetary impacts, such as noise, can be translated into financial impact through the cost of mitigation measures.

IV. DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the above analysis, the Department recommends that the Commission determine that Hayward has shown that:

- the probable result of denial would be an adverse effect upon the future adequacy, reliability, or efficiency of energy supply to the applicant, to the applicant's customers, or to the people of Minnesota and neighboring states;
- a more reasonable and prudent alternative to the proposed facility has not been demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence in the record; and
- the record does not demonstrate that the design, construction, or operation of the proposed facility, or a suitable modification of the facility, will fail to comply with relevant policies, rules, and regulations of other state and federal agencies and local governments.

Should the Commission find, after consideration of the EA, that the proposed facility "will provide benefits to society in a manner compatible with protecting the natural and socioeconomic environments, including human health," the Department recommends that the Commission issue a CN to Hayward.

/ar

Rules and Statutes Addressed in the Comments

Statute or Rule Citation	Department Comment	Location
<p>7849.0120 CRITERIA. A certificate of need must be granted to the applicant on determining that:</p>		
<p>A. the probable result of denial would be an adverse effect upon the future adequacy, reliability, or efficiency of energy supply to the applicant, to the applicant's customers, or to the people of Minnesota and neighboring states, considering:</p>		
<p>(1) the accuracy of the applicant's forecast of demand for the type of energy that would be supplied by the proposed facility;</p>	<p>the forecast of the need for the renewable energy expected to be produced by the proposed Project is reasonable</p>	<p>II.A.1.i</p>
<p>(2) the effects of the applicant's existing or expected conservation programs and state and federal conservation programs;</p>	<p>unlikely that the regional needs for solar energy ... could be met through DSM programs</p>	<p>II.B.3</p>
<p>(3) the effects of promotional practices of the applicant that may have given rise to the increase in the energy demand, particularly promotional practices which have occurred since 1974;</p>	<p>this sub-criterion has been met</p>	<p>II.E.2</p>
<p>(4) the ability of current facilities and planned facilities not requiring certificates of need to meet the future demand; and</p>	<p>current and planned facilities not requiring a CN have not been demonstrated to be more reasonable</p>	<p>II.C.1.i</p>
<p>(5) the effect of the proposed facility, or a suitable modification thereof, in making efficient use of resources;</p>	<p>addressed in environmental report</p>	<p>II.D</p>
<p>B. a more reasonable and prudent alternative to the proposed facility has not been demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence on the record, considering:</p>		
<p>(1) the appropriateness of the size, the type, and the timing of the proposed facility compared to those of reasonable alternatives;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the proposed Project's size is not excessive and therefore is reasonable; • the proposed Project's type is reasonable; • that the timing of the proposed Project is reasonable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • II.B.1.i; • II.B.1.ii; • II.B.1.iii.
<p>(2) the cost of the proposed facility and the cost of energy to be supplied by the proposed facility compared to the costs of reasonable alternatives and the cost of energy that would be supplied by reasonable alternatives;</p>	<p>that the cost of the proposed Project and the cost of energy to be supplied by the proposed Project is reasonable</p>	<p>II.C.1.ii</p>

Rules and Statutes Addressed in the Comments

Statute or Rule Citation	Department Comment	Location
<p>7849.0120 CRITERIA. A certificate of need must be granted to the applicant on determining that:</p>		
<p>(3) the effects of the proposed facility upon the natural and socioeconomic environments compared to the effects of reasonable alternatives; and</p>	this sub-criterion has been met	II.C.1.iii
<p>(4) the expected reliability of the proposed facility compared to the expected reliability of reasonable alternatives;</p>	this sub-criterion has been met	II.C.2
<p>C. by a preponderance of the evidence on the record, the proposed facility, or a suitable modification of the facility, will provide benefits to society in a manner compatible with protecting the natural and socioeconomic environments, including human health, considering:</p>		
<p>(1) the relationship of the proposed facility, or a suitable modification thereof, to overall state energy needs;</p>	the proposed Project fits the state's overall energy needs	II.A.1.ii
<p>(2) the effects of the proposed facility, or a suitable modification thereof, upon the natural and socioeconomic environments compared to the effects of not building the facility;</p>	addressed in environmental report	II.D
<p>(3) the effects of the proposed facility, or a suitable modification thereof, in inducing future development; and</p>	addressed in environmental report	II.D
<p>(4) the socially beneficial uses of the output of the proposed facility, or a suitable modification thereof, including its uses to protect or enhance environmental quality; and</p>	addressed in environmental report	II.D
<p>D. the record does not demonstrate that the design construction, or operation of the proposed facility, or a suitable modification of the facility, will fail to comply with relevant policies, rules, and regulations of other state and federal agencies and local governments.</p>	the record at this time does not demonstrate that ... the proposed Project ... will fail to comply	II.E.1
<p>Minnesota Statutes § 216B.243 subd. 3 (9) with respect to a high-voltage transmission line, the benefits of enhanced regional reliability, access, or deliverability to the extent these factors improve the robustness of the transmission system or lower costs for electric consumers in Minnesota</p>	this statute does not apply	N/A

Rules and Statutes Addressed in the Comments

Statute or Rule Citation	Department Comment	Location
<p>7849.0120 CRITERIA. A certificate of need must be granted to the applicant on determining that:</p>		
<p>Minnesota Statutes §§ 216B.243 subd. 3a & 216B.2422, subd. 4 The Commission may not issue a certificate of need under this section for a large energy facility that generates electric power by means of a nonrenewable energy source, or that transmits electric power generated by means of a nonrenewable energy source, unless the applicant for the certificate has demonstrated to the Commission's satisfaction that it has explored the possibility of generating power by means of renewable energy sources and has demonstrated that the alternative selected is less expensive (including environmental costs) than power generated by a renewable energy source</p>	the proposed Project meets a renewable preference	II.B.2
<p>Minnesota Statutes § 216B.2426 The Commission shall ensure that opportunities for the installation of distributed generation, as that term is defined in section 216B.169, subdivision 1, paragraph (c), are considered</p>	the requirement to consider distributed generation has been met	II.C.3
<p>Minnesota Statutes § 216B.1694, subd. 2 (a) (4) An innovative energy project...shall, prior to the approval by the commission of any arrangement to build or expand a fossil-fueled generation facility, or to enter into an agreement to purchase capacity or energy from such a facility for a term exceeding five years, be considered as a supply option for the generation facility, and the commission shall ensure such consideration and take any action with respect to such supply proposal that it deems to be in the best interest of ratepayers;</p>	this statute does not apply	II.C.4
<p>Minnesota Statutes § 216B.243 subd. 3 (10) Compliance with § 216B.1691 whether the applicant or applicants are in compliance with applicable provisions of sections 216B.1691 and 216B.2425, subdivision 7...</p>	this statute does not apply	II.E.3
<p>Minnesota Statutes § 216B.243, subd. 3 (12) if the applicant is proposing a nonrenewable generating plant, the applicant's assessment of the risk of environmental costs and regulation on that proposed facility over the expected useful life of the plant, including a proposed means of allocating costs associated with that risk</p>	this statute does not apply	II.E.4

Rules and Statutes Addressed in the Comments

Statute or Rule Citation	Department Comment	Location
<p>7849.0120 CRITERIA. A certificate of need must be granted to the applicant on determining that:</p>		
<p>Minnesota Statutes § 216B.243, subd. 3 (10) Compliance with § 216B.2425, subd. 7 whether the applicant or applicants are in compliance with applicable provisions of sections 216B.1691 and 216B.2425, subdivision 7...</p>	<p>this statute does not apply</p>	<p>II.E.5</p>
<p>Minnesota Statutes § 216H.03 on and after August 1, 2009, no person shall construct within the state a new large energy facility that would contribute to statewide power sector carbon dioxide emissions</p>	<p>the proposed Project will not contribute to statewide power sector CO₂ emissions</p>	<p>II.E.6</p>

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Sharon Ferguson, hereby certify that I have this day, served copies of the following document on the attached list of persons by electronic filing, certified mail, e-mail, or by depositing a true and correct copy thereof properly enveloped with postage paid in the United States Mail at St. Paul, Minnesota.

Minnesota Department of Commerce
Comments

Docket No. IP7053/CN-21-112

Dated this 8th day of **March 2022**

/s/Sharon Ferguson

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
A	Branam	abranam@arevonenergy.com	Arevon	8800 N Gainey Center Dr Ste 250 Scottsdale, AZ 85258	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_21-112_Official CC Service List
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	OFF_SL_21-112_Official CC Service List
Jeremy	Duehr	jduehr@fredlaw.com	Fredrikson & Byron, P.A.	200 South Sixth Street Suite 4000 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-1125	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_21-112_Official CC Service List
Kate	Fairman	kate.frantz@state.mn.us	Department of Natural Resources	Box 32 500 Lafayette Rd St. Paul, MN 551554032	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_21-112_Official CC Service List
Annie	Felix Gerth	annie.felix-gerth@state.mn.us		Board of Water & Soil Resources 520 Lafayette Rd Saint Paul, MN 55155	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_21-112_Official CC Service List
Sharon	Ferguson	sharon.ferguson@state.mn.us	Department of Commerce	85 7th Place E Ste 280 Saint Paul, MN 551012198	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_21-112_Official CC Service List
Jacqueline	Foley	jfoley@arevonenergy.com	Arevon	8800 N Gainey Center Dr Ste 250 Scottsdale, AZ 85258	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_21-112_Official CC Service List
Kyle	Gerking	kgerking@tenaska.com	Tenaska, Inc.	14302 Fnb Pkwy Omaha, NE 68154	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_21-112_Official CC Service List
Kari	Howe	kari.howe@state.mn.us	DEED	332 Minnesota St, #E200 1ST National Bank Bldg St. Paul, MN 55101	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_21-112_Official CC Service List
Breann	Jurek	bjurek@fredlaw.com	Fredrikson & Byron PA	200 South Sixth St Ste 400 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_21-112_Official CC Service List

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Ray	Kirsch	Raymond.Kirsch@state.mn.us	Department of Commerce	85 7th Place E Ste 500 St. Paul, MN 55101	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_21-112_Official CC Service List
Karen	Kromar	karen.kromar@state.mn.us	MN Pollution Control Agency	520 Lafayette Rd Saint Paul, MN 55155	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_21-112_Official CC Service List
Chris	Matthews	cmatthews@arevonenergy.com	Arevon	8800 N Gainey Center Dr Ste 250 Scottsdale, AZ 85258	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_21-112_Official CC Service List
James	Mortenson	james.mortenson@state.mn.us	Office of Administrative Hearings	PO BOX 64620 St. Paul, MN 55164-0620	Electronic Service	Yes	OFF_SL_21-112_Official CC Service List
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	OFF_SL_21-112_Official CC Service List
Stephan	Roos	stephan.roos@state.mn.us	MN Department of Agriculture	625 Robert St N Saint Paul, MN 55155-2538	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_21-112_Official CC Service List
Michael	Roth	MRoth@tenaska.com	Tenaska, Inc.	14302 Fnb Pkwy Omaha, NE 68154	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_21-112_Official CC Service List
Joe	Sedarski	joe.sedarski@westwoodps.com	Westwood	12701 Whiewater Dr Ste 300 Minnetonka, MN 55343	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_21-112_Official CC Service List
Will	Seuffert	Will.Seuffert@state.mn.us	Public Utilities Commission	121 7th PI E Ste 350 Saint Paul, MN 55101	Electronic Service	Yes	OFF_SL_21-112_Official CC Service List

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Janet	Shaddix Elling	jshaddix@janetshaddix.com	Shaddix And Associates	7400 Lyndale Ave S Ste 190 Richfield, MN 55423	Electronic Service	Yes	OFF_SL_21-112_Official CC Service List
Sean	Sosa	ssosa@arevonenergy.com	Arevon	8800 N Gainey Center Dr Ste 250 Scottsdale, AZ 85258	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_21-112_Official CC Service List
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	OFF_SL_21-112_Official CC Service List

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Sarah	Beimers	sarah.beimers@state.mn.us	Department of Administration - State Historic Preservation Office	50 Sherburne Avenue Suite 203 St. Paul, MN 55155	Electronic Service	No	SPL_SL_CN - CERTIFICATE OF NEEDS
David	Bell	david.bell@state.mn.us	Department of Health	POB 64975 St. Paul, MN 55164	Electronic Service	No	SPL_SL_CN - CERTIFICATE OF NEEDS
Randall	Doneen	randall.doneen@state.mn.us	Department of Natural Resources	500 Lafayette Rd, PO Box 25 Saint Paul, MN 55155	Electronic Service	No	SPL_SL_CN - CERTIFICATE OF NEEDS
Kate	Fairman	kate.frantz@state.mn.us	Department of Natural Resources	Box 32 500 Lafayette Rd St. Paul, MN 551554032	Electronic Service	No	SPL_SL_CN - CERTIFICATE OF NEEDS
Annie	Felix Gerth	annie.felix-gerth@state.mn.us		Board of Water & Soil Resources 520 Lafayette Rd Saint Paul, MN 55155	Electronic Service	No	SPL_SL_CN - CERTIFICATE OF NEEDS
Todd	Green	Todd.A.Green@state.mn.us	Minnesota Department of Labor & Industry	443 Lafayette Rd N St. Paul, MN 55155-4341	Electronic Service	No	SPL_SL_CN - CERTIFICATE OF NEEDS
Kari	Howe	kari.howe@state.mn.us	DEED	332 Minnesota St, #E200 1ST National Bank Bldg St. Paul, MN 55101	Electronic Service	No	SPL_SL_CN - CERTIFICATE OF NEEDS
Ray	Kirsch	Raymond.Kirsch@state.mn.us	Department of Commerce	85 7th Place E Ste 500 St. Paul, MN 55101	Electronic Service	No	SPL_SL_CN - CERTIFICATE OF NEEDS
Chad	Konickson	chad.konickson@usace.army.mil	U.S.Army Corps of Engineers	180 5th St # 700 Saint Paul, MN 55101	Electronic Service	No	SPL_SL_CN - CERTIFICATE OF NEEDS
Stacy	Kotch Egstad	Stacy.Kotch@state.mn.us	MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	395 John Ireland Blvd. St. Paul, MN 55155	Electronic Service	No	SPL_SL_CN - CERTIFICATE OF NEEDS

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Karen	Kromar	karen.kromar@state.mn.us	MN Pollution Control Agency	520 Lafayette Rd Saint Paul, MN 55155	Electronic Service	No	SPL_SL_CN - CERTIFICATE OF NEEDS
Dawn S	Marsh	dawn_marsh@fws.gov	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Minnesota-Wisconsin Field Offices 4101 American Blvd E Bloomington, MN 55425	Electronic Service	No	SPL_SL_CN - CERTIFICATE OF NEEDS
Stephan	Roos	stephan.roos@state.mn.us	MN Department of Agriculture	625 Robert St N Saint Paul, MN 55155-2538	Electronic Service	No	SPL_SL_CN - CERTIFICATE OF NEEDS
Jayne	Trusty	execdir@swrdc.org	SWRDC	2401 Broadway Ave #1 Slayton, MN 56172	Electronic Service	No	SPL_SL_CN - CERTIFICATE OF NEEDS
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	SPL_SL_CN - CERTIFICATE OF NEEDS
Kenneth	Westlake	westlake.kenneth@epa.gov	US Environmental Protection Agency	Environmental Planning & Evaluation Unit 77 W Jackson Blvd. Mailstop B-19J Chicago, IL 60604-3590	Electronic Service	No	SPL_SL_CN - CERTIFICATE OF NEEDS
Alan	Whipple	sa.property@state.mn.us	Minnesota Department Of Revenue	Property Tax Division 600 N. Robert Street St. Paul, MN 551463340	Electronic Service	No	SPL_SL_CN - CERTIFICATE OF NEEDS
Jonathan	Wolfgram	Jonathan.Wolfgram@state.mn.us	Office of Pipeline Safety	445 Minnesota St Ste 147 Woodbury, MN 55125	Electronic Service	No	SPL_SL_CN - CERTIFICATE OF NEEDS