

Appendix A

Comments on the Draft EIS and Responses

This appendix contains the written and verbal comments received on the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Mankato to Mississippi River 345 kV Transmission Line Project (project), and responses to these comments by Department of Commerce, Energy Environmental Review and Analysis (EERA) staff. The draft EIS was issued May 5, 2025. Comments on the draft were solicited through public meetings and a public comment period. The public comment period ended on June 10, 2025.

A total of 58 written comments were received during this time from individuals, agencies, and organizations.

During this same public comment period, the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (Commission) held public and evidentiary hearings on the project. Comments were also made on the draft EIS during these hearings.

Written Comments

Written public comments and EERA's responses to those comments are compiled and presented in the attached comment-response table. Some of the responses include modifications to the EIS, as indicated in the responses. Modifications to the text of the EIS are denoted by a vertical line in the margin next to the text that has been modified.

The comment-response table is arranged by comment ID, which corresponds to the name of the agency, organization, company, or individual commenting. The first attached table is alphabetized by the name of each agency, organization, and company first, and then by each individual's last name. The corresponding comment ID that is associated with each name can be used to identify particular comments and responses in the second table, the comment-response table.

Verbal Comments

During the draft EIS comment period, the public was invited to provide verbal comments at in-person and virtual public meetings/hearings. These hearings occurred in Mankato (on the 27th), Waterville (27th), Owatonna (28th), Zumbrota (28th), and Faribault (29th), as well as virtually on the 29th.

Comments made on the draft EIS during the public hearings not answered during the hearings are answered in this appendix. These public hearing comments (comment ID's 59-77) and responses are included in this appendix.

Last Name	First Name	Additional names	Organization Name	Comment ID	eDocket ID
Thilges	Ryan		Blue Earth County Public Works Department	58	20256-219968-01
Gauthier	Tom		Cedarpointe Partners LLC	28	20256-219705-01
Chase	Michael		Citizens for Environmental Rights and Safety (CFERS)	7	20255-219426-01
Bromeland	Jennifer		City of Eagle Lake	53	20256-219821-01
Willie	Liz		City of Madison Lake	26	20255-219331-01
Sonnenberg	Carl		City of Waseca	42	20256-219788-02
Cornelius	Lauren		Dodge County (Director of Environmental Services)	67	Owatonna hearing
Cornelius	Lauren		Dodge County Environmental Services	36	20256-219808-01
Eichhorst	Ryland		Mayor of Oronoco	8	20255-219440-01
Eichhorst	Ryland		Mayor of Oronoco	46	20256-219788-03
Eichhorst	Ryland		Mayor of Oronoco	47	20256-219788-03
Bump	Samantha		Minnesota Department of Natural Resources	30	20256-219807-01
Egstad	Stacy Kotch		Minnesota Department of Transportation	10	20253-216230-01
Egstad	Stacy Kotch		Minnesota Department of Transportation	41	20256-219799-01
Just	David		RAMS Model Airplane Club	76	Zumbrota hearing
Van Norman	Eric		Rochester Aero Model Society (RAMS)	27	20253-216353-01
Van Norman	Eric		Rochester Aero Model Society (RAMS)	44	20256-219788-03
Thompson	Dustin		Thompson's Garage Door and Openers Company	48	20256-219788-03
Agnew	Lauren	Jessica Livingston	Vegetation Management Planning Working Group	43	20256-219785-01
Christopherson	Doug		Waseca County Board of Commissioners, Chair	42F	20256-219788-02
Staloch	Ann		Waseca Economic Development Authority	42A	20256-219788-02
Beschnett	Bill		West Interchange Group, LLC	42C	20256-219788-02

Last Name	First Name	Additional names	Organization Name	Comment ID	eDocket ID
Heine	Ellen		Xcel Energy	57	20256-219810-01
Allen	Jeanne			33	20256-219770-01
Barajas	Luis			1	20255-219442-01
Barajas	Luis			69	Zumbrota hearing
Bauer	Shirley			65	Owatonna hearing
Berg	Tamra			2	20256-219417-01
Brandt	Nathan			39	20256-219809-01
Brown	Michael and Christine			3	20256-219551-01
Bultman	Christopher			34	20256-219759-01
Burandt	Paul			72	Zumbrota hearing
Bye	Jean			4	20255-219331-02
Byron	Don			42D	20256-219788-02
Cariveau	Gordon and Yvonne			6	20255-219439-01
Collins	Michael and Julie			5	20256-219657-01
Condes	Scott			9	20255-219438-01
Glorvigen	Erin			35	20256-219768-01
Glorvigen	Erin			37	20256-219803-01
Grivna	Shane			73	Zumbrota hearing
Guentzel	Erin			60	Mankato hearing
Hanson	Shawna			12	20256-219572-01
Hart	Andy			13	20256-219571-01
Hassler	Virginia			71	Zumbrota hearing
Henslin	Gary			56	20256-219820-01
Jacobs	Mark			11	20256-219545-01
Just	Angela			15	20256-219570-01
Knutson	Zach			55	20256-219818-01
Knutson	Keith			70	Zumbrota hearing
Knutson	Zach			75	Zumbrota hearing
Krause	Harley and Diane			16	20255-219444-01
Kuehl	Matthew			14	20256-219605-01
Langr	Paul			74	Zumbrota hearing
Laures	Leonard			51	20256-219788-03
Mattson	Jeff			31	20256-219655-01
Mattson	Jeff			32	20256-219704-01
Mattson	Jeannie			54	20256-219817-01
Melhorn	Lori			38	20256-219788-01
Mueller	Kathryn			17	20256-219543-01
Negebauer	Peter			64	Owatonna hearing

Last Name	First Name	Additional names	Organization Name	Comment ID	eDocket ID
O'Conner	Wayne			42B	20256-219788-02
Overland	Carol	Nancy Prehn cc on comment		18	20255-218810-01
Overland	Carol	Nancy Prehn cc on comment		19	20255-218922-0
Overland	Carol	Prehn Family		40	20256-219811-01
Overland	Carol			62	Waterville hearing
Quaale	Loren			52	20256-219788-03
Quinlan	Kevin			29	20256-219703-01
Sammo	Tom			77	Faribault hearing
Sammon	Tom			21	20255-219434-01
Schmidt	Sarah			22	20256-219573-01
Schmidt	Todd			42E	20256-219788-02
Schulz	Lori and Joyce			20	20255-219436-01
Sheady	Dan			49	20256-219788-03
Smith	Doug			66	Owatonna hearing
Stadsvold	Bard			23	20256-219553-01
Strand	Paul			68	Zumbrota hearing
Taylor	Brady and Jennifer			24	20255-219330-01
Taylor	Brady			61	Waterville hearing
Thomforde	Dale			25	20255-219416-01
Tolzman	Harry			59	Mankato hearing
Weber	Paul			45	20256-219788-03
Zimmerman	Randy			63	Owatonna hearing

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
1	20255-219442-01	Looking at the preferred 161 kV line along 75th St. is going to go right next to quite a few million dollar homes. From 18th St. all the way to the Zumbro River. My vote and all of my neighbors would be the alternative route. Or better yet put it underground Like most of the major countries in the world who would want to buy a million dollar home next to a giant transmission line?	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning aesthetics are discussed in Sections 5.5.1, 6.5.1, 7.5.1, 9.5.1, and 10.5.1 of the EIS. Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning property values are discussed in Sections 5.5.7, 6.5.7, 7.5.7, 9.5.7, and 10.5.7 of the EIS. Appendix I provides a Property Value Supplement. System alternatives to the project, such as placement underground, are discussed in Chapter 4 of the EIS.
2	20256-219417-01	Berg Family Farms is a 5th generation farm in Goodhue County. Farming is our livelihood. According to the preferred route, the transmission line will slice through our farmland in Cherry Grove township. This is prime farmland.	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning agriculture/farming are discussed in Sections 5.7.1, 6.7.1, 7.7.1, 9.7.1, and 10.7.1 of the EIS.
2	20256-219417-01	At the Zumbrota meeting I attended I didn't hear what the NEED is from Xcel.	Construction of a large energy facility in Minnesota requires a certificate of need from the Commission (Minnesota Statute § 216B.243). The applicant filed a joint certificate of need and route permit application on April 2, 2024. Project need is discussed in Chapter 4 of the application: https://www.edockets.state.mn.us/documents/%7B00CD9F8E-0000-C621-8B0C-0A9959360AEE%7D/download?contentSequence=0&rowIndex=232 and Section 4.1 of the EIS.
2	20256-219417-01	I find it disheartening that those of us impacted by the transmission line will not receive any benefit from that transmission line. We get our electricity from Goodhue County Coop. Many of us affected chose to live/work in a rural area or community and now we have to sacrifice what we have for the benefit of those who have no idea of what living in the country even is. We must remember we cannot make anymore farmland!!	Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning agriculture/farming are discussed in Sections 5.7.1, 6.7.1, 7.7.1, 9.7.1, and 10.7.1 of the EIS.
3	20256-219551-01	We are writing to express our favor for the preferred route and our opposition to the alternate route for Segment 2 of the 345 kV transmission line project, referenced in Docket Numbers CN- 22-532 and TL-23-157.	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Your route preference has been noted.
3	20256-219551-01	The alternate route, as currently proposed, would pass within approximately 270 feet of our home. This proximity raises serious concerns about the diminished value of our property due to the presence of the transmission line. The potential visual and auditory impacts, coupled with public perception of health risks associated with high-voltage power lines, contribute to a significant reduction in property value and quality of life.	Chapters 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10 of the EIS discuss and compare potential impacts and mitigation measures associated with human settlement, including aesthetic, noise, and property value impacts.
3	20256-219551-01	We urge the Commission to consider the negative impact this alternate route would have on residential properties and the surrounding environment. The preferred route was designed to minimize these impacts by avoiding densely populated areas and preserving the integrity of local communities.	Chapters 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10 of the EIS discuss and compare potential impacts and mitigation measures associated with human settlement, health and safety, land-based economies, archeological and historic resources, and the natural environment.
3	20256-219551-01	We respectfully request that the Commission stay with the preferred route and not consider the proposed alternate route for Segment 2 and prioritize a path that mitigates our concerns. Thank you for your attention to this matter. We look forward to your response and appreciate your commitment to serving the public interest.	Your route preference has been noted.

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
4	20255-219331-02	<p>Relative to segment 1, I would strongly urge Xcel and the commission to select the route following the highway 14 corridor for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) While highway 14 is not the most direct or cheapest route, it is the most equitable route. The higher initial capital cost will be rightfully spread across the users of the electricity and not put on the backs of the property owners through decreased property values. It is neither fair nor equitable to expect the property owners to lose both their enjoyment and their value to save on initial capital costs for the energy users when a "corridor of disruption" already exists for infrastructure along highways. 2) In many cases the higher initial capital cost will be offset by: A) easier access for repairs and upkeep, B) tree trimming is already occurring along the highway corridor. 3) We are currently seeing many of these high voltage transmission projects successfully run along highways such as the new line that was strung along interstate 94 in west central Minnesota. Another example is the very large power infrastructure through urban areas along highway 169 in Shakopee. Highway corridors are the place to put this infrastructure. It is property already in a high density or "disrupted" situation. 4) Highway corridors are the strategy for the future. Much like urban planners fight against urban sprawl and pressure mounts to set aside land to not be developed, a progressive view of the future will have us not take the cheapest route, but rather plan for the future and concentrate infrastructure into corridors and leave rural and farmland as rural. 5) The value of agricultural land is undervalued. It has the same potential for being developed as all other land and it should be looked at as such. Farmland should be valued the same as residential and buildable lots. 	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Your preference for Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14 Option) has been noted. The EIS discusses following existing rights-of-way. Minnesota Rule 7850.4100 requires the Commission to consider use or paralleling of existing rights-of-way, survey lines, natural division lines, and agricultural field boundaries. Minnesota Statute 216E, subdivision 7(e), states that the Commission must consider routing a high voltage transmission line along an existing high voltage transmission line or highway right-of-way and to the extent these are not used it must state the reasons why. Cost is also a factor but not the only factor. Costs would not necessarily be distributed or offset as implied.</p>
4	20255-219331-02	<p>Regarding docket number CN-22-532. The matter of the application for a certificate of need for the Mankato to Mississippi River 345kV Transmission project in southern Minnesota.</p> <p>I am sure that Xcel has done adequate due diligence to support the need for additional energy being added to the grid and I would not take exception to that. We are an energy hungry society.</p> <p>I would take this opportunity to express a concern about our overall energy sources and strategy. I am concerned at how it seems our energy generation is moving further and further from the areas that consume it. As that distance increases the energy lost over transmission lines also increases, the infrastructure needed to carry that power increases, and the upkeep of that infrastructure increases. We are creating a power system that 1) is more fragile than in the past, and 2) has a much bigger environmental impact in many ways that we are currently not assigning a value.</p> <p>You cannot drive around our rural land without power infrastructure marring nature. Huge windmill and solar farms are everywhere. As the metropolitan areas demand more and more power, the rural areas are being asked to give up and devalue their land and their nature to feed this monster. We are losing the beauty of our country.</p> <p>Someday history will look back at this and wonder why we created these systems of generation so far from consumption. When you review the entire supply chain starting with producing the materials needed for the solar farms and the power poles; are we being as green as we like to think we are? In going green we are building a system where the manufacturing and maintaining of the green infrastructure itself is detracting from the end goal of green.</p> <p>We will know we are green when we do a better job of incorporating the sources of energy into the users of energy. Imagine investing in the development of technology that is incorporated into the windows and walls of skyscrapers that captures the sun or the wind to provide power to that skyscraper.</p> <p>My point being – I lack confidence that this transmission line like many projects is required because we are not thinking big enough in sources and uses of energy. We need more energy, but what is the best, greenest way to do it. Having run an iron foundry I know how much energy is consumed to produce this infrastructure and wonder if we wouldn't do less damage to our planet if we found the cleanest way possible to burn natural gas, or the best way to incorporate green into building materials because I lack confidence that our current remote solar and wind farms and accompanying structure are actually reducing our emissions when you factor in all of the factors.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>System alternatives to the project, such as peaking generation rather and distributed generation, are addressed in Chapter 4 of the EIS.</p>

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
5	20256-219657-01	We are Michael H. And Julie S. Collins and we live at: 12036 11th Ave. NE Rochester, Minnesota 55906. Our home is located in what you refer to as the Alignment Alternative area in Oronoco Township. Presently, Our Home is located dangerously close to these power lines. We have lived here since 1988 and these power lines were built decades later on our neighbors land along our contiguous fenceline. These power lines currently run 100 feet from the front door of our home. After researching this matter I have found that our home resides closer to these power lines than any other dwelling along the entire route. At the time these power lines were first built, we were told that we were not eligible for a buy out from Excel Energy because these lines were not on our property. Now we are suffering from serious health issues directly related to the Electro Magnetic field that these power lines emit. We were wrongfully informed by Representatives from Excel energy at the time when these lines were initially built. Now we are suffering immensely. Any additional increase in kilovolts will be fatal. We ask for your consideration now and before we hire expert legal counsel in this field of law.	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Your residence is shown on Map 66-28 and was measured as being approximately 214 feet from the existing transmission line (Segment 3). The CapX Co-Locate Option would be south of the existing line, so further away from your residence (approximately 320 feet away). As such, your residence is accounted for in Table 10-1 as one of the residences within 250 to 500 feet of the centerline of the Segment 4 CapX Co-Locate Option. Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning human health and safety are discussed in Sections 5.6, 6.6, 7.6, 9.6, and 10.6 of the EIS.
6	20255-219439-01	Me and my 83 year old mother are opposed to the Segment 4 east route thru the City of Oronoco, especially the route that cuts south of HWY 52, for what looks like 2-3 miles. It makes no sense to the south of Hwy 52. Where it crosses over Hwy 52 to the south the right back to the north of Hwy 52. The proposed route puts a pole right in our front yard - of the house and commercial building.	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Your opposition to Segment 4 East has been noted.
6	20255-219439-01	The ground below is solid limestone, the topographical of the land is up and down in this area, with a cliff by the river, low land that is a virtual highway for deer, ducks, geese, fox, ground hogs, racoons, every type of animal you can imagine lives in this low land near the river.	Potential impacts and mitigation measures to geology and topography are discussed in Section 10.9.3 of the EIS. Potential impacts and mitigation measures to wildlife are discussed in Section 10.9.12 of the EIS.
6	20255-219439-01	The property to the north is a private RV park, Allen acres, has a RV parking, pavilion, picnic benches, all nicely landscaped like a park. Speaking of parks, I believe the City of Oronoco also has a planned future park for the area to the south of our property to the river.	The park within the City of Oronoco and potential plans for its development are discussed in Section 10.5.5.1.2 of the EIS.
6	20255-219439-01	Economically this project is already effecting our leasing the commercial building due to the uncertainty of the route. Our family has already had to give up 2.7 acres due to the right of way for the over pass at Hwy 52 and 5th St. which has no exits, and now exits are 1 mile in either direction from our property. So if this power line is placed right in front of our home and building it will be a death sentence to our leasing our building and our lively hood. It would also take the only piece of property to build a new home or building - so I would like to see the MN PUC approve the Segment 4 West, the Xcels proposed route that to my understanding can double circuit on the current lines.	Comment noted.
6	20255-219439-01	I believe the reason the south/north across Hwy 52 was only to avoid the Prairie Island Tribe on the north side of Hwy 52. And didn't take into account the environmental impacts on the wildlife or our property. Please use Segment 4 West.	Your preference for Segment 4 West has been noted.
7	20255-219426-01	Citizens For Environmental Rights & Safety (CFERS) continues to maintain that Route Segment 17 (aka "Hwy 14 ROW Route") is BY FAR the most equitable and fair siting route IF this project is approved. Note the big "IF".....read further on the next page to see why.	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Your preference for Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14 Option) has been noted.
7	20255-219426-01	Xcel Energy's stated preferred route (Route 1 and Route 2) was quoted at \$341.9 Million and Route Segment 17 at \$397.1 Million by Mr. Tony Wendland in his Surrebuttal Testimony of May 19, 2025. The \$55.2 Million delta between the comparable options is 16%, however the Draft EIS does not provide sufficient detail to allow one to examine the assumptions made and the basis of the computations. For example, it was stated that there were 347 residences within 500 ft of the centerline for Route Segment 17 compared to 117 for preferred Segment Routes 1 & 2. Due to the wide expanse of the Hwy 14 ROW, further information is needed to assess the validity of this assertion. CFERS' expectation is that the 345 kV line would be judiciously routed away from such residences—within the ROW—perhaps across the median to a better tower siting without such infringement—as was done on MN HWY #25 west of Belle Plaine, MN. In addition, COST is not the primary ranking criteria! Is there a defined "cost" of a ravaged rural environment? Or a "cost" of the limitation to the full use of one's property? Or perhaps the "cost" of diminished property values caused by this project being built?	Cost is one of 14 factors the Commission considers when making a decision on a route permit per Minnesota Rules 7850.4100 and as discussed in Section 2.2.1 of the EIS. Proximity to residences is included in Table 7-4 and Table 8-1 of the EIS both from the perspective of the total number of residences within the route width as well as the total number of residences within a 500-foot buffer of the anticipated alignment of Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14 Option). As described in the EIS, pole placement or even ROW overlapping with the Highway ROW is not always permittable.
7	20255-219426-01	Another concern is that MN DOT stated they have "unplanned future projects" that would be adversely affected by having a 345 kV transmission line routed in their domain! So, it appears we have a MN State department defending their fiefdom, though a recently passed state law says that these type of projects NEED to be allowed to be there! Is it more acceptable to execute EMINENT DOMAIN on small Goodhue and Rice County farmers who will be forever dramatically affected by 150 foot-wide clear-cuts of their windbreaks and wildlife habitats?	The EIS discusses following existing rights-of-way. Minnesota Rule 7850.4100 requires the Commission to consider use or paralleling of existing rights-of-way, survey lines, natural division lines, and agricultural field boundaries. Minnesota Statute 216E, subdivision 7(e), states that the Commission must consider routing a high voltage transmission line along an existing high voltage transmission line or highway right-of-way and to the extent these are not used it must state the reasons why.

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
7	20255-219426-01	Regarding the impact to small farms in the preferred route, the EIS does not QUANTIFY the acreage of properties for EACH parcel in the proposed route. In addition, EACH parcel in the proposed preferred route does not show the permanent loss of trees and wildlife habitat destroyed by the clearcut mandate of 150 ft width, centered under the proposed transmission line. CFERS respectfully requests The Honorable Administrative Law Judge Ann C. O'Reilly REQUIRE Xcel publish in the Environmental Impact Study: a) the acreage of each parcel impacted by the ROW of this project and b) the planned clearcut destruction for each parcel. Xcel should stop quoting "averages", noting USDA provides farm statistics by decile--far more useful than the "average values" for the acreages of counties quoted by the applicant. The "shape of the statistical curve" is more informative of the truth of the data, than the average.	Chapters 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10 of the EIS discuss and compare potential impacts and mitigation measures associated with human settlement, health and safety, land-based economies, archeological and historic resources, and the natural environment. The EIS is intended to characterize the potential resource impacts across the various routing options. The EIS is to remain unbiased with respect to individual parcels and properties. Comparing impacts on an individual property along one route option to impacts on an individual property along a different route option would not provide a useful approach to assist with informed decision making.
7	20255-219426-01	Regarding stated intent to site the transmission line down adjoining property lines, this has great potential harm to jointly-owned/shared drain tile lines and drain fields which have existed in some cases for many decades as sections of farmland were broken-up and sold off. CFERS recommends that Xcel be required to identify which properties in their preferred routes have such shared assets extending beyond the affected parcels.	Parsing out impacts by a parcel-specific basis is outside the scope of the EIS. The Route Permit (refer to Appendix H) would include the following conditions: The Permittee shall avoid, promptly repair, or replace all drainage tiles broken or damaged during all phases of the Transmission Facility's life unless otherwise negotiated with the affected landowner. The Permittee shall keep records of compliance with this section and provide them at the request of Commission staff.
7	20255-219426-01	The recent admission that 1,341 landowners were only recently notified that their property may be affected by this 345 kV Transmission Line project is totally unbelievable! It causes one to wonder what other oversights or assumptions were made—or if certain predetermined conclusions had already been made about the Route Segment 17!	Mailings sent to landowners (including those along the Route Segment 17 Hwy 14 Option) after scoping included a January 31 letter from the applicant and a May 13 letter from PUC. The applicant's January 31, 2025, letter provided information about the project, information on how to submit public comments, and a map of all of the route and alignment alternatives being studied in the EIS (refer to docket ID number 20255-218883-01). The PUC's May 13, 2025 letter provided notice of the public hearings and provided information regarding the DEIS comment period.
7	20255-219426-01	Solicitations by several wind turbine developers have been received by rural landowners in the 2S "Preferred" Route area—some many months prior to the Xcel announcement of their preferred route. A coincidence? Is this a version of the "Field of Dreams" tactic of "build it (transmission line) and they (wind turbines) will come"? There were statements in the draft of the EIS that Segment Route 17 did not "...allow the potential for a future 345 kV connection into the West Faribault Substation to support greater renewable generation in this area" (Direct Testimony and Schedules, Ellen Heine; p 16; 20253-216972-01; 28 March 2025). There appears to be a connection between the solicitations by wind turbine developers and Ms Heine's testimony. This brings us to the question of "NEED" vs "WANT" for this project. There is a strong suspicion here that this project is simply "WANTED" to enable someone's renewable energy mandate. Put another way, if this Mankato-Mississippi River 345 kV project can be approved, it will create a new transmission line highway for more wind-turbines and solar farms. No one has seen any QUANTIFIABLE benefits to be achieved by landowners that will be burdened by the construction of this transmission line!	<p>The purpose of the project is to construct an HVTL to provide additional transmission capacity to reduce congestion and to improve electric system reliability throughout the region as more renewable energy resources are added to the high voltage transmission system. The project is needed as part of a broader regional solution to reduce thermal loading, enable future generation, and improve transfer voltage stability.</p> <p>The project does not include any proposed generation along the HVTL at this time.</p> <p>Section 3.2.2 of the EIS states: "The West Faribault Substation is located between Segment 1 and Segment 2. As noted in the joint certificate of need application and route permit application, these segments are near the existing substation but are not interconnected to it. The application also notes that the project is designed with options to accommodate future expansion by routing these segments near this substation so that in the future, the 345 kV line could be connected to the West Faribault Substation. This could occur if better connections to the backbone 345 kV line are required to accommodate the needs on lower voltage transmission systems in the area."</p> <p>The EIS also notes in Section 3.1.3, that "if the Commission permitted Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14 Option), a possible connection from it to the West Faribault Substation could be required. This new line would be approximately 15 miles in length between Owatonna and Faribault and would be the subject of a separate permit application and environmental review process. The timing for this potential need could be within 10 to 15 years and would be based on a need to connect the 345 kV system to the West Faribault Substation (Appendix E)."</p> <p>Any future generation developments would be required to obtain an interconnection agreement and siting requirements under Minnesota Statute. The project need is not predicated on future conditions.</p>

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
7	20255-219426-01	<p>There are concerns about MISO/MN PUC interactions. MISO is an advisory board, as we understand it---and the MN PUC has oversight regarding MN utility projects like this transmission line which have direct impacts to landowners and rate-payers. We have a view that this Mankato-Mississippi 345 kV Transmission Line causes MN landowners to be subjected to loss of control of their properties to enable a utility company to profit by sending power to customers out of state. The burden will be borne by those landowners who have nothing to gain or benefit from this project.</p>	<p>Comment noted. MISO's relevance to the project is described in Section 4.1.1 of the EIS.</p>
7	20255-219426-01	<p>This is why the Hwy 14 ROW Route (aka "Route Segment 17") is the ONLY acceptable route for this project. If it costs more than the preferred route, too bad! The initial cost may be high, but has limited impact to the livelihood of rural MN landowners. Tell MN DOT and Xcel to work out a plan to put it in the ROW of Hwy 14. Let the rate payers—whether in-state or out-of-state—bear the financial burden for this project. The Hwy 14 ROW (aka Route Segment 17) is already condemned, use it! Stop TAKING privately owned agricultural land!</p>	<p>Your preference for Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14 Option) has been noted. As described in Section 3.3.2.1 of the EIS, the project ROW would not be solely contained within the highway ROW throughout the route's full length.</p>
8	20255-219440-01	<p>Potential Impacts with 4E route though Oronoco</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transmission line and poles along Highway 52 could negatively impact Oronoco residents and visitors visiting businesses, residents and parks with the unpleasant view of the many poles, as well as for motorists on 52. -Construction of (19-38) poles ~13,500 ft along Highway 52 on private and public properties would be disruptive and could cause anxiety with residents and business owners. - Aesthetics of the power line through Oronoco can be eliminated by selecting routes that are located away from the 1,802 residents in Oronoco with double-circuiting or paralleling existing transmission lines. <p>(Note - comment includes 4 maps with proposed development).</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. The city of Oronoco's planned developments are discussed in Section 10.5.5.1.2 of the EIS. This section has been updated to address the new developments noted during the Zumbrota public hearing.</p>
9	20255-219438-01	<p>In the area west of Zumbrota and south of MN 60, why the late amendment to add new power poles and lines versus using existing poles? Two sets of poles will be a major impact to valuation of ag land in this area.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. The applicant noted in a May 5, 2025, letter (docket ID number 20255-218608-01) that the Mankato to Mississippi River 345 kV transmission line (i.e., the project) can no longer be double-circuited with the existing line (referred to as the Hampton to North Rochester 345 kV transmission line (Line 0964) because it is anticipated a new line recently approved by the Midcontinent Independent Transmission Operator, Inc. (MISO) as part of its Long Range Transmission Planning (LRTP) Tranche 2.1 involves adding a second 345 kV circuit to the existing.</p>
10	20253-216230-01	<p>The Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) has reviewed the information available on the additional routes alternatives and submits the following comments for Draft EIS consideration.</p> <p>Following the announcement of the official scoping decision, the Applicant participated in MnDOT's Utility Early Notification Memo (ENM) process for review of all proposed route alternative modifications that affect MnDOT interests and right-of-way (ROW).</p> <p>Attachments 1, 2 and 3 detail MnDOT's current understanding of possible impacts, suggested mitigative measures, potential permit limitations/requirements, and other relevant information regarding the reviewed routes.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. The attachments to your letter were also provided with the EIS as Attachment F.</p>
10	20253-216230-01	<p>Route Segment 17 (Highway 14 Option)</p> <p>MnDOT appreciates the route width variance considerations of the Applicant and Energy Environmental Review and Analysis (EERA) staff to allow for routing flexibility with this option. However, these considerations may need to be extended past the seven locations as determined by the Applicant to include areas of concern found by MnDOT during the ENM review process. Current route flexibility considerations may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • planned but currently unfunded trunk highway improvements • pending study completions • planned trunk highway turn backs (maps included in Attachment 3) • existing drainage infrastructure • existing public and MnDOT utility conflicts • control of access1 along most of the planned colocation areas of US 14 • specific areas of safety concern as determined by MnDOT Operations, Traffic, and Maintenance staff 	<p>This correspondence is included in Appendix F of the EIS.</p>

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
10	20253-216230-01	<p>Further, if the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (Commission) selects the extensive colocation option of Route Segment 17, recent changes to Minnesota law require the Applicant submit a Constructability report to MnDOT. Beyond being a legal requirement, the report is essential for MnDOT to assess and mitigate potential impacts on public safety that the route segment may have during construction and after construction.</p> <p>Minn. Stat. § 161.45.6 reads as follows:</p> <p>Subd. 6. High voltage transmission; constructability report; advance notice.</p> <p>(a) If the commissioner and a utility or transmission line developer identify a permittable route along a trunk highway corridor for possible colocation of transmission lines, a constructability report must be prepared by the utility or transmission line developer in consultation with the commissioner. A constructability report developed under this subdivision must be used by both parties to plan and approve colocation projects.</p> <p>(b) A constructability report developed under this section between the commissioner and the parties seeking colocation must include terms and conditions for building the colocation project. Notwithstanding the requirements in subdivision 1, the report must be approved by the commissioner and the party or parties seeking colocation prior to the commissioner approving and issuing a permit for use of the trunk highway right-of-way.</p> <p>(c) A constructability report must include an agreed upon time frame for which there may not be a request from the commissioner for relocation of the transmission line. If the commissioner determines that relocation of a transmission line in the trunk highway right-of-way is necessary, the commissioner, as much as practicable, must give a four-year advance notice.</p> <p>Although the statute does not specify when the Applicant must submit a report to MnDOT or how it should be incorporated into the Commission's record (e.g., required compliance filing, permit condition, or downstream permit inclusion), MnDOT considers the Applicant's legal obligation to complete and submit a Constructability Report, with sufficient time for MnDOT to review, a necessary prerequisite under the statute to confirm Route Segment 17 is permittable before the Commission's final decision.</p>	<p>Section 2.7.3 of the EIS acknowledges the requirement that a constructability report be submitted by the applicant, and the additional detail noted in the comment has been added to this section.</p>
10	20253-216230-01	<p>General MnDOT Permitting Comments</p> <p>Alignments paralleling within or otherwise encroaching on trunk highway ROW will need further review as utility permit approvals cannot be assured without certain specifics not yet provided. Alignments crossing trunk highways should be perpendicular with poles located outside MnDOT ROW to the maximum extent practical and feasible. Exceptions to these crossing preferences will need to be coordinated prior to MnDOT utility permit application submittals.</p> <p>Aside from recent legislative changes allowing certain high-voltage transmission lines permitted via Minn. Stat. § 216I to longitudinally occupy portions of TH ROW not previously allowed by Policy, there are several standing Policies, Manuals and other MnDOT documentation that offer guidelines and limitations to such placements based on safety and the proper function of the highway. Please see Policy and Guidance - Utility Agreements & Permits - MnDOT.</p> <p>Should any of the route alternatives continue to move forward for Commission route permit consideration, continued coordination with MnDOT staff is necessary. Any MnDOT permits required as a part of this Project can be coordinated at an earlier time but may not be issued until the Commission has approved all necessary permits for this project. All applicable permitting, traffic control and construction coordination efforts should be made through the appropriate MnDOT district staff.</p> <p>MnDOT has a continuing interest in working with all parties to ensure that possible impacts to the entire state trunk highway system, safety of the traveling public and MnDOT maintenance personnel, and environmentally significant areas of concern are adequately addressed.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Continued coordination with MnDOT will occur.</p>
11	20256-219545-01	<p>I have easement for North Route 1 and at number meets have request bore sample next to exist pole for possible hazardous material used back in late 1950's early 1960 to treat poles. X-Cel doesn't seem responsive to request as if this route is chosen they just pull poles move on. That could cause major concerns on what was on poles as at that time little known about lead, mercury, arsenic and any number of heavy metals to treat poles. My land has wet lands and streams that are contained in Cannon Valley Watershed. Time to find issues is before route chosen as 2 miles from roads and a lot planking if soil has to be hauled out and in plus excessive at cost to project.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process.</p> <p>Wooden transmission line poles were historically treated with creosote. Potential contamination associated to creosote treated power poles is usually considered de minimis and would not necessitate remediation. If evidence of soil contamination is observed during construction activities, it would be addressed following appropriate regulatory requirements.</p>
11	20256-219545-01	<p>Do not believe X-cel customers should bear cost if X-cel is reselling to other carriers or for large data centers.</p>	<p>Construction of a large energy facility in Minnesota requires a certificate of need from the Commission (Minnesota Statute § 216B.243). The applicant filed a joint certificate of need and route permit application on April 2, 2024. Project need is discussed in Chapter 4 of the application: https://www.edockets.state.mn.us/documents/%7B00CD9F8E-0000-C621-8B0C-0A9959360AEE%7D/download?contentSequence=0&rowIndex=232 and Section 4.1 of the EIS.</p>

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
11	20256-219545-01	Better route would be Highway 14 and can work with State Minnesota as most of highway already bypass cities to Rochester and then still have existing routes for diversity.	Your preference for Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14 Option) has been noted.
11	20256-219545-01	Really need due diligence for lost carbon once expand easements. Need all unknowns resolved before route selected and landowner compensation begins as have dealt with X-Cel before and once project completed they do not consider priority to properly fix problem. They already increased capacity with out telling landowners or puc and will need extra easement if go to full capacity if haven't already done so can only take X-cel word?	Comment noted.
12	20256-219572-01	I am resubmitting my impact statement for judicial review/consideration with regard to Segment 4 of the transmission line that is proposed to run along the south edge of my property. Instead, I propose that this portion of the line be collocated with the existing Cap X transmission line.	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Your preference for the CapX Co-Locate option has been noted.
12	20256-219572-01	First, I have lived in my location for over 11 years now, moving here after my previous property South of Pine Island was affected by the Cap X 2020 transmission line and then subsequently taken for road development (125th Street). My current property runs parallel to 75th Street. I currently have a Dairyland power line running along the ditch at the South side of my property. I have a very unique and beautiful property as do many of my neighbors. My property is especially unique because it consists of a 1923 Tudor style home that was relocated to this acreage site from the Historic Pill Hill area of Rochester (area behind Saint Marys Hospital) in the 1980s. I have a well-established tree line that both camouflages this powerline as well as buffers my property from the extremely busy and loud 75th Street traffic. This tree line has taken many years to develop, and if taken down, will not be able to be replaced as a well-established tree line again during my lifetime. This most certainly will cause a detrimental depreciation to my property's value. However, as worst case scenario, if you decide to use this route, I would, at the very least, request that you please consider constructing your transmission line on the opposite (South side) of 75th Street since there is no consistent or well-groomed tree lines on that side of the highway. The current Dairyland power line runs on the South side of 75th Street at the East side of my property anyways. Not sure why the existing power line was crossed over 75th Street just to the East of my property to continue for such a short way to the West of my property where it then heads to the North at 18th Avenue.	This portion of Route Segment 4 East would double-circuit the existing transmission line along the south side of your property. There is an alignment alternative to bring this part of the alignment to the south side of 75th St. This alignment alternative (AA16) is discussed in Section 10.14.3. Your preference for AA16 over Route Segment 4 East has been noted.
12	20256-219572-01	Secondly, 75th Street is an extremely busy two-lane highway being used to deter Highway 63 traffic around Rochester. Again, this is only a two-lane highway with a very small shoulder space to service a large volume of traffic. In fact, due to the high rate of accidents at the 18th Avenue intersection with 75th Street (just to the West of my property), MNDot has now begun construction on a roundabout at that intersection. I would recommend that you carefully consider the logistics of attempting to construct and maintain this transmission line along a very busy two-lane highway with very little shoulder space.	Comment noted.
12	20256-219572-01	Finally, to both the North and immediate South of my residence is a significant amount of high-end development/construction happening. Hence, the need for the roundabout at the 18th Avenue intersection to accommodate even more anticipated traffic burden on and across the highway. Please consider the significant destruction of aesthetics you are causing to our very expensive, beautiful properties in this area by running this very UGLY transmission line through it.	Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning aesthetics are discussed in Sections 5.5.1, 6.5.1, 7.5.1, 9.5.1, and 10.5.1 of the EIS.
12	20256-219572-01	As a lifelong inhabitant of the Rochester/Oronoco/Pine Island area, PLEASE consider these points that I have thoughtfully presented to you above. Again, with these points in mind, PLEASE consider collocating this Segment 4 section of the transmission line onto the existing Cap X transmission line. This would cause much less disruption and devaluation to all involved. Thank you for your consideration.	Your preference for the CapX Co-Locate option has been noted.
13	20256-219571-01	The current transmission line route will border my parcel either on the north side or the side of the parcel. I prefer to have the transmission border the south side of my farm parcel along 75th St. NE. I do not want the transmission crossing through my farm field and near the neighbors large dairy farm and house for safety reasons. (Note - comment includes map).	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Your preference for Segment 4 East (southern of two options) has been noted. Your opposition to Segment 4 West (northern of two options) has been noted.
14	20256-219605-01	I believe my farm and my farms owned jointly with my brother are in segment 4 west that has now become an alternate route. I have commented and spoke at your first meeting and submitted documents and letters. I must still stand my ground that I do not understand the route ; a route that does not stay to the road but dissects our land in two and also why the property tax assessor is not involved in negotiations. As the use of eminent domain calls for "just compensation" why is taxation not in the equation, as I have no reduction in tax's on my existing utility easements. I am not trying to be a bad neighbor trying to push this off on others or argue the need, but the area this section would cross is kept very natural and as these areas with no infringements disappear from our landscapes, with other easier options available wouldn't it make sense to save this area. I also hope others can enjoy this area "as is" in the future.	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. The EIS discusses following existing rights-of-way. Minnesota Rule 7850.4100 requires the Commission to consider use or paralleling of existing rights-of-way, survey lines, natural division lines, and agricultural field boundaries. Minnesota Statute 216E, subdivision 7(e), states that the Commission must consider routing a high voltage transmission line along an existing high voltage transmission line or highway right-of-way and to the extent these are not used it must state the reasons why. Landowner agreements are outside the scope of this EIS.

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
15	20256-219570-01	<p>Please ask that the applicant include or update the draft EIS with the following information:</p> <p>a. What communications have been made with the City of Rochester, Olmsted County, and/or Minnesota Department of Transportation regarding future plans for the Highway 63/75th Street, which is where the applicant's preferred route is for Segment 4? If the City of Rochester is anticipating future growth such that widening of the road is needed to meet traffic needs, this may impact transmission line placement. How will you ensure that power line placement will not need to be moved in the future to account for highway expansion demands? For example starting June 2, 2025, there is an update being performed at Hwy 63 and Olmsted Co. Rd. 112 intersection to install a roundabout with construction expected to end in late August 2025. Other related MNDOT projects found here: https://www.dot.state.mn.us/d6/projects.html</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Chapter 13 of the EIS includes reference to the planned work at 75th Street. The roundabout is located a half mile away from the anticipated alignment. As noted in the EIS, the permittee would be required to coordinate transportation impacts with county, city, and state road authorities.</p>
15	20256-219570-01	<p>b. What communications have been made with the City of Rochester and those working on the Destination Medical Center (DMC) project when considering growth of the city north of Rochester along Hwy 52 and other areas such as 75th and 85th Streets NW (Segment 4 impacts)? DMC is a 20 year economic project to support Rochester becoming a global destination medical center that will have an impact not just in Rochester but the surrounding communities. While the draft mentions a few medical centers, including Mayo Clinic, the draft EIS makes no mention of the DMC venture. See: https://dmc.mn/</p>	<p>The City of Rochester was notified of the availability of the Draft EIS - see docket 20255-218853. The DMC project was reviewed in the preparation of the Final EIS. The six development sub-districts currently identified by the DMC Master Plan do not extend north of 5th Street in Rochester, approximately 5 miles south of Segment 4. The Development Plan prioritizes compact medical, commercial, and residential development in downtown Rochester.</p>
15	20256-219570-01	<p>c. Correction is needed. Please update page 668 of the draft EIS to appropriately reflect the name People's Energy Cooperative found under section 10.5.10.2 Public Utilities Existing Conditions. See link for more information: https://peoplesenergy.coop/</p>	<p>The EIS has been updated to reflect the utility name.</p>
15	20256-219570-01	<p>d. What communications have been made to date with People's Energy Cooperative regarding notice of this project? If they have not been notified, they need to be made aware given the impact of this project on its current customers. I see this electric company is only mentioned once, on page 668 of the draft EIS, and was difficult to find as the full name of the electric company is not identified. It is not specifically mentioned in Section 10.5.10.5 Potential Impacts whether or not People's Energy Cooperative was informed or consulted by the applicant about the nature of the impacts as described in the draft EIS. Similarly, there is no mention that the applicant would plan to do so.</p>	<p>People's Energy Cooperative was notified of the availability of the Draft EIS - see docket 20255-218853. As identified in Sections 1.1 and 4.1 of the DEIS, this project is designed to meet needs associated with present and future transmission needs, which are distinct from distribution needs associated with the provisioning of power to the end user at a home or business. People's Energy Cooperative manages distribution of power.</p>
15	20256-219570-01	<p>e. Correction is needed. Please see Docket #20255-218594-16 - MMRT Project Map #66 Segment 4 Detailed Map Book, page 20: Segment 4 East is missing notation of a single-resident household at the following address: 2838 75th Street NW, Rochester, MN 55901. All other related maps/documents should be updated and corrected accordingly (e.g., Appendix B Scoping Decision Part 4, page 9; etc.)</p>	<p>Map 66, Detailed Map Book for Segment 4 has been updated. Additionally, residential counts in Section 10.5.1 and Appendix G have also been updated.</p>
15	20256-219570-01	<p>f. Clarification is needed. In the draft ESI, at section 10.5.3.2 Potential Impacts, what is the "one residence" that is identified in the first sent of the first paragraph when it says "Segment 4 East's ROW includes one residence." What is the address?</p>	<p>The EIS notes that there is one residential structure in Segment 4 East's ROW, on the northeast side of the intersection of 31st Ave NW and 75th St NW (Map 66-20).</p>
15	20256-219570-01	<p>g. Include commentary and preferably a study that indicates the probability of a power line getting damaged. The applicant contends that it does not like to put a second power line in parallel with an existing transmission line due to chance of both being damaged at the same time. Unless this is a significant statistical chance, this is a weak argument to make. How often does damage to a power line occur and for what circumstances? This scenario should be included in the draft ESI.</p>	<p>Refer to Section 2.7.6 of the EIS for additional information about reliability and applicable standards. The EIS does not include damage occurrence modeling or risk analysis for line failure.</p>
15	20256-219570-01	<p>If a permit is granted, regarding Segment 4, we strongly urge that the Commission approve the plan for Segment 4 CapX Co-Location (the alternate option) due to ability to use a majority of the existing infrastructure (e.g., see Table 10-3 on page 642 of the draft ESI) and this option offers the least amount of impact to households by a significant amount (only 40 impacted) such as depicted in Figure 10-1, Segment 4, Proximity to Residential Structures on page 644 of the draft ESI. Segment 4 East is the least viable option with the most significant impact to residences (258 impacted). Segment 4 East also has the most significant amount of Cultural Resources in the Route Width, which primarily includes historical homes.</p>	<p>Your preference for Segment 4 CapX Co-Locate Option has been noted. Your opposition to Segment 4 East has been noted.</p>
15	20256-219570-01	<p>Also, from a cost saving perspective, by their own admission in the draft EIS, they identify that the Segment 4 CapX Co-Location option is the financially responsible option (See Section 10.11 on page 761 of the draft) as follows:</p> <p>"The low end of the cost range for the 161 kV transmission line, is for the Segment 4 CapX Co-Locate Option (which incorporates Route Segment 12, Appendix D). The Segment 4 CapX Co-Locate Option involves constructing the new 161 kV line parallel to the existing CapX2020 North Rochester – Mississippi River double-circuit 345/345 kV transmission line (Section 3.1.5.5 Segment 4 CapX Co-Locate Option). This option is estimated to be less expensive because it is approximately six miles shorter in length than Segment 4 West or Segment 4 East. A shorter route means less structures, less conductors, and less right-of-way, which results in lower overall costs. The applicant's testimony notes the total cost to construct the Segment 4 CapX Co-Locate Option is estimated to be \$41.1 million."</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
16	20255-219444-01	Please keep road dust down by chloride applications every month of construction.	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. As noted in Section 5.9.1.3 of the EIS, if construction activities generate problematic dust levels, the applicant would employ construction related practices to control fugitive dust as needed. This could include application of water or other commercially available non chloride dust control agents on unpaved areas subject to frequent vehicle traffic, reducing the speed of vehicular traffic on unpaved roads, and covering open bodied haul trucks.
16	20255-219444-01	Reimbursement for lost land rent?	Section 3.3.2.2 of the EIS summarizes the process for right-of-way acquisition and compensation. Specific details on agreements and reimbursement are outside the scope of the EIS.
16	20255-219444-01	Farmland compaction factor payout of 3 years is not enough, farmland does not produce as well as it did even 10-15 years later.	Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning agriculture/farming are discussed in Sections 5.7.1, 6.7.1, 7.7.1, 9.7.1, and 10.7.1 of the EIS. Landowner agreements are outside the scope of this EIS.
16	20255-219444-01	Farming around poles is getting impossible. We are losing tillable farmland. Farm equipment cannot maneuver between poles.	Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning agriculture/farming are discussed in Sections 5.7.1, 6.7.1, 7.7.1, 9.7.1, and 10.7.1 of the EIS.
17	20256-219543-01	Hello, my family lives along with preferred route North 1 and I would like to voice my concerns with this route. The preferred route would run down 604th Ave with the line going right through my front yard. The line would sit about 100 feet from my front door. This means the 75 ft right-away would basically consume my entire front yard. Below I will line item my individual concerns.M76	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process.
17	20256-219543-01	My first concern is regarding the safety aspect. The front yard is where my kids play, which means a majority of their outdoor time would be spent within 25 meters of this line. I know there is mixed research on correlation between childhood cancer but we cannot say with 100% certainty that the risk is 0, especially with the close proximity to my home. The proposed line weaves down my street around all the homes except mine, where it will cross right in my front yard. Below are a few studies showing the potential risk associated with having a line this close to my home and within an area where my children are playing. I have genuine concerns about the health and safety of my children were this line to cross in my yard. We cannot say with certainty that it is safe to have this line crossing so close to my home and where my daughters play. This is my number 1 concern. a. Childhood leukaemia and distance from power lines in California: a population-based case control study. "For leukaemia, there was a slight excess of cases at distance of 0–50 m, yielding an adjusted OR of 1.4" (https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4931365/) b. Residential proximity to power lines and risk of brain tumor in the general population "We found significant associations between cumulated duration living at <50 m to high voltage lines and: i) all brain tumors" (OR 2.94; 95%CI 1.28–6.75);" (https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0013935120303662) c. Proximity to overhead power lines and childhood leukaemia: an international pooled analysis. "In this first comprehensive pooled analysis of childhood leukaemia and distance to power lines, we found a small and imprecise risk for residences < 50 m of 200 + kV lines that was not explained by high magnetic fields." (https://www.nature.com/articles/s41416-018-0097-7) d. Exposure to Electromagnetic Fields of High Voltage Overhead Power Lines and Female Infertility "After adjusting for confounding factors, women living within 500 meters of the lines carried a higher risk (aOR 4.44, 95% CI 2.77 to 7.11) of infertility compared with women living more than 1000 meters of the lines." (https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6522214/)	Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning human health and safety are discussed in Section 5.6 of the EIS. Appendix J includes an EMF supplement which was updated for the FEIS to include the additional references you provided.
17	20256-219543-01	My second concern is from a financial standpoint. We bought our current home in 2019 and have spent the last 6 years completely redoing the interior and updated the lawn/exterior. We have planted 100's of trees, lilacs, bushes within the 75 feet right away which will need to be cleared. This removes any wind block and renders our front yard unusable for any future buildings which will drastically decrease the property value. Due to concerns for safety we will have to move if the north 1 route is chosen. With the loss in property from right away, wind block, and proximity of line our home value will decrease on top of finding a new home with a higher mortgage interest rate.	Your opposition to Segment 1 North has been noted. Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning property values are discussed in Sections 5.5.7, 6.5.7, 7.5.7, 9.5.7, and 10.5.7 of the EIS. Appendix I provides a Property Value Supplement.

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
17	20256-219543-01	I am concerned about the noise/humming which radiates from these lines. With the lines running within 100 ft from my front door the noise would disturb any peace experienced in my front yard and again impact property value.	The sample route permit (Section 5.3.6 of Appendix H) contains the following mitigation related to noise: "The Permittee shall comply with noise standards established under Minnesota Rules 7030.0010 to 7030.0080. The Permittee shall limit construction and maintenance activities to daytime working hours to the extent practicable." Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning property values are discussed in Sections 5.5.7, 6.5.7, 7.5.7, 9.5.7, and 10.5.7 of the EIS. Appendix I provides a Property Value Supplement.
17	20256-219543-01	If a storm or unforeseen event was to occur these lines could potentially fall onto my home, which is an additional safety concern.	For electrical safety code and maintenance reasons, utilities generally do not allow residences or other buildings within the ROW of a transmission line.
17	20256-219543-01	Based on my above listed concerns, I would like to object to the North 1 route which runs down 604th Ave.	Your opposition to Segment 1 North has been noted.
18	20255-218810-01	I'm writing this Comment because I'm jawdroppingly outraged at the failure to provide notice to 1,341 landowners and the prospect of upcoming hearings and ultimate routing decision moving forward when 1,341 landowners have not received adequate notice. Equally outrageous is Commerce-EERA's failure to acknowledge the basic necessity of timely notice. Granted due process is out of vogue federally, but we expect better in Minnesota. I am grateful to see this announcement of a Prehearing Conference about this notice failure and hope to see equitable treatment of these landowners. Thirteen years ago, I observed failure to provide notice to "newly affected landowners," a detrimental failure that had left landowners with no warning, little ability to participate, administrative and judicial disregard for their predicament, and transmission routed over their land. Now, 1,341 landowners have not received notice in this docket, which harkens back to that CapX 2020 Hampton to La Crosse routing docket through Cannon Falls. ² In that CapX docket, Xcel and Commerce chose to disregard the DOT's Comments and Policy of Accommodation that rendered the preferred route unworkable, and route changes were not made public, notice not provided to landowners, until one or two days prior to the public hearing. See Motion for Reconsideration of St. Paul's Church and Cannon Falls Landowners, June 1, 20123. Those Cannon Falls landowners who were not provided notice were the ones that were given transmission on their property. At the time, at the hearing where this lack of notice was made public, I was representing NoCapX and North Route Group and I quickly argued for a window for Intervention, but that was rejected in part because I did not have a client among those landowners (some of whom later became clients). Similarly, for these 1,341 landowners, transmission on their property and eminent domain may well be their fate. Commerce has declared it is not concerned, as notice "is a courtesy, not a legal obligation." Other than the Prehn Family/NoCapX 2020, there is no party representing landowners on the ground. The only other party in this docket is "Clean Energy Organizations," which have historically supported transmission projects and is supporting this project.	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Mailings sent to landowners (including those along the Route Segment 17 Hwy 14 Option) after scoping included a January 31 letter from the applicant and a May 13 letter from PUC. The applicant's January 31, 2025, letter provided information about the project, information on how to submit public comments, and a map of all of the route and alignment alternatives being studied in the EIS (refer to docket ID number 20255-218883-01). The PUC's May 13, 2025 letter provided notice of the public hearings and provided information regarding the DEIS comment period.

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
18	20255-218810-01	<p>There are three failures at issue. First is the Commerce-EERA admitted delay of Notice for the 5 months since December; second is the additional “few weeks” of additional delay before notifying of failure of Notice on May 8, 2025; and third, the failure to disclose on the part of Commerce-EERA for “a few weeks” after the December failure was “discovered.” Tempest has fugited, and now we’re faced with hearings at the end of this month. See Dornfeld Letter and email, May 8, 2025. The Second Prehearing Order set the intervention deadline as January 14, 2025, and that’s long since passed. What options are available to these landowners? Mr. Dornfeld’s take in the May 8, 2025 email reflects no sense of responsibility to those landowners.</p> <p>The Department respectfully objects to holding a prehearing conference. A prehearing conference to discuss this issue is unnecessary. The Department understands that the Commission’s notice will be served on the entire landowner mailing list, including the 1,341 new, potentially impacted landowners. As the Department’s May 8 filing explained, the notice to newly affected landowners is a courtesy, not a legal obligation.</p> <p>Dornfeld email, May 8, 2025.</p> <p>That’s a stunning position for a state agency to take when landowners could lose their land to this project. Due process should be top of mind these days:</p> <p>All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.</p> <p>U.S. Constitution, 14th Amendment, Section 1(emphasis added).</p> <p>The position of Commerce-EERA is also contrary to the Commission’s mandate to “adopt broad spectrum citizen participation as a principal of operation.” Minn. Stat. §216I.16, Subd. 1. The Commission has long been lax in adopting that broad spectrum of citizen participation, reflected in the recommendations of the Office of the Legislative Auditor’s “Public Utilities Commission’s Public Participation Process” which urged recognition of the role of the public and the PUC’s responsibilities to the public⁵ Since the Commission’s “streamlining” steamrolling agenda and its success in achieving the 2024 legislative changes, it’s become even harder to participate, and need and permitting processes have been radically constricted⁶. In a routing proceeding, notice to landowners who may/will be affected by a transmission project is fundamental.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>As a point of clarification, Commerce - EERA staff was made aware the afternoon of May 2, 2025 that the December notice was not sent out to newly effected landowners. The ALJ and parties were made aware of this issue within 5 business days, after EERA and Attorney General staff were able to confirm information and coordinate the appropriate response.</p>
18	20255-218810-01	<p>These 1,341 landowners have rights that must be observed, and the Commission has responsibilities to the public and affected landowners that cannot be disregarded. Affected landowners must somehow be compensated for this failure to provide notice, but how? This is a failure that puts landowners at a significant disadvantage in the routing process and if not corrected, it sets a dangerous precedent.</p> <p>Landowners must be provided with immediate specific notice, sufficient time and assistance to learn how this routing process “works,” and means of participation, which means a delay in the schedule, including public and evidentiary hearings. The intervention deadline, filing deadlines, and meeting and hearing dates should be set forward at least as long as this notice was delayed, five months plus “a few weeks.”</p> <p>Commerce-EERA must take the responsibility for this mess, though it may not be the ideal entity to take the lead in fixing this mess. Some ideas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Every notice in this docket, and every Commission docket, must be immediately eFiled with Affidavit of Service and list of recipients and addresses when sent. -Each landowner should be directly contacted by mail and phone and provided information, not public meeting “information lite,” but substantive explanations sufficient for an understanding of what this project may mean to them, details on “Buy the Farm” if their land would be taken, how it is that they became affected landowners, to be sworn on oath and how to meaningfully participate. This is beyond Commerce-EERA and PUC’s charge, beyond duties of the PUC’s Public Advisor. Perhaps this should be handled by the A.G.’s Office-RUD, which well represents the public interest; -Additional in-person public meetings should be held in the affected areas with targeted invitations to the 1,341 landowners in the area(s), with notice filed in eDockets. -Landowners must be extended the clearly explained opportunity, the option, of Intervention without objection; -Landowners will require some level of substantive assistance to be able to participate in the hearing⁷, submit testimony, question witnesses, and offer a brief, without limitation or objection from applicant or Commerce to their participation. This is the purpose of Intervenor Compensation, and it should be approved for this docket. 	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
18	20255-218810-01	<p>Realistically, landowners seldom have experience or resources to participate effectively, and in addition to Commerce-EERA, the Commission should provide some measure of assistance to bring them up to speed quickly. With hearings set for the end of this month, starting roughly two weeks from Friday's Prehearing Conference, I don't see how the necessary outreach and education can occur without postponing the hearings. It took five months and a few weeks to get to this point, and it may take that long to make up for Commerce-EERA's failure. As the responsible party, it should bear the cost of fixing its errors, though a state entity distanced from causation should lead the correction. Provision of process information and assistance is urgently needed, NOW!</p> <p>Institutional history is important. Most working on this docket were not a part of the CapX 2020 Hampton to La Crosse routing docket through Cannon Falls, PUC Docket TL-09-1448. In that docket, there was a similar failure of notice, though that was Xcel's failure. The utility had disregarded the DOT's prohibition of running the transmission line over a Highway 52 interchange until the very last minute, just days before the Public Hearing, and some of those potentially affected landowners did not receive any notice at all. See Affidavits accompanying Motion for Reconsideration of St. Paul's Church and Cannon Falls Landowners9. An immediate attempt to extend at least some intervention rights to these landowners failed, and no effort was made by the applicants or the Commission to assist these landowners. Those landowners now have CapX 2020 transmission on their property or just outside their backyards, alongside the school's ball field. It was a travesty of process.</p> <p>Lack of notice and steamrolling over landowners must not happen again. Failure to provide notice to 1,341 landowners is inexcusable, and the hearings must not go forward as currently planned. This is not a problem of the landowners' making, and they should not have to pay the price. Commerce-EERA made this problem and must take the lead in fixing its problem.</p>	Comment noted.
19	20255-218922-0	<p>Thanks to Valerie Herring, representing Xcel, for filing yesterday's letter with the Heine Direct Schedule 4 Affidavit of Service and description of the Company's mailing to 2,878 landowners, including the 1,341 newly affected landowners.</p> <p>EERA's Scoping Decision adding the 1,341 landowners was issued December 2, 2024. Xcel's mailing went out to the landowners on January 31, 2025, which though better than no notice, was sent two weeks after the Intervention deadline. The Xcel notice is too late, and it remains EERA's problem to correct.</p> <p>Newly affected landowners have not received a targeted mailing letting them know that they are "newly affected landowners." Though not sent specifically to, or identifying the landowners as, "newly affected landowners," the Xcel mailing stated: You are receiving this letter because your property is located either on one of the newly added routes or one of the originally proposed routes. A map of all routes under consideration is included in this mailing.</p> <p>That language, placement, and font is not attention grabbing – it's in the fourth paragraph, found in the "Project Status" section, in the same small font as the rest of the mailing: (Note copy of mailing is included).</p> <p>It's my understanding that Dept. of Commerce-EERA notices to potentially affected landowners lead with a "your land may be affected" in attention grabbing bold and/or CAPS.1 Commenters at public meetings/hearings often note that applicant mailings are like campaign lit or equally unwanted direct mail advertisements, items that go directly into recycling buckets. Though appreciated, applicant mailings aren't a substitute for EERA notice.</p> <p>It's good to know Xcel sent out notice, but timing remains an issue due to mailing after the Intervention deadline had passed, and Xcel's mailing was a generic mailing to both original and newly affected landowners. Xcel's diligence doesn't alleviate Commerce-EERA's notice failure or the Asst. A.G.'s abject disregard of due process and property rights, stating "the notice to newly affected landowners is a courtesy, not a legal obligation." See U.S. Constitution, 14th Amendment, Section 1; see also Minnesota Constitution, Article 1, Section 7. Does this really need to be stated?</p> <p>Newly affected landowners have not had attention grabbing particularized notice nor have they had a reasonable chance to learn about and prepare for meaningful and effective participation. How will this be fixed in a way that graciously opens the door, encourages participation, and sufficiently informs the landowners and provides process such that they can exercise their rights? It's my guess that we need a plan and a reasonable delay, Certified to the Commission, to make up for notice deficiencies, encourage that "broad spectrum of public participation," and provide necessary due process.</p>	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Required notices per Minnesota Statute 216E.03 and Minnesota Rule 7850 were sent.
20	20255-219436-01	<p>I am writing this comment to express our opposition to the "Preferred 345 kV" transmission line which will impact our family farm. Our farm is located on 227th St. E in Faribault and is on the 2 South route. We are opposed to this line being built on our farm. This is our family farm, and family farms in MN are few and becoming fewer. This line would negatively impact our ability to farm and/or rent our land for farming. This will severely limit our income to support our farm.</p>	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Your opposition to Segment 2 South has been noted. Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning agriculture/farming are discussed in Sections 5.7.1, 6.7.1, 7.7.1, 9.7.1, and 10.7.1 of the EIS.

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
20	20255-219436-01	In addition, this 345 kV line will reduce the value of our property - 10-40% is a possible negative impact. There are health risks associated with these lines that are either known or unknown. That is not acceptable and will affect our well being.	Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning property values are discussed in Sections 5.5.7, 6.5.7, 7.5.7, 9.5.7, and 10.5.7 of the EIS. Appendix I provides a Property Value Supplement. Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning human health and safety are discussed in Sections 5.6, 6.6, 7.6, 9.6, and 10.6 of the EIS.
20	20255-219436-01	If this line is needed - we support the HWY 14 alternative. This line follows a highway and doesn't break up family farms like ours.	Your preference for Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14 Option) has been noted. However, Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14 Option) would also have impacts on family farms and agricultural lands.
21	20255-219434-01	Known land development. (Note comment includes a map).	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Indication of the potential development has been added to Section 6.5.5.2 of the EIS.
22	20256-219573-01	I am writing to express my disagreement with the proposal of the lines in my area. I do not want the project on the alternative route along new Hwy 14. We do not want this project near where we live. I live at 62859 120th Ave Claremont, MN. The proposed alternative would be approximately $\frac{1}{4}$ mile from my home. I do not want the visual disturbance or "eyesore". I do not want the damage of compacting to my neighbor's fields. I do not want the risk of increased exposure to the electrical fields. We love our community without the visual interference of large power lines.	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Your opposition to Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14 Option) has been noted.
22	20256-219573-01	I want to clarify some comments from the Owatonna public comments session. It was suggested that following the Hwy 14 corridor would benefit small towns by allowing communities to tie into this power supply. However, this project scope and intent is to simply support existing transmission lines, they are not designed or ready to have small towns tie into without significant investment in substations. I want to be clear this project on the alternative route will not benefit the power supplies for the towns on Hwy 14 after speaking with Excel Energy Personnel.	Comment noted.
22	20256-219573-01	I do not believe the alternative route on Hwy 14 is practical as MnDOT regulations do not permit access to the new lines through MnDot property, the energy company would have to utilize private property. This alternative route would require a significant infringement on private property. It's counterproductive to allow the project here.	Comment noted. Section 2.7.3 of the EIS notes that access from the MnDOT roads may not be permissible where there is controlled access. Section 7.5.10.5 has been updated to reflect the potential for increased disturbance associated with construction activities given the controlled access.
22	20256-219573-01	In summary, I do not want the alternative route on Hwy 14 because it's the visually disturbing, damaging to fields, not helpful to communities affected and not practical for the easement on private property. Please do not allow the alternative on new Hwy 14.	Comment noted. Your opposition to Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14 Option) has been noted.
23	20256-219553-01	My concern is it appears that the line path is going to make a corner on our property located at 605 Lake Shady Ave North Oronoco 55960. This property is on a bluff and we have been improving the property in preparation to build an office/warehouse. If this route is approved, I feel it would render our property useless for our intended plans. M168If the corner was moved North West 500 feet it would probably not be an issue. We are currently at the final build design and bidding for construction starting August/September 2025.	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. The area where Segment 4 East crosses your property is shown on Map 66-18. Should Segment 4 East be selected by the Commission, the final alignment could be located anywhere within the route width shown on Map 66-18. Section 10.5.5.2 of the EIS has been updated to reflect the potential for transmission line to preclude specific types of future development within the ROW. As described in Section 3.3.2.2, the applicant would contact each property owner to describe the need for the transmission facilities and how the project may affect each parcel. The applicant's ROW agents would also seek information from the property owner about any specific concerns that they may have with the project at which time final pole placement could be discussed.

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
24	20255-219330-01	<p>In the matter of the Mankato-Mississippi River Transmission Project in Southeast Minnesota, should a route permit be issued by the Commission, we are writing to provide support for Xcel Energy's preferred north route for segment 1.</p> <p>As noted below in the direct testimony of Ellen Heine on behalf of Northern States Power Company, doing business as Xcel Energy dated March 28, 2025, we ask that you especially take into consideration the north route of segment 1 is the most direct, utilizes existing right-of-way to the greatest extent possible, and has fewer homes (70) within close proximity to the proposed centerline than the route alternatives (142).</p> <p>The south route of segment 1 is not preferred given the detrimental impact it would have on our family in our multigenerational 1857 home and Dirty Lakes Fab Shop LLC business located at 8789 State Highway 60 Waterville, MN 56096 as well as our many neighbors along the State Highway 60 corridor.</p> <p>As the project continues to develop, we respectfully ask that the north route for segment 1 be recommended to minimize human impact and ensure that our property is bypassed so that we can raise our children in our dream home and allow them to continue the legacy.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Your preference for Segment 1 North has been noted. Chapters 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10 of the EIS discuss and compare potential impacts and mitigation measures associated with human settlement, health and safety, land-based economies, archeological and historic resources, and the natural environment.</p>
24	20255-219330-01	<p>In the matter of the Mankato-Mississippi River Transmission Project (Docket 23-157), we are writing with regards to our concern that our multigenerational 1857 home and Dirty Lakes Fab Shop LLC business located at 8789 State Highway 60 Waterville, MN 56096 are within the 150-foot-wide right-of-way for a preliminary route option of Segment 1.</p> <p>We ask that you take into consideration the impact this would have on our family and move forward with an alternative route to ensure that our property is bypassed so that we can raise our children in our dream home and allow them to continue the legacy.</p>	<p>Comment noted. If Segment 1 South is selected by the Commission, it would be behind your house as shown on Map 13-27. Segment 1L, which is the segment that was located on the north side of 440th Avenue in front of your home was removed during scoping (refer to Appendix B for the scoping decision). The removal of this segment was completed based on Xcel's letter provided in docket ID number 202411-211748-01.</p>
25	20255-219416-01	<p>Attached are the two exhibits that I submitted at the public hearing on May 28, 2025, at the Zumbrota VFW. The first attached file includes my comments comparing the Segment 4 Xcel Energy's Preferred Route versus the CapX Co-Locate Option. The second attached file includes details on the proximity to residences for both routes.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process.</p>
25	20255-219416-01	<p>Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE XCEL ENERGY'S PREFERRED ROUTE FOR SEGMENT 4.</p> <p>A. For Segment 4, Xcel Energy's Preferred Route is shown in Schedule 3, Figure 6 and in Figure 7 below. Xcel Energy's Preferred Route for Segment 4 generally follows existing transmission lines and roads between the North Rochester Substation and its intersection with the existing 161 kV [Chester] line. Xcel Energy prefers this route for Segment 4 because it maximizes the amount of shared right-of-way with existing transmission lines as compared to the alternatives. Xcel Energy's Preferred Route for Segment 4 is double-circuited with an existing 69 kV line for 6.4 miles and double-circuited with an existing 161 kV line for approximately 11.3 miles. In total, Xcel Energy's Preferred Route shares existing transmission line right-of-way for 17.7 miles of its 22.2-mile length or for nearly 80 percent of its total length. Sharing existing transmission line rights-of-way when practicable minimizes new impacts to residences and the environment.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
25	20255-219416-01	<p>Comparison of Xcel Energy's Preferred Route for Segment 4 versus CapX Co-Locate Option</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CapX Co-Locate Option is about 16.4 miles long, which is about 5.8 miles shorter than the Xcel Energy's Preferred Route of 22.2 miles. The CapX Co-Locate Option has an estimated cost of \$41.1 million, which is \$28.6 million less than the Xcel Energy's Preferred Route estimated cost of \$69.7 million. The CapX Co-Locate Option impacts many fewer residences. (Note, comment includes a table with residence numbers). 	<p>Comment noted.</p>
25	20255-219416-01	<p>Impacts to Residences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several residences along 75th Street NW/Highway 63 will be impacted by the Xcel Energy's Segment 4 Preferred Route. Besides having the new 161 kV line within 54-500 feet of the existing residence, about 50 feet of permanent clearing of trees will occur within the Right-of-Way (ROW) of Xcel Energy's Segment 4 Preferred Route. Many of these residences use trees and bushes as a sound and visual barriers from 75th Street NW/Highway 63. The following are a few examples of residences along or near 75th Street NW/Highway 63 that would be impacted by the Xcel Energy Preferred Route. The blue line is approximately 50 feet back from the MNDot ROW. <p>(Note, comment includes maps with residences).</p>	<p>Figure 10-1 in the EIS provides the residence counts, Figure 10-1 in the EIS indicates that the CapX Co-Locate option impacts fewer residences than do the other route options. Section 10.14.3 of the EIS acknowledges vegetation is used to provide sound and visual barriers.</p>

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
25	20255-219416-01	<p>Other Benefits of the CapX Co-Locate Option over the Xcel Energy's Preferred Route for Segment 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Xcel Energy's Preferred Route for Segment 4 is double-circuited with an existing 161 kV line for approximately 11.3 miles. This means two of the major supply lines into Rochester are on the same structures increasing exposure reliability issues due to major weather and other events. • Xcel Energy's Preferred Route for Segment 4 crosses the MN DNR Douglas Trail north of Douglas requiring permanently clearing 100 feet of ROW from trees along the trail. • Savings of \$28.6 million in reduced cost with the CapX Co-Locate Option may help pay for shifting 5-6 existing 345/345 kV structures and lines off Prairie Island Indian Community property. 	<p>Utilities must comply with North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC) standards which define the reliability requirements for planning and operating the electrical transmission grid in North America. Reliability analyses studied all NERC contingency categories (P1-P7).</p> <p>Table 10-6 in the EIS details the intersections of the different route options with trails and water crossings.</p> <p>Xcel committed to avoiding the Prairie Island Elk Run property should Segment 4 CapX Co-Locate Option be selected, see section 10.5.2.1.3, which notes that the route width of the Segment 4 CapX Co-Locate Option was extended east in order to have a potential alignment avoid the Elk Run property (Figure 10 2, Map 66-26).</p>
26	20255-219331-01	<p>On behalf of the City of Madison Lake, I write to you today to express concerns regarding the proposed Segment 1 South route and how it would adversely affect the City of Madison Lake.</p> <p>The City has approved a plat and is in the process of entering into a developer's agreement with Dollar General regarding the construction of a DG Market on the Wostehoff parcel (R14.05.35.100.019). Dollar General is has obtained permits from the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) to address lane configuration and access requirements. Furthermore, bids have already been solicited for project-related infrastructure, including roadway construction. We anticipate groundbreaking for this development in the next few months.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process.</p> <p>The planned development referenced in your comment is discussed in Sections 5.5.5 and 13.1 of the EIS.</p>
26	20255-219331-01	<p>Regarding the Hiniker-owned property (R14.05.34.102.005), Madison Lake is experiencing steady and accelerating residential growth. While only two homes have currently been constructed in the Three Lakes Development, forecasts supported by building permit activity and market demand indicate substantial expansion in this area over the next several years.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Hiniker property is shown in Figure 5-3 of the EIS and the potential for future development is discussed in Section 5.5.5 of the EIS.</p>
26	20255-219331-01	<p>Moreover, the Dauk property (R37.05.34.226.011) holds unique strategic importance to the City's long-term development objectives. It represents the only viable corridor for extending the City's Main Street and Downtown District-a key priority in Madison Lake's community and economic development plan. Any encroachment by high-voltage infrastructure would significantly hinder this expansion and limit opportunities for cohesive urban planning and economic growth.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Dauk property is shown in Figure 5-3 of the EIS and the potential for future development is discussed in Section 5.5.5 of the EIS.</p>
26	20255-219331-01	<p>These developments underscore the incompatibility of the proposed route with the City's current and future land use plans. The proposed South route in segment 1 would not only disrupt construction timelines and planning commitments but also jeopardize critical components of our economic and community growth strategy. We respectfully reiterate our request that the proposed and preferred North route be selected in light of these considerations on behalf of the City of Madison Lake and our development partners. (Note comment includes maps).</p>	<p>Your preference for Segment 1 North has been noted. Your opposition to Segment 1 South has been noted.</p>
27	20253-216353-01	<p>Hello, we are the leadership team of the Rochester Aero Model Society (RAMS) Minnesota radio controlled airplane club, a club chartered with the Academy of Model Aeronautics (AMA). We were recently made aware of this project so we missed the initial comment period. We lease land from the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) and suspect they may have been notified of this project, but we were not notified until a concerned neighbor reached out to us. We would like to voice our concerns with the proposed Route 4 West alternative in Segment 4.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process.</p> <p>Your opposition to Segment 4 West has been noted.</p>
27	20253-216353-01	<p>Our nationally recognized FAA-Recognized Identification Area (FRIA) is located at 2633 85th St NW, Rochester, MN. A large high voltage power line would be significantly detrimental to our club to the point that it may result in the club's closing. The proposed Route 4 West alternative route crosses our main landing approach necessitating a shortening of our approach increasing the possibility of damage to our aircraft and reducing flight safety. Our runway cannot be modified because of the contour of the land. We have been at this location since 1998 and our club has existed for more than 50 years. We are one of the largest FRIs in the state. A FRIA is a defined geographic area where drones can be flown if they don't have Remote ID equipment, thus our club offers a place for all who enjoy Radio Controlled aircraft to fly without extra requirements from the FAA or interfering with other activities at parks and schools.</p> <p>We currently have 30+ members and offer free training to kids and adults (usually 5-10 students per year) and offer a hands-on experience during our monthly fun-flies where all public are welcome.</p> <p>Again, we want to stress that a large power line running along 85th Street NW would be significantly detrimental to our club, to the point it might force us to shut down. That would be a loss for the community at large given our outreach, training and a hands-on experience beyond our 30+ members.</p> <p>I am attaching some photos of our FRIA space, and the club's location along 85th Street NW. (Note comment has attachments).</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Section 10.5.8 of the EIS discusses the RAMS club and its proximity to Segment 4 West. Information in this section was incorporated from your March 10, 2025 email.</p>

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
28	20256-219705-01	<p>I was not able to attend the Public Hearings but I am very concerned about the final route of this Transmission Line. My comments are relating to the proposal that would bring the route down Highway 52 and through the City of Oronoco. My Company, Cedarpointe Partners LLC, owns property along Minnesota Avenue on the south edge of Oronoco and would be drastically affected with a major power line in that right of way.</p> <p>In conversations with others in that area it is my understanding that the Oronoco route has been abandoned and I thank you if that is the case. I wanted to submit my comments any way so they would be on record if anything was to be changed.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process.</p> <p>The route that runs down Highway 52 is referred to as Segment 4 East. This route is still being considered and is discussed in Chapter 10 of the EIS.</p>
28	20256-219705-01	Cedarpointe Partners is an LLC that owns the property occupied by Two Sisters Restaurant and the adjoining developable land. Cedar Woodlands III Owners Association is responsible for the utilities and maintenance of the properties. Please see the attached sheet for comments.	Comment noted.
28	20256-219705-01	<p>These comments are related to Segment 4 East:</p> <p>1. From the information supplied it is very difficult to see where the Transmission lines are placed. There are no street names or map references to identify locations. I can only guess which properties are actually impacted by the placing of the lines. I would like to see more detail of the proposed locations.</p>	Map 66 in the EIS contains a detailed map book for the routes in Segment 4.
28	20256-219705-01	2. From the proposed locations shown the towns of Zumbrota and Pine Island have the lines located outside and around the towns. Oronoco is shown to have the lines run through the center of the town! Transmission lines could be run to the west of Oronoco and south to 85th St or 75th street and then east thereby avoiding Oronoco completely.	Segment 4 East makes use of following an existing highway corridor (Highway 52). The EIS discusses following existing rights-of-way. Minnesota Rule 7850.4100 requires the Commission to consider use or paralleling of existing rights-of-way, survey lines, natural division lines, and agricultural field boundaries. Minnesota Statute 216E, subdivision 7(e), states that the Commission must consider routing a high voltage transmission line along an existing high voltage transmission line or highway right-of-way and to the extent these are not used it must state the reasons why.
28	20256-219705-01	3. According to the PUC Application EXCEL is requesting 1000 ft width along the route. I assume this is an easement and would use the existing right of way. The proposal to bring the line through Oronoco would place the line to the East side of Minnesota Avenue. The distance from the shoulder of Minnesota Avenue to the lot line of the Two Sisters lot is only 80 feet and the Distance from the same shoulder to the building is only 115 ft! The distance from the shoulder to the lot line on the south end of the lot is only 50 ft and the distance from the shoulder to the Convenience Store is only 165 ft. This is a long way from the easement distance requested in the application!	As discussed in Section 3.3 of the EIS, if the Commission issues a route permit, the permit would designate a "route." The requested route width can vary and be up to 1.25 miles wide. The HVTL must be constructed within the route designated by the Commission unless, after permit issuance, permission to proceed outside of the route is sought by the applicant and approved by the Commission. The ROW is the specific area required for the safe construction and operation of the transmission line, and for Segment 4 East the ROW would be 100 feet. The ROW acquisition process is described in Section 3.3.2.2 of the EIS.
28	20256-219705-01	4. Elevation is another problem. The restaurant building is on top of the hill above the road. The top edge of the building is approximately 75 ft higher than the roadway. This would place the corner of the building roof in close proximity to the power lines.	As discussed in Section 2.7.6 of the EIS, the project must meet the requirements of the National Electrical Safety Code when constructing new facilities or upgrading existing facilities (Minnesota Statute § 326B.35).
28	20256-219705-01	5. Existing Utilities create another problem. There is a 12 inch watermain and a major sanitary sewer line in the right of way where the poles would be placed.	The applicant would work around existing utility infrastructure. As noted in Section 10.5.10 of the EIS, the applicant indicated that they would use the Gopher State One Call system to locate and mark underground utilities prior to ground disturbing activities
28	20256-219705-01	These seem to be major objections to locating the transmission line through Oronoco and I am asking that you choose a route to the west of the city.	Your opposition to Segment 4 East has been noted.
29	20256-219703-01	My name is Kevin Quinlan I am a property owner on the proposed MMRT segment #1 map 2-6 at the 45 degrees corner where you see the #8 on the map. My main concern is a hill that lies along the southside of the existing powerline potentially being impacted by the expansion the powerline. This hill is very steep and has pine trees on top of it that deer bed down in especially in the winter. If more width is needed, I think it would be better to take it on the north side of the line.	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process.</p> <p>Alignment Alternative 8 was included in the final scoping decision to address your concerns with the hillside. Alignment Alternative 8 is shown on Map 13-15 and is discussed in the EIS in Section 5.13.4.</p>
29	20256-219703-01	A secondary concern is this project effecting my property value. I am aging and at some point, anticipate moving. There's the visual part of the powerline and I'm finding there's seems to be quite a bit of concern of the health effects from emf. Whether this concern is justified or not it's out there and everyone seems to agree it can affect property value.	<p>Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning property values are discussed in Sections 5.5.7, 6.5.7, 7.5.7, 9.5.7, and 10.5.7 of the EIS. Appendix I provides a Property Value Supplement.</p> <p>Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning human health and safety are discussed in Sections 5.6, 6.6, 7.6, 9.6, and 10.6 of the EIS.</p>
29	20256-219703-01	When I look at the maps from Morristown to my property it seems the powerline goes close to quite a few homes where it could be going across vacant farmland.	Comment 2

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
29	20256-219703-01	This line originated in 1953 and was likely low voltage. I think it's 161kv now with a major upgrade to 345kv does a 75 year old route make sense or just convenient because of existing easements.	The EIS discusses following existing rights-of-way. Minnesota Rule 7850.4100 requires the Commission to consider use or paralleling of existing rights-of-way, survey lines, natural division lines, and agricultural field boundaries. Minnesota Statute 216E, subdivision 7(e), states that the Commission must consider routing a high voltage transmission line along an existing high voltage transmission line or highway right-of-way and to the extent these are not used it must state the reasons why. The ROW would require an expanded width to accommodate the higher voltage, as described in Section 3.3.2 of the EIS.
30	20256-219807-01	<p>Route Preferences and Recommendations</p> <p>Segment 17</p> <p>To mitigate potential impacts on native plant communities, state-administered lands, and public waters, Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14) is preferred. If Segment 17 is not selected, the DNR strongly encourages double-circuiting the final route as much as feasible to minimize long-term impacts on natural resources.</p> <p>Alternative 1J</p> <p>The DNR highly encourages avoiding the use of route alternative 1J. This route alternative does not follow an existing transmission line and crosses between multiple areas known for their waterfowl population including Ballantyne, Duck, and Madison Lakes, all Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance, and Gilfillan Lake Wildlife Management Area (WMA). This route would create a hazard for the bird populations in and migrating through the area.</p> <p>Segment 2 North and South: Faribault WMA</p> <p>Segment 2 North creates a new and additional transmission line in the vicinity of the Faribault WMA, which is not preferred. The DNR supports Segment 2 South near the Faribault WMA as it follows 235th Street East and has the potential to be double-circuited with an existing transmission line.</p> <p>Segment 3/Segment4/Alternative 15: Zumbro River</p> <p>The DNR supports the crossing of the Zumbro River that co-locates with the existing CapX transmission line. If the Right-of-Way (ROW) expansion or temporary staging areas are needed on the east side of the Zumbro Crossing, we request to limit the amount of tree removal within the Minnesota Biological Survey (MBS) Site of Moderate Biodiversity Significance and riparian zone of the Zumbro River.</p>	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Your route preferences have been noted. For clarification purposes, and per Appendix D, Alternative IJ is a part of Segment 1 South.
30	20256-219807-01	<p>Rare Resources: Natural Heritage Review</p> <p>Multiple Natural Heritage Reviews has been completed for the Project (MCE 2023-00832, 2025-00029, and 2025-00030). The DNR recommends including a special permit condition that the Applicant will comply with applicable requirements related to state-listed endangered and threatened species in accordance with Minnesota's Endangered Species Statute (Minnesota Statutes, section 84.0895) and associated Rules (Minnesota Rules, part 6212.1800 to 6212.2300 and 6134). This includes following the conditions listed in the Natural Heritage letters to minimize or avoid impacts to state-listed species and other rare resources that have the potential to be impacted by the Project. (Note Natural Heritage Reviews are included in comment).</p>	The EIS has been updated to include the Natural Heritage Review letters MCE 2025-00029 and 2025-00030 in Appendix M.
30	20256-219807-01	<p>State-listed Species</p> <p>Several state-listed species have been documented throughout the Project area. The DEIS adequately addresses mitigation measures for these species.</p> <p>Calcareous Fen</p> <p>Calcareous fens have been documented in the vicinity of the Project. The DNR requests a special permit condition, similar to TL-23-159, that the Applicant must work with the DNR to determine if any impacts will occur during any phase of the Project. If the Project is anticipated to impact any calcareous fens, the Applicant must develop a Calcareous Fen Management Plan in coordination with the DNR, as specified in Minn. Stat. § 103G.223.</p> <p>MBS Sites of Biodiversity Significance and DNR Native Plant Communities</p> <p>Several MBS Sites of Biodiversity Significance and DNR Native Plant Communities have been documented throughout the project. The Natural Heritage letter addresses actions to mitigate disturbance to these ecologically significant areas which have been adequately addressed in the DEIS.</p>	Comment noted.
30	20256-219807-01	<p>Coordination with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)</p> <p>We recommend that coordination with USFWS regarding avoidance and permitting of federally protected species on the selected route be included as a permit condition.</p>	Comment noted.

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
30	20256-219807-01	<p>Avian Flight Diverters</p> <p>To prevent avian collisions due to visibility issues, the DNR recommends including a special permit condition, similar to TL-22-415, that the Applicant will coordinate with the DNR to determine appropriate locations for avian flight diverters after the route is finalized. Generally, the avian flight diverters will be needed at river crossings, fragmented forested patches, and near lakes and wetlands. The use of avian flight diverters minimizes the number of bird collisions with the transmission lines. Standard transmission line design shall incorporate adequate spacing of conductors and grounding devices in accordance with Avian Power Line Interaction Committee standards to eliminate the risk of electrocution to raptors with larger wingspans that may simultaneously come in contact with a conductor and grounding devices.</p>	Comment noted.
30	20256-219807-01	<p>Vegetation Management Plan</p> <p>The DNR recommends continued coordination with the Vegetation Management Plan Working Group (VMPWG) to refine the Project's Vegetation Management Plan (VMP). Our agency also supports a special permit condition to require the Applicant to develop a VMP in coordination with the VMPWG. The VMP should specifically address vegetation removal timing and avoiding removal in floodplains and near designated trout streams.</p>	Comment noted.
30	20256-219807-01	<p>Wildlife Friendly Erosion Control</p> <p>Due to entanglement issues with small animals, the DNR recommends including a special permit condition, similar to TL-22-415, that erosion control blankets be limited to "bio-netting" or "natural netting" types, and specifically not products containing plastic mesh netting or other plastic components. Hydro-mulch products may contain small synthetic (plastic) fibers to aid in its matrix strength. These loose fibers could potentially re-suspend and make their way into waterways.</p> <p>Dust Control</p> <p>The DNR recommends including a special permit condition, similar to TL-22-415, to avoid products containing calcium chloride or magnesium chloride, which are often used for dust control. Chloride products that are released into the environment do not break down and instead accumulate to levels that are toxic to plants and wildlife.</p> <p>Facility Lighting</p> <p>The DNR recommends including a special permit condition, similar to TL-22-415, to utilize downlit and shielded lighting and minimize blue hue to reduce harm to birds, insects, and other animals. Potential Project impacts related to illuminated facilities can be avoided or minimized by using shielded and downward facing lighting and lighting that minimizes blue hue.</p>	Comment noted.
30	20256-219807-01	<p>State Lands</p> <p>The Project crosses multiple DNR-administered lands that will require a utility license from the DNR. The utility license review will identify potential natural resource and recreation concerns. The utility license to cross state lands review also determines deed, contract, funding, or other restrictions on state lands. Such restrictions could impact licensing and routing of the transmission line. Some DNR-administered lands have been purchased using funds that put restrictions on the lands. Before the DNR can grant a utility license over state lands with a funding restriction, our agency must receive written approval from the funding provider. The DNR will identify if and where there are funding restrictions on state lands. The funding provider review can take up to a year or more after which approval may or may not be granted.</p>	Comment noted.
30	20256-219807-01	<p>Public Waters</p> <p>Public waters are designated as such to indicate the lakes, wetlands, and watercourses over which DNR has regulatory jurisdiction. The Project proposes to cross multiple public waters, so a DNR Public Waters Work Permit or a DNR License to Cross would be required.</p> <p>Water Appropriation</p> <p>A DNR Water Appropriation Permit is required for dewatering activities during construction if the water pumped exceeds 10,000 gallons in a day and/or one million gallons in one year. The DNR General Permit for Temporary Appropriation may be used for the dewatering if the dewatering volume is less than 50 million gallons and the time of the appropriation is less than one year. A DNR Water Appropriation Permit can be applied for in the MNDNR Permitting and Reporting System (MPARS).</p>	Comment noted.
31	20256-219655-01	<p>I own farmland in Cherry Grove Township, Section 17 T109N R17W, that will be impacted by the "preferred" route 2 South, Mankato to Mississippi River Transmission 345 KV Transmission Line Project. The farm that I own has been in my family since 1872. This property is part of a multigenerational legacy and holds significant cultural, historical, and agricultural value.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process.</p> <p>Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning agriculture/farming are discussed in Sections 5.7.1, 6.7.1, 7.7.1, 9.7.1, and 10.7.1 of the EIS.</p>

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
31	20256-219655-01	<p>The route selection process considers certain factors under Minnesota Administrative Rules 7850.4100. The yellow highlighted areas are in direct conflict with route 2 South. (Note for purposes of this comment summary, yellow highlight is not shown, instead the text that was yellow highlight is now bold).</p> <p>7850.4100 FACTORS CONSIDERED.</p> <p>In determining whether to issue a permit for a large electric power generating plant or a high voltage transmission line, the commission shall consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. effects on human settlement, including, but not limited to, displacement, noise, aesthetics, cultural values, recreation, and public services; B. effects on public health and safety; C. effects on land-based economies, including, but not limited to, agriculture, forestry, tourism, and mining; D. effects on archaeological and historic resources; E. effects on the natural environment, including effects on air and water quality resources and flora and fauna; F. effects on rare and unique natural resources; G. <i>application of design options that maximize energy efficiencies, mitigate adverse environmental effects, and could accommodate expansion of transmission or generating capacity;</i> H. <i>use or paralleling of existing rights-of-way, survey lines, natural division lines, and agricultural field boundaries;</i> I. use of existing large electric power generating plant sites; J. <i>use of existing transportation, pipeline, and electrical transmission systems or rights-of-way;</i> K. electrical system reliability; L. costs of constructing, operating, and maintaining the facility which are dependent on design and route; M. adverse human and natural environmental effects which cannot be avoided; and N. irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources. <p>In contrast, the blue highlighted areas are aligned with the Highway 14 alternative route. (Note, the blue highlight is now italics).</p>	<p>Chapter 6 of the EIS discusses and compares potential impacts and mitigation measures associated with human settlement, health and safety, land-based economies, archeological and historic resources, and the natural environment for Segment 2.</p>
31	20256-219655-01	<p>The alternative is the only feasible and responsible option if the project must proceed. The existing Highway 14 corridor already has a right-of-way in place, which would significantly minimize disruption to additional individuals and families, reduce land fragmentation, and ensure better adherence with Minnesota Administration Rules 7850.4100.</p> <p>I strongly urge the Commission and Xcel Energy to reject Route 2 South and adopt the Highway 14 alternative, which better balances infrastructure needs with long-term community and landowner impacts.</p> <p>(Note, comment includes a map of planned future residence).</p>	<p>Your preference for Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14 Option) has been noted.</p> <p>The EIS discusses following existing rights-of-way. Minnesota Rule 7850.4100 requires the Commission to consider use or paralleling of existing rights-of-way, survey lines, natural division lines, and agricultural field boundaries. Minnesota Statute 216E, subdivision 7(e), states that the Commission must consider routing a high voltage transmission line along an existing high voltage transmission line or highway right-of-way and to the extent these are not used it must state the reasons why.</p> <p>Although Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14 Option) follows existing road ROW, it would still have impacts to private land and agriculture, as the anticipated alignment and ROW would not be located entirely within the Highway 14 ROW.</p>
32	20256-219704-01	<p>Please see the attached document with my future residence. (Note, comment includes a map).</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process.</p> <p>As described in Section 6.5.3 of the EIS, utilities generally do not allow residences or other buildings within the ROW of a transmission line. Any residences or other buildings within a proposed ROW have the potential to be removed or displaced.</p> <p>If Segment 2 South were selected by the Commission the applicant would contact each property owner to describe the need for the transmission facilities and how the project may affect each parcel as described in Section 3.3.2.2 of the EIS. The applicant's ROW agents would also seek information from the property owner about any specific concerns that they may have with the project at which time final pole placement could be discussed.</p>

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
33	20256-219770-01	<p>We have been long term residents of the area just north of 75th st. NW in Rochester, MN., which is one of the potential routes of this new segment that is proposed. To be specific, our property adjoins 2 of the alternate routes, just north of 75th st. and south of 85th st. NW. Our subdivision was built with efforts to maintain tree and wildlife habitats, as much as possible, as written in our covenants. These lines would clearly impact the wildlife that breed and live in this area, including deer, turkey and fox, as this is close to the Zumbro River. Children and adults learn to shoot at the Archery Center, which this line would cut through. Trees are plentiful in this area and would be disrupted. Since lines already exist on 75th St. NW, which is also a highway, there would be much less environmental disruption there or to the more northern route that is also an option for this power line.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning vegetation and wildlife for Segment 4 options are discussed in Section 10.9 and 10.13.2 of the EIS.</p>
34	20256-219759-01	<p>To whom is reading my statement and hearing my plea regarding the Mankato-Mississippi River 345 kV Transmission Line project, thank you for your time and consideration. My name is Christopher Bultman and I reside at 12366 E 200th Street, Kenyon, MN 55946. My home and property are located in section 2 of the project and falls directly on the alternative north route. It is my request that this project remain South of Hwy 60, which is Xcel Energy's preferred route included in the testimony filed March 2025. If Xcel's preferred route is not deemed acceptable by the PUC and/or the administrative law judge, I would request the alternative route that runs parallel to Hwy 14 be the next considered option. I feel that Hwy 14 alternative route would be the most reasonable route option and the least impactful. There is already a right-of-way designated for the highway and it can be easily accessed at any point for maintenance or repair. Especially considering the MN weather, highways are the first to be cleared of snow and would allow those critical repairs to be made much easier and faster than a rural route such as the north alternative route.</p> <p>I support this stance and argument with my statement and a few facts for consideration. The first and most dear to me is my property, it has been in the Bultman family since Rice County was settled. My home was built in 1880. My family has occupied this property, my home farm, for generations. I am one of two sesquicentennial farms left in Rice County. I do NOT want my home burdened and disrupted by this industrialized project. It destroys the history and culture of Rice County MN. I was raised here and I'm hoping for that to continue for many more generations.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Your preference for Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14 Option) has been noted. Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14 Option) would also have impacts on family farms and agricultural lands.</p>
34	20256-219759-01	<p>My neighbor is a local business owner; they own a nursery and gardening business. Their address is 12823 E 200th Street, Kenyon, MN 55946. They provide garden supplies, grow produce and flowers and sell it all from their home/farm. This is a substantial income for them. They have customers frequent their location for produce. This project would negatively impact their customers and financial wellbeing. Their business is Home & Harvest; their names are Brian and Tasha Homeier. They too have lived on their farm and made a home there going back generations. The transmission line, if it is constructed on the north route, would run nearly right over their home and definitely be in the 150 ft right-of-way. They have a special needs child that has a heart defect and this would be detrimental to her as well. They may have very well spoken up for themselves, but this is another supporting reason why the north route is not a reasonable alternative. They are also not in favor of this project, based on previous conversations I've had with them.</p>	<p>Your opposition of Segment 2 North has been noted. The residence is shown on Map 26-7 and was measured as being approximately 187 feet from the anticipated alignment of Segment 2 North. The residence is accounted for in Figure 6-1 as one of the residences within 75 to 250 feet of the anticipated alignment of Segment 2 North.</p> <p>The non-residential buildings that are potentially associated with the noted business are also shown on Map 26-7 and accounted for in Table 6-4. Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning human health and safety are discussed in Section 6.6 of the EIS.</p>
34	20256-219759-01	<p>This project was pitched in the brochure at the May meeting, and I quote, "deliver new low-cost renewable energy and provide other regional benefits by building new and more resilient "backbone" electric transmission infrastructure to serve the customers." I find this inaccurate or at the very least interesting, because a question was posed at the in-person hearing held in Faribault, MN on May 29th, 2025. It was asked what cost savings would the community see from this project? An Xcel representative at the meeting couldn't produce an answer. The statement that was given was that our consumer costs are comprised of much more than just infrastructure and Xcel didn't state that any savings or benefit from this project would be seen by the people affected by it or anyone else for that matter. Xcel also conveyed that this would make the grid more resilient during extreme weather, but also stated that this transmission line doesn't carry any power to the surrounding areas but to growing metropolitan areas far from the communities this structure is being built on. I believe the only cost savings and infrastructure improvement is for the company building it and in no way will this translate to the people of this state and more importantly the people that this transmission line project will affect.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
34	20256-219759-01	<p>I am also doubting the "need" of this project. The circumstances of needing electricity aren't lost on me. I understand that, but at who's need? Who's cost? Whose benefit is this really? The presentation Xcel gave didn't provide us with reason for this infrastructure change other than a potential need for the future. The impact of this project is being put on communities, businesses, and farms that already give so much and produce so much for the surrounding area and community. This is a disruption to our way of life and our ability to provide for our families and community.</p>	<p>Construction of a large energy facility in Minnesota requires a certificate of need from the Commission (Minnesota Statute § 216B.243). The applicant filed a joint certificate of need and route permit application on April 2, 2024. Project need is discussed in Chapter 4 of the application: https://www.edockets.state.mn.us/documents/%7B00CD9F8E-0000-C621-8B0C-0A9959360AEE%7D/download?contentSequence=0&rowIndex=232 and Section 4.1 of the EIS.</p>

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
34	20256-219759-01	I ask that the administrative law judge and the PUC exclude the alternative north route east of Faribault to Kenyon from the possibility of construction. I ask that if the current preferred Xcel route (south route) is not feasible that the alternative southern route that runs parallel to Hwy 14 be used as the alternative. I ask that you honor and respect the culture and history of the rural areas and consider the impact this has. Consider the image that this transmission line project will give the State of MN if we devalue the rural areas to nothing more than a pathway for projects, rather than valuable land with valued Minnesotans.	Your preference for Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14 Option) has been noted.
35	20256-219768-01	I received a letter in the mail with the notice of informational meetings, just wanted to let you know that - previously I did not get anything in the mail. After reviewing the packet of information, I looked on the website for the draft of the environmental Impact statement. In the detailed map book for segment 4 (https://eera.web.commerce.state.mn.us/web/project-file/13527), it shows Route Segment 4R going right next to our home on the upper left-hand corner of page 3 of the PDF. Would you be able to elaborate on what this route segment 4R means? It is the only spot on the route that I see that is blue, rather than red. Is this an option, or would it be both the red and blue lines if this route was chosen? Whatever info you are able to provide would be helpful. As I mentioned previously, there are a lot of tall trees on the southern line of our lot, which is right where the Route Segment 4R would be run - which would make us very sad if these trees had to be cut down. Our preference would be to just have the route run that is 350-feet south of our home, as discussed in a previous email correspondence that we had below where I stated: Having the power lines near our home is not ideal in the first place, but if it is, we ask that it be the southernmost route to give our neighborhood a little buffer. We have three young kids and both the construction impact, as well as the proximity to power lines, concerns me as a parent. Currently there are not any homes or developments built to the south of our property so it would make the most sense to run it there through the open field. We also would not want it to impact any of the trees on our property and with the first route it appears they would need to be removed or potentially impacted. See screenshot below. (Note, comment includes a screenshot of a map of Route Segment 4R)	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Route Segment 4R is discussed in Section 10.13.2 of the EIS. This section notes that the alternative would involve more tree clearing than its equivalent counterpart of Segment 4 West. Your opposition to Route Segment 4R has been noted.
35	20256-219768-01	Thank you for taking the time to respond to my email. Yes, you are correct. The red line route is preferred, and it would have less environmental impact, as there are no trees currently through the open field. The red line route would also allow easier access for construction and maintenance. The blue line route 4R would require a significant amount of tree removal along the southernmost line of our property, and the properties to the west of us. These trees provide privacy and shade for our home, and most of them along the route are very mature trees. Our overall preference would be to have the route along 75th street NW chosen, but if the route is chosen to the south of our home, that it would be the red line route and not the 4R blue line route. Yes, please include this email thread as a comment for the current comment period. Thank you again for taking the time to respond to me. We are anxiously awaiting the final route decision to be published. Please let me know if you would like any other information from me.	Your preference for Segment 4 East has been noted. Your opposition to Route Segment 4R has been noted.
35	20256-219768-01	I would also like to emphasize that even if they do not need to remove the trees based on the final location of the power lines (if the blue route 4R is selected), the weight of the heavy machinery for the construction of the poles is a concern, as the root systems of those trees span 15-20 feet underground around each of the trees. Any time a piece of heavy equipment moves over the soil of the root system it could potentially damage or kill the trees.	Comment noted.
36	20256-219808-01	Excel Energy began planning Mankato-Mississippi River Transmission Project (CN-22-532 and TL-23-157) in 2023. Throughout the route development process, the company devoted significant effort to public meetings and stakeholder engagement to ensure communities along the proposed routes were actively involved and had the opportunity to provide meaningful input of this substantial infrastructure initiative. At that time, all route options under consideration were located north of Dodge County, and as such, Dodge County attended the stakeholder engagement process but was informed that this would not have any impact on our county. However, during a March 2025 meeting with the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) regarding the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), the PUC requested that an alternative route—referred to as Hwy 14/Alternative 17—be explored. This newly proposed route would traverse Dodge County.	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process.

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
36	20256-219808-01	<p>It is concerning that a new route of this scale is being introduced so late in the planning process. Excel has spent nearly two years developing multiple route options, and is now being asked to evaluate a significantly longer alternative—approximately 15% longer—within a much shorter timeframe. Moreover, this alternative route affects several counties that were not included in the original routing process and are unfamiliar with the project, yet they are now expected to become informed enough to make comments in a matter of weeks. Dodge County was only made aware of the potential impacts of the Hwy 14/Alternative 17 route on May 16, 2025, via a public mailer (attached). We have until June 10, 2025, to submit formal comments. Given the scope and complexity of this project, this window is insufficient for a thorough review or for providing comprehensive and constructive feedback.</p> <p>We believe there was a breakdown in communication during the process, and Dodge County should have been notified of the potential route modification well in advance of May 16th. The introduction of this alternative feels rushed, and we respectfully request an extension of the public comment period, if this route is considered a viable option. Additional time is essential to allow Dodge County and its residents to adequately evaluate the proposed impacts and submit informed, meaningful comments on a project of this magnitude. (Note, comment includes the Notice of Informational Meetings, Public and Evidentiary Hearings, and Availability of Draft EIS).</p>	<p>Rich Davis from EERA emailed Dodge County on January 22, 2025 requesting zoning information for inclusion in the project's EIS.</p> <p>Mailings sent to landowners (including those along the Route Segment 17 Hwy 14 Option) after scoping included a January 31 letter from the applicant and a May 13 letter from PUC. The applicant's January 31, 2025, letter provided information about the project, information on how to submit public comments, and a map of all of the route and alignment alternatives being studied in the EIS (refer to docket ID number 20255-218883-01).</p> <p>The PUC's May 13, 2025 letter provided notice of the public hearings and provided information regarding the DEIS comment period.</p> <p>The applicant's January 31, 2025, letter provided information about the project, information on how to submit public comments, and a map of all of the route and alignment alternatives being studied in the EIS (refer to docket ID number 20255-218883-01). This letter was sent to Dodge County at 721 Main St N, Mantorville, MN 55955.</p>
37	20256-219803-01	<p>I am sure you are getting a barrage of emails today with this being the deadline for comments on this round of feedback. I do have one question I hope you may be able to answer.</p> <p>As I understand it, you are in charge of the environmental review of the project, seeking feedback from all individuals that may be impacted along the routes. Our neighbors did some research on why there is an alternative route 4R to the south of us, and it appears to be due to the landowner to the south of us not wanting the power lines running through the middle in case he decides to develop his property in the future. You may not know the answer to this as it is likely beyond your control, but how is the final route determined? I can appreciate the fact that the landowner to the south has a development planned, but considering our neighborhood and homes are already established I would hope that our comments would have more impact. The landowner could say a lot of things that may never come to fruition - ideas change, costs change, people change. Route 4R could conceivably be selected and then the landowner decides to never develop his property, then we are stuck with power lines close by for no reason other than for something he once had planned. We firmly believe that the route along 75th street NW is the ideal route, but if not then route 4O would be much preferred and less impactful to the current established homeowners in the area.</p> <p>I'm not sure if you are able to submit this email as an official comment as well, but if you are able to I would appreciate it.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process.</p> <p>Alternative routes were proposed during the scoping period and those alternatives accepted by the Commission for further study, such as Route Segment 4R, are listed in the scoping decision.</p> <p>Section 1.3 of the EIS explains the process for determining a final route.</p> <p>Your preference of Segment 4 East has been noted.</p> <p>Your opposition to Route Segment 4R has been noted.</p>
38	20256-219788-01	<p>As a resident of Oronoco Township and one of two owners of Two Sisters Kitchen + Bar Restaurant in the City of Oronoco, I don't support the installation of the Mankato-Mississippi 345kV Transmission line through the City of Oronoco or Oronoco Township.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process.</p> <p>Your opposition to Segment 4 East has been noted.</p>
38	20256-219788-01	<p>The southern portion of the 161kV preferred route would follow along 75th street which is just south of our primary home property in River Ridge. Concerns regarding health risks and decreased property values due to its proximity to the line would significantly affect me personally. Please consider using the existing capx2020 transmission lines for the 161vK preferred route.</p>	<p>Your preference for the CapX Co-Locate option has been noted.</p> <p>Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning human health and safety are discussed in Sections 5.6, 6.6, 7.6, 9.6, and 10.6 of the EIS.</p> <p>Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning property values are discussed in Sections 5.5.7, 6.5.7, 7.5.7, 9.5.7, and 10.5.7 of the EIS. Appendix I provides a Property Value Supplement.</p>
38	20256-219788-01	<p>Studies for this project say routes are selected to have minimal impact to humans and the environment. A transmission line through the City of Oronoco and developed neighborhoods along Hwy 52, 85th Street, and 75th Street would significantly impact hundreds of homes and businesses by loss of property taken to complete the project, health risks related to being in close proximity of transmission lines, and the unsightly look would negatively impact the value of property with transmission lines going through it. Please consider using the capx2020 transmission lines for both the 345kV and 161kV, or choose a route that impacts fewer people, their homes and businesses.</p>	<p>Your preference for the CapX Co-Locate option has been noted.</p>

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
39	20256-219809-01	<p>I had received this regarding the Mississippi River transmission line project and was wondering if you had a little time at some point soon to discuss.</p> <p>The property I represent is 2500 Adams St. - were in Mankato right across from the Walmart distribution center on the east end of town.</p> <p>From what I can see the proposed line would run along hwy. 14 - so it would run near or thru our property the way it looks? Just looking for clarification on what all is going on and what we need to expect.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process.</p> <p>The location of your property is shown on Map 13-16. The anticipated alignment for Segment 1 South and the Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14 Option) are on the north side of Highway 14, directly north of your property. The route width for these two options would overlap your property, the permanent ROW which is based on the anticipated alignment would not overlap your property. As described in Section 3.2.2.2 of the EIS, if Segment 1 South were selected by the Commission, modifications to the existing lines directly west of your property would also be required. Finally, refer to an email to you from Rich Davis sent on June 10, 2025 for additional information.</p>
40	20256-219811-01	<p>NoCapX 2020 and the Prehn Family, hereinafter "NoCapX and Prehn," hereby submits these Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and on the merits of the Certificate of Need and Routing Applications in the above-captioned "Mankato – Mississippi River" dockets. Our comments are primarily procedural. Attached is DNR Response to DPA Request and prior Comments in this docket for inclusion in the record and consideration.</p> <p>Per the Commission's Notice, Comments are solicited regarding the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What information needs to be clarified or included in the draft EIS to ensure that the final EIS is complete and accurate? • Should the Commission grant a certificate of need for the proposed MMRT Project? • Should the Commission grant a route permit for the proposed MMRT Project? • If granted, what additional conditions or requirements should be included in a route permit? <p>These are very general questions, only touching the tip of this iceberg of the many issues the Commission must consider, including significant systemic procedural problems.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process.</p>
40	20256-219811-01	<p>The Prehn Family's interest is in the southern alternative that ran just south of Waterville and Sakatah State Park – which also traversed the CenterPoint natural gas underground storage dome as shown in the application:</p> <p>(Note, comment includes a map of Segment 1 from the application)</p> <p>This was altered by Xcel in its May 6, 2024 Supplemental Comment with some, but NOT all of the gas wells shown:</p> <p>(Note, comment includes a revised (May 6, 2024) map from Xcel).</p> <p>Once the existence and location of the gas dome was revealed by the Prehns, it was quickly acknowledged by Xcel and CenterPoint was informed – again, AFTER the application.</p> <p>However, that natural gas storage dome is a well-known part of Minnesota utility infrastructure. The route over the dome should never have been proposed and accepted by the Commission and Commerce-EERA. It's very strange that this option was accepted as a potential route, that the dome was not disclosed by Xcel in its application, and without disclosure or inclusion in the application, the application should not have been declared "complete." Though the Prehn's route of concern has been perhaps eliminated due to Xcel's preference for the route North of the state park, their concerns about the blatant omissions and acceptance by the Commission of a route over the gas dome remain. It's odd, to say the least.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
40	20256-219811-01	<p>Following in the "odd" column, just before the public hearings, it was discovered that 1,341 landowners did not receive notice. While the statutes excuse failure to provide notice, where landowners have not been given notice, those routes should not be considered.</p>	<p>Mailings sent to landowners (including those along the Route Segment 17 Hwy 14 Option) after scoping included a January 31 letter from the applicant and a May 13 letter from PUC. The applicant's January 31, 2025, letter provided information about the project, information on how to submit public comments, and a map of all of the route and alignment alternatives being studied in the EIS (refer to docket ID number 20255-218883-01).</p> <p>The PUC's May 13, 2025 letter provided notice of the public hearings and provided information regarding the DEIS comment period.</p>

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
40	20256-219811-01	<p>THE APPLICATION WAS DEEMED COMPLETE WHEN IT WAS NOT COMPLETE</p> <p>In the application, Xcel proposed a route that would traverse a 13 square mile underground natural gas storage dome – and it did not disclose the fact of the dome's existence and location of that gas storage dome, nor did it even inform CenterPoint of its plans! It was NoCapX 2020 and the Prehn Family that gave notice of this route to CenterPoint, and raised other issues that should have rendered the application incomplete.</p> <p>In the Completeness round of comments, Xcel ducked its failure to address gas storage:</p> <p>With respect to identification of the underground natural gas storage and associated natural gas facilities in Project maps, publicly available pipeline and infrastructure data was used in the filed Application detailed maps in Appendix K. The Applicant completed additional review and contacted CenterPoint for additional information of this storage site and will continue to work with CenterPoint on any mitigation measures that may be needed. The Company is providing a revised version of Segment 1, Map 8 from Appendix K as Attachment B to these Reply Comments to indicate the location of the CenterPoint facility. The Applicant notes that it has extensive experience working with natural gas companies and other pipeline companies on evaluating and implementing AC mitigation when transmission lines cross or are located parallel to pipelines, which is a relatively common occurrence throughout the system.</p>	Comment noted.
40	20256-219811-01	<p>Xcel Completeness Comments, p. 7. Supplemental Comments were more forthcoming.</p> <p>As an example of the incompleteness of the application, early on at a Commission meeting, when raising the issue of the missing CenterPoint natural gas dome, despite it not being included in the Application, the Chair stated that the Commission was well aware of the gas dome, likely due to the Commission docket regarding the Texas freeze and shortage of natural gas. Despite the Commission's knowledge, Xcel was not instructed to include details about the gas dome in relation to its transmission proposal in the application:</p> <p>The Prehn family and NoCapX 2020 also raised a number of arguments regarding application completeness, including that the application fails to discuss: an existing underground gas storage facility in the project area, an identification of all homesteads within at least one-half mile of the proposed route, the potential for corrosive impact of transmission lines on pipelines, potential cumulative impacts on other transmission lines in the area, the need for a new easement if the full route does not fit within the existing easement, line losses, reactive power, electric and magnetic fields, socioeconomic impacts, property tax impacts, and an identification of the full system megawatt loading used in the modeling.</p> <p>The Commission has considered the concerns raised by the Prehn family and NoCapX2020 and determines that these issues would be best considered and addressed as part of the scoping process and further record development. The Commission also agrees with EERA, which argued that any contested issues can be addressed through the contested case hearing process that is required under the full permitting process for the route permit.</p> <p>Order Accepting Applications As Complete, Establishing Procedural Requirements, and Notice of Order For Hearing, June 26, 20243.</p> <p>The Prehns and NoCapX 2020 had raised the presence of the natural gas dome early on, and that basic fact of its existence should not have been ignored and the Commission should not have allowed Xcel to proceed with proposing a segment over the gas dome. Failure to provide this information is an example of an incomplete application.</p>	Comment noted.
40	20256-219811-01	<p>DEIS DOES ADDRESS CENTERPOINT GAS STORAGE BUT DOES NOT ADDRESS "AVOIDANCE" OR "MINIMIZATION" AND DOES NOT REMOVE THE ROUTE ALTERNATIVE OVER THE GAS DOME FROM CONSIDERATION</p> <p>The DEIS does have some information about the gas dome. However, the DEIS does not include sufficient information about the CenterPoint natural gas dome, and the FEIS should more fully disclose locations of wells and monitors and the potential issues disclosed by Xcel in routing transmission over the gas dome.</p> <p>The DEIS has a table showing nine wells within the Segment 1 Right of Way. DEIS, p. 181, Table 5-20. Xcel's May 6, 2024 Segment 1 map appears to show only 4. The FEIS must clarify how many gas wells and monitors (observation well?) are in the route area.</p>	<p>The DEIS indicates that the nine wells, all identified within the MWI well logs, all appear to be associated with facility operations. The EIS also notes installation of structure foundations along the Segment 1 South ROW would not encounter bedrock of the anticline formation. Structure foundations would generally range from 20 feet to 60 feet in depth.</p> <p>Refer to docket ID 202411-211748-01 which explains that Segment 1L was removed by the applicant given necessary setbacks needed to accommodate certain large equipment that is used by CenterPoint Energy at the gas wells.</p>
40	20256-219811-01	<p>The DEIS discusses "Potential Impacts," followed by "Mitigation." There is no section on "Avoidance" or "Minimization," the two actions preceding Mitigation. Jumping to Mitigation presumes no "Avoidance" or "Minimization," particularly concerning when it appears that "Avoidance" is the most sound option. The FEIS must address "Avoidance" and "Minimization."</p>	<p>Mitigation is the process of identifying means to avoid and minimize potential impacts. The EIS defines mitigation in multiple sections, including Section 5.1, to include avoiding impacts and minimizing impacts. The analyses included under the headings "Mitigation" include discussion of avoidance and minimization measures. Compensatory mitigation (compensating for impacts by replacing or providing substitute resources or environment) is a component of the mitigation sequence that comes after attempts are made to avoid and minimize resource impacts.</p>

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
40	20256-219811-01	The FEIS must describe "flashing in the event of a natural gas venting release," which Xcel raises in its May 6, 2024 Supplemental Comment, but it is nowhere in the DEIS.	CenterPoint noted that flashing would be unlikely. Flashing would require multiple path failures to occur, a failure in a connection for the natural gas to disperse, and heat or a fault in the transmission line to create a spark.
40	20256-219811-01	The DEIS must also address corrosion of pipeline due to interaction with electricity, a common occurrence when transmission and pipelines are sited parallel. There is no discussion of this, and because the pipelines have been in place for so long, what level of cathodic protection is present and what level is needed, and what cost of increasing protection would be.	The EIS does address induction mitigation needs, for example refer to Section 5.5.10.6, which states: Where the project crosses pipeline ROWs, mitigation might be required. If induction mitigation is necessary, the pipeline company would have to approve the mitigation being installed and the applicant would be responsible for the added project costs.
40	20256-219811-01	Had Xcel included the CenterPoint facility in its application, had Xcel had to notify CenterPoint of its wish to route over the gas dome, had CenterPoint learned of the proposed route and had to meet with Xcel rather than learn of it from the Prehns, the transmission route the company proposed over the gas dome would likely not have been proposed in the application, and the Prehns would not have had to intervene to address their interests in this application due to their living on top of the gas dome and ongoing issues with the CenterPoint gas dome over the last sixty years. Presumptions, yes, but the failure to disclose is significant, and should be addressed. How will Xcel be held accountable for necessary disclosures? The Prehns and NoCapX 2020 had documented most, but not all, of this gas dome infrastructure after an extensive survey of the area and provided a map in a scoping comment filed in July.	Public input into impacts and mitigation measures to study in the EIS during the scoping process are appreciated. Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process.
40	20256-219811-01	In response to a Data Practices Act Request to the DNR, NoCapX and the Prehns received a map that was provided to Commerce-EERA, documenting additional wells and monitors, plus the area of leased land, that had not been provided previously. In its May 6, 2024 Supplemental Comments, Xcel acknowledged the existence of the CenterPoint dome and disclosed that it had finally met with CenterPoint personnel on May 1, 2024, long after the application was submitted. The Company is aware of the CenterPoint underground gas storage facility and is coordinating with CenterPoint concerning the location of the Project and any necessary mitigation. The CenterPoint facility is used to store natural gas during the summer and to withdraw gas in the winter heating season with gas stored several hundred feet below ground in the Mount Simon Sandstone formation. On May 1, 2024, Company representatives met with CenterPoint staff to discuss the proposed Project and the CenterPoint facilities in this area. The proposed routes were discussed, as well as the 150 foot wide easement needed for the proposed 345 kV transmission line. The Company indicated that typical foundations for the proposed 345 kV transmission line structures range from 40-70 feet in depth, depending on site-specific soil and geologic conditions, and CenterPoint noted that these would have no impact on the underground storage facility, which is located several hundred feet underground. CenterPoint noted that the proposed Segment 1 South, Route Alternative 1L is near four wells associated with their facilities (see revised Segment 1, Map 8 attached to these Supplemental Comments which shows wells within 500 feet of the proposed centerline) and indicated that it requires a minimum clearance of 70 feet above each well for access and maintenance work. CenterPoint also noted that, while unlikely, transmission lines crossing over valve sites could experience flashing in the event of a natural gas venting release. The Company will continue to coordinate with CenterPoint to ensure that the proposed routes and transmission structures are adequately set back from the existing wells, valves, pipelines, and associated facilities to avoid any potential impacts. Additionally, the Company will work with CenterPoint to evaluate the need for potential AC mitigation.	Comment noted.
40	20256-219811-01	Xcel Supplemental Comments, p. 4, May 5, 2024. This DNR map shows that some of CenterPoint's infrastructure was not recorded in our area reconnaissance. The yellow area is land under lease for the gas dome, but obviously the dome does not observe the property lines, and likely extends beyond, evidenced by the wells in the State Park: (Note, comment includes a map from the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources showing Waseca-Waterville Gas Storage Field - area under lease and storage extent.	Comment noted.

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
40	20256-219811-01	<p>See Attachment A, p. 2, DNR Response to Data Request. This map should be in the FEIS, together with discussion of potential impacts, as disclosed by Xcel:</p> <p>CenterPoint noted that the proposed Segment 1 South, Route Alternative 1L is near four wells associated with their facilities (see revised Segment 1, Map 8 attached to these Supplemental Comments which shows wells within 500 feet of the proposed centerline) and indicated that it requires a minimum clearance of 70 feet above each well for access and maintenance work. CenterPoint also noted that, while unlikely, transmission lines crossing over valve sites could experience flashing in the event of a natural gas venting release.</p>	<p>Figure 5-9 in the EIS has been updated to include the approximate location of the underground gas storage area. Additionally, Section 5.9.5.2 of the EIS has been updated to include note that the presence of associated natural gas wells, and the need for vertical clearance to accommodate equipment access, can restrict transmission line placement over well locations.</p>
40	20256-219811-01	<p>May 6, 2024 Supplemental Comments.</p> <p>Repetition of this information is not beating a dead horse. Failure to provide notice to CenterPoint, failure to include such obvious and material information in an application, proposing what appears to be an unconstructable transmission route in its application, and the Commission's declaration of this application as "complete," are examples of why the Commission's "completeness" decision is an inadequate base on which to build a record to support any decision.</p> <p>A review of the DEIS7 does show that it includes some information about the CenterPoint gas dome, but not enough. It discusses coordination as if it is necessary because the route is open for consideration, and does not eliminate it from consideration due to potential interaction between the utility infrastructure. Although Xcel has stated that its preferred route is the northern route through that area, the alternative route over the gas dome apparently remains available.</p>	<p>Segment 1 South is still an option. The northern edge of the gas dome and the nearest well is approximately 75' from Segment 1 South's anticipated alignment.</p>
40	20256-219811-01	<p>THE "INFORMAL" PROCESS IN THIS DOCKET HAS NO DIRECTION FROM THE COMMISSION, AND IS UNSUITABLE FOR REVIEW OF A CERTIFICATE OF NEED APPLICATION FOR A PROJECT OF THIS SIZE AND INTEREST</p> <p>The "informal" process "may be used when contested case proceedings are not required" and the rule gives specific examples of where this is appropriate – review of this Certificate of Need application does not fit within any of the categories where informal process is allowed, i.e., where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. there are no material facts in dispute; B. the parties and the commission have agreed to informal or expedited proceedings; or C. informal or expedited proceedings are authorized or required by statute. <p>See Minn. R. 7829.1200.</p> <p>Looking at the criteria for informal proceedings, there's no basis for informal proceedings for this Certificate of Need Application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there material facts in dispute? Whether a project is "needed" is the most basic of material facts, and MISO "approval" and MISO and Xcel desire for the project are not need. Even with the many filing exemptions for Xcel, these exemptions are not exemptions from provision of information to prove up need. Xcel relies solely upon MISO for its need claim, and MISO is not the decider. MISO's criteria is not the Commission's criteria. MISO "approval" does not convey approval of the Commission – the Commission has statutory criteria that must be met. • Have the parties and the commission agreed to informal proceedings? No. Comments and briefing papers document the Prehn Family and NoCapX 2020's request for a contested case. • Are informal proceedings authorized or required by statute? Nope. 	<p>As you noted, the Order Accepting Applications as Complete, Establishing Procedural Requirements, and Notice of Order for Hearing, June 26, 2024, authorized review using the informal process.</p>
40	20256-219811-01	<p>Under the rules, a Contested Case may be requested at any time before the end of the Public Comment period. The Public Comment period ends today, June 10, 2025. Staff briefing papers acknowledged the possibility that, as provided by the rules, a contested case may be requested during the Comment period:</p> <p>Concerning the hearing process, staff notes that with one exception, there have been no requests to refer the certificate of need application for a contested case proceeding; however, due to the anticipated controversy and because the route permit application review process must include a contested case proceeding, the Commission may want to consider forwarding the certificate of need application to the OAH with the route application for joint proceedings.</p> <p>In addition, the Commission should be aware of the possible scenario where a contested case is requested on the certificate of need application during the reply comment period on the merits, which is months into the review process. Considering the need for a contested case and then conducting one at that time would likely add additional time to the review schedule.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
40	20256-219811-01	<p>Staff Briefing Papers, May 22, 20248.</p> <p>The Informal process was Ordered by the Commission with only nominal direction:</p> <p>Hearings in this matter will be conducted in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, Minn. Stat. 14.57-14.62; Minn. R. 1400, 5010-8400; and to the extent they are not superseded by those rules, the Commission's rules of Practice and Procedure, Minn. R. 7829.0100 to 7829.400. Hearings may be recessed and reset by the ALJ pursuant to Minn. R. 1405.1400 to 2300.</p> <p>Order Accepting Applications As Complete, Establishing Procedural Requirements, and Notice of Order For Hearing, June 26, 20249.</p> <p>The Commission hereby accepts the certificate of need permit application as substantially complete and authorizes review using the informal process.</p> <p><i>Id.</i>, p. 9. No other direction was given.</p> <p>Initial and Reply Comment periods were set, Comments were filed, and then what? How would a record be developed, Findings of Fact sufficient to support a Certificate of Need decision? What is the role of the Administrative Law Judge in the Certificate of Need docket? Or would fact finding be left to Commission staff, or to the Commissioners, to the Commission's Order writer, or would Xcel write those "Findings of Fact." The murkiness of the process is disturbing.</p>	<p>The role of the ALJ is outside the scope of the EIS. Section 2.1 of the EIS notes that the Commission accepted the application as complete and authorized use of informal proceedings. That decision making process is outside the scope of the EIS.</p>
40	20256-219811-01	<p>What will be considered a part of the record? Many scoping and public comments addressed need for the project. Would Commenters have to specifically direct their comments to the CoN docket? Would they have to resubmit comments made to be considered? Commenters at the public meetings and hearings were not provided the option to testify under oath, oath was not offered, and testifying under oath is allowed under the rules. What weight would the comments not under oath receive?</p>	<p>It is our understanding that most or nearly all comments are posted to both the TL and CN docket. It is possible if someone posted directly to the docket, they may have selected one docket number and not the other.</p>
40	20256-219811-01	<p>Xcel's pre-application meetings, EERA's Scoping meetings, and Public Hearings were very well attended, and commenters were frequent and eloquent. Many of the members of the public present at informational and public scoping meetings, many of the commentors, have raised the issue of need – need itself is in its essence a contested matter. A review of the Commission's decision does not provide any rationale for assigning this docket to the "informal" process. There are material facts in dispute –NEED is the most basic material fact. See NoCapX Prehn 3-28-2025 Initial, 4-1-2025 Supplemental Initial, and 4-25-2025 Reply Need Comments.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
40	20256-219811-01	<p>The Commission's authorization of use of the "informal" process did not set out any framework for review, did not offer specifics for how this process would proceed. The process in this docket is not flawed, it's nonexistent.</p> <p>At this time, the Prehn Family and NoCapX 2020 again request a contested case. In the alternative, we request Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and a Recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
40	20256-219811-01	<p>ALTHOUGH THERE'S A STATUTORY OUT WHERE NOTICE IS NOT PROVIDED, FAILURE TO PROVIDE NOTICE SHOULD ELIMINATE THOSE LANDOWNERS' LAND FROM CONSIDERATION FOR TRANSMISSION.</p> <p>Unfortunate as it is for landowners, Minnesota law is clear that notice is nice, but failure of notice is not a dealbreaker: The failure to provide mailed notice to a property owner or defects in the notice do not invalidate the proceedings, provided a bona fide attempt to comply with this subdivision has been made.</p> <p>Minn. Stat. §216I.05, Subd. 8(4)(d). What constitutes a "bona fide attempt" where land may be taken, and where the U.S. and Minnesota Constitutions require due process?</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
40	20256-219811-01	<p>In this docket, it's been revealed that 1,341 landowners did not receive notice. Failure of notice for 1,341 landowners is no small matter. How this happened is not clear, but what is clear is that affected landowners should not pay the price for failure of notice. Landowners who did not receive notice have been denied the opportunity to Intervene, as the best case of Notice was Xcel's mailing on January 31, 2024, two weeks after the Intervention deadline. The Commission did not send notice until days before the Public Hearings. At least one very upset landowner did appear at a Public Hearing, perhaps more at other hearings, but looking at the timeline, did landowners have sufficient "YOUR LAND MAY BE AFFECTED" notice to learn how this process works and what they could do to advocate for themselves? It's doubtful.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
40	20256-219811-01	<p>See Attached 6-5-2025 DoC Response to NoCapX Prehn IR-1; 6-6-2025 Xcel Response to NoCapX Prehn IRs 4 & 5; All property of landowners who did not receive notice should be removed from consideration as a route option.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
40	20256-219811-01	<p>NoCapX 2020 and the Prehn Family are eFiling prior comments to assure they are included in the hearing record for both dockets. We are grateful for this final opportunity to comment in the above-captioned proceeding, and appreciate Xcel's preference of the route alternative that does not cross CenterPoint's natural gas storage dome.</p> <p>(Note, comment includes previous comments).</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
41	20256-219799-01	<p>On May 13th, 2025, the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (Commission) and the Minnesota Department of Commerce (DOC) issued a Notice of Public Information Meetings, Public and Evidentiary Meetings, and Availability of Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) on Xcel Energy's (Applicant) Certificate of Need (CN) and Route Permit (RP) applications for the Mankato – Mississippi River 345kV Transmission Line Project (Project). The Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) has reviewed the DEIS on the proposed Project and submits the following comments and suggested edits in response to the Notice. (Note, bold text is suggested edits from MnDOT; strikethrough text is to be removed).</p> <p>MnDOT appreciates the work of the DOC staff and the Applicant on the Project's DEIS, and for incorporating part of MnDOT's findings from the Applicant's Utility Early Notification Memo on Route Segment 17. MnDOT offers these suggested edits and additions to portions of the DEIS that apply to areas within our purview, focusing on Route Segment 17.</p>	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process.
41	20256-219799-01	<p>2.7.3 State of Minnesota Approvals</p> <p>The Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) requires a two-step process for constructing transmission lines within a Minnesota trunk highway ROW. The first step would be to complete an Early Notification Memo (ENM), which details the project's anticipated effects on the trunk highway system, so the agency is aware of environmental and other interests related to the project. The second step for receiving a permit from MnDOT includes developing a constructability report. The constructability report is required by Minnesota Statute § 161.45.6 and includes terms and conditions of building the collocated project. The report is required to be approved prior to issuing a permit to use the trunk highway interstate and other state or US highways with controlled access to construct the transmission line. Following the approval of the constructability report, the commissioner would provide advance notice for the project to move forward, preferably a four year advance notice. A completed, approved and signed constructability report would include language describing the minimum four-year advanced notice from the Commissioner of Transportation wherein the Applicant would be required to relocate any structures that conflict with a state transportation project. The application would be required to comply with all permit conditions outlined in the route permit and comply with MnDOT permit conditions.</p> <p>Additional permits that may be required by MnDOT include an access driveway and oversized/overweight permits. To access the construction corridor, temporary driveway access locations from state highways may be required. Form 1721 outlines the necessary information to include in the application. In some cases, and as is the case with the entire Route Segment 17 Option along US 14, access from the MnDOT roads may not be permissible where there is controlled access. During construction, oversize/overweight permits would be required. Oversized/overweight permits may be needed to transport mobile cranes, utility poles, construction equipment, and construction materials to the project location. Additional permits may be required for transporting overweight equipment and materials during seasonal road restrictions observed in the spring. Oversized/overweight permits are typically requested by vendors working on the project.</p>	These edits have been made to Section 2.7.3 of the EIS.
41	20256-219799-01	<p>3.3.2.1 Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14 Option) Opportunity for MnDOT ROW Sharing</p> <p>Route Segment 17 would parallel US Highway 14 for approximately 80 miles from Mankato to Byron. The requested permanent ROW would be 150 feet and would parallel or overlap with the existing MnDOT highway ROW. Permanent utility ROW or easements do not apply to areas within, overlapping, or otherwise encroaching MnDOT ROW. Because utility facilities are allowed to occupy trunk highway ROW via permit only, the Applicant would not have continued access to any trunk highway ROW and would be required to obtain additional permits from MnDOT for each instance of access for any reason. The US Highway 14 MnDOT ROW varies in width to accommodate controlled access to the highway. The anticipated alignment would be placed within and outside of the existing MnDOT ROW. If the anticipated alignment is within the MnDOT ROW, the utility pole would be placed outside of the clear zone. The clear zone is an unobstructed travel area beyond the through-traveled way that allows errant vehicles to recover. MnDOT provides guidance in their Facility Design Guide on recommended clear zone distances. Clear zone distances range from 18 feet to 46 feet along US Highway 14 and are dependent on the speed of travel, embankment slope, and radius of turn. Typical ROW configurations are provided in Figure 3-16 for transmission centerlines outside of the MnDOT ROW and within the MnDOT ROW.</p>	These edits have been made to Section 3.3.2.1 of the EIS.
41	20256-219799-01	<p>Figure 3-16 Typical MnDOT ROW Configurations</p> <p>Consider replacing "Easement Overlap" with "Area of Colocation"</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>EERA does not have an original working copy of this figure and therefore this edit was not made.</p>

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
41	20256-219799-01	<p>6.5.10.5 Potential Impacts</p> <p>Vehicles and equipment that would be used for construction of the transmission line (for example, overhead line cranes, concrete trucks, construction equipment, and material delivery trucks) are generally heavy load vehicles and can cause more damage to road surfaces. Oversized/overweight load permits must be obtained from MnDOT and county road authorities when size and/or weight limits would be exceeded. During operation, severe weather, including high winds, ice, snowstorms, and tornadoes, could result in structure damage. If structures and lines fall over or otherwise reach the ground, they would create safety hazards on any roadways located within the designed fall distance of an overhead transmission line parallel to existing roadways. Snow and ice accumulation and high winds could make the transmission line more susceptible to failure or collapse. Any additional, significant, non-breakaway above ground infrastructure within road ROW increases the probability of errant vehicle collisions. The applicant indicated that its design standards would meet or surpass NESC requirements for the safe design and operation of transmission lines. These standards include designing transmission lines to withstand severe winds from summer storms and the combination of ice and strong winds from winter weather.</p>	These edits have been made to Section 6.5.10.5 and the equivalent sections in Chapters 5, 7, 9, and 10.
41	20256-219799-01	<p>6.5.10.6 Mitigation</p> <p>The applicant committed to attempt to avoid or limit roadway closures to the maximum extent practicable and using conductor safety guides over roads or utilize helicopters for stringing activities where possible. The applicant also noted impacts to traffic would be mitigated by limiting construction traffic to the project right-of-way and existing access points to the maximum extent feasible and minimizing impacts related to dust by proper use of BMPs (e.g., soil matting, wetting) to reduce the potential for dust. The applicant also committed to utilizing appropriate safety measures such as use of safety signage, installation of temporary barrier structures, and employing spotters during clearing or stringing activities. The Applicant is responsible for obtaining an approved Traffic Control Plan from MnDOT's affected District office(s) utilizing guidance and specifications from Temporary Traffic Control Zone Layouts Field Manual 2018. Finally, the applicant would meet with MnDOT, county highway departments, township road supervisors, and/or city road personnel to address any issues that occur during roadway construction.</p>	These edits have been made to Section 6.5.10.6 and the equivalent sections in Chapters 5, 7, 9, and 10.
41	20256-219799-01	<p>MnDOT has a responsibility to ensure that possible impacts to the entire state trunk highway system, safety of the traveling public and MnDOT maintenance personnel, and environmentally significant areas of concern are adequately addressed. Accommodating utility facilities within trunk highway ROW can be in the public's interest when such use and occupancy of the ROW does not interfere with the free and safe flow of traffic, does not impair the highway or its protected visual quality, does not conflict with any provision of federal, state, or local law, rule, or regulation, and does not unreasonably increase the difficulty or future cost of highway construction or maintenance. Although MnDOT strives to accommodate utility facilities whenever possible, the permitted use and occupancy of highway ROW for non-highway purposes is subordinate to the primary interest and safety of the traveling public.</p>	Comment noted.
42	20256-219788-02	<p>Resolution No. 25-40</p> <p>A Resolution of the Waseca City Council Endorsing Additional Socioeconomic Evaluation of Tranche Route Option C, Route Segment 17 (Highway 14 Option) Transmission Corridor</p> <p>(Note, comment includes a signed copy of the June 3, 2025 resolution - signed by Randy Zimmerman, Mayor and Julia Zuehlke, City Clerk. Comment also includes letters regarding the resolution - these are 42A-42F).</p>	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. The EIS has been updated to note the City of Waseca's resolution in Section 7.5.5.1.2. The potential for future interconnection requests as a result of the project has been added to Section 7.5.5.2 of the EIS.
42A	20256-219788-02	<p>On behalf of the Waseca City Economic Development Authority, I am writing to formally recommend a further review of the proposed Minnesota Highway 14 corridor south segment option as a viable route for Xcel Energy's proposed Mankato to Mississippi River 345 kV Transmission Project.</p> <p>The Waseca EDA has reviewed Xcel Energy's preferred route segment and recognizes the importance of modernizing electrical infrastructure to meet growing regional demand and renewable energy integration.</p> <p>We believe the current proposed route should more fully consider the evolving needs and opportunities across southeast Minnesota.</p> <p>We believe the "alternate route" of the Highway 14 corridor represents a strategically sound plan that would better align with state energy goals, regional development priorities, and local community interests. A full and fair analysis will help ensure that all stakeholders- including municipalities, residents, and energy consumers- benefit from the best possible routing decision.</p> <p>The Waseca EDA supports infrastructure development that promotes regional economic vitality and equitable energy distribution, particularly in communities like Waseca and its surrounding areas.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration and continued commitment to a fair and inclusive planning process. The Waseca EDA welcomes any opportunity to collaborate further in support of responsible energy infrastructure planning.</p>	Section 7.5.5.1.2 of the EIS has been updated to reflect the EDA's support for infrastructure development near communities like Waseca. Section 7.5.5.2 has been updated to acknowledge the potential future economic benefits the HVTL could bring to communities like Waseca.

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
42B	20256-219788-02	<p>I spent some time this morning with Bill Besch nett, who represents The West Interchange Group. That group and I own approximately 160 acres just inside the west interchange, immediately west of the airport. We have spoken many times about the possibility that this would be ideal development land. We understand that the city and county governments are beginning to do some long term planning regarding this possibility. Nick and I would appreciate it very much if you would include the us in your deliberations. We also understand that the owners to the south are eager to be included. Not many areas could put together a development of this size. We also understand that the power line location is still up for consideration, and we of course understand how important this would be to the entire area.</p> <p>Please feel free to contact either Nick or myself if any further information is needed.</p>	Section 7.5.5.1.2 of the EIS has been updated to acknowledge the landowners letters of interest for this land to be developed in the future.
42C	20256-219788-02	<p>Thank you for reaching out to me last week. I represent the West Interchange group and have discussed this situation with both John Gardner and Vern Benson who are the two other partners in the West Interchange Group. We own 80+ acres directly south of the west interchange, and are in close contact with the owner of the 80 acres just to our east. While I am speaking only on behalf of our group, I will be speaking with Wayne O'connor, the owner to the east shortly, and I am certain that he will also contact you, speaking as we do on this opportunity.</p> <p>The West Interchange Group certainly supports a further review and analysis of the economic impact as it relates to the electrical power lines and other infrastructure being considered by both the city and the county. As you already are aware, our group has had our land under consideration for outside development, only to be turned down due to this very lack of infrastructure.</p> <p>Also, we feel very strongly that we need to continue with talks regarding how we may best develop this land, including annexation, its timing and its affects on real estate taxes and such. While we are not developers, we purchased this land close to twenty years ago, hoping that at some future date, development would occur. Things most often work out best for a region when there is a willing buyer and a willing seller, both local.</p>	Section 7.5.5.1.2 of the EIS has been updated to acknowledge the landowners letters of interest for this land to be developed in the future.
42D	20256-219788-02	<p>This letter serves as an acknowledgment of support for a comprehensive review and analysis of the economic impact related to developmental infrastructure needs, including electrical power transmission, sewer, water, and fiber optic connectivity for the interchange located west of Waseca, Minnesota.</p> <p>I am the owner of approximately 150 acres of tillable land adjacent to this west interchange.</p> <p>I would also like to express my interest in learning more about the potential for annexation into the City of Waseca, as well as the opportunity to sell and/or develop this parcel for future commercial use.</p> <p>Regarding the proposed Mankato to Mississippi 345 kV Transmission Line expansion, I strongly encourage the City of Waseca, Xcel Energy, and the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission to fully investigate and compare the environmental impact of the Highway 14 corridor with the Highway 60 corridor. I also urge consideration of the socioeconomic advantages and commercial development potential associated with the Highway 14 corridor.</p>	Section 7.5.5.1.2 of the EIS has been updated to acknowledge the landowners letters of interest for this land to be developed in the future.
42E	20256-219788-02	<p>This letter is an acknowledgment of support for a full review and analysis of the economic impact for developmental infrastructure, including electrical power transmission, sewer, water, and ftberoptic connectivity for the interchange west of Waseca, MN.</p> <p>I own approximately 100 acres of tillable land adjacent to this west interchange. This letter is also to express my intent to negotiate towards annexation into the city of Waseca, and to sell and/or develop this parcel for commercial development.</p> <p>In regards to the proposed Mankato to Mississippi 345 kV Transmission line expansion, I strongly encourage the City of Waseca, Xcel Energy, and the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission to fully investigate and consider the Hwy 14 corridor concerning the environmental impact compared to the Hwy 60 corridor, and the socioeconomic benefits and business development potential of the Hwy 14 corridor.</p>	Section 7.5.5.1.2 of the EIS has been updated to acknowledge the landowners letters of interest for this land to be developed in the future.

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
42F	20256-219788-02	<p>On behalf of the Waseca County Board of Commissioners, I would like to express our strong desire to see further review and consideration for electric transmission along the Highway 14 Route Option.</p> <p>As a local government, we have many shared interests with the City of Waseca, and have engaged in many collaborative efforts over the years in the areas of community and economic development. We believe the areas surrounding the Highway 14 corridor are ripe for future development given its strategic position along an arterial highway connecting the state from east to west.</p> <p>The University of Minnesota Center for Transportation Studies has published research in the last 18 months that both maps and creates a case study illustrating the statewide impact of medical device industry clusters, and the vital role that transportation plays. This study, <i>Industry Clusters on the Prairie: Economic Drivers in South Central Minnesota</i>, focused on the dispersion of key manufacturers in greater Minnesota, and specifically highlights the Highway 14 corridor as essential infrastructure for expanding on the global reputation that Minnesota has built as a hub for innovation and production of medical devices and technology.</p> <p>Another recent study <i>MedTech Connect: Medical Device Manufacturing and Supply Chain Analysis in South Central Minnesota</i>, published by the Region 9 Development Commission, is cited in the UofM work and used as key evidentiary information for their conclusion. These are two strong examples that communicate that the State should be emphasizing expansion, growth and development of critical assets and infrastructure along the M199 Highway 14 corridor. Not only is it a logical approach considering current metrics, it's critical considering future metrics.</p> <p>Our ask is that you lean on existing, scholarly works that have already been established and then add in your own expanded analysis on socioeconomic impacts to our area. This doesn't just have potential regional benefits, but statewide benefits.</p>	Comment noted.
43	20256-219785-01	<p>EERA, on behalf of the interagency Vegetation Management Planning Working Group (VMPWG), respectfully submits comments on the Vegetation Management Plan (VMP) proposed by Xcel Energy (Applicant).</p> <p>The VMPWG has reviewed the draft VMP for the proposed Mankato to Mississippi River Transmission Project (Project) included as Appendix V of the Joint Certificate of Need and Route Permit Application filed April 2, 2024.1 The VMPWG does not recommend any action by the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (Commission) at this time, but is providing comments to facilitate transparency in the record as the VMPWG works with Xcel Energy to arrive at a VMP that is adequate to meet preconstruction compliance filing requirements.</p> <p>Overall, the plan for site restoration and implementation appears to be achievable and includes a description of standards for handling vegetation removal, protecting existing vegetation during site preparation and construction, and revegetating areas of exposed soil following construction.</p> <p>The VMPWG is committed to working with applicants and permittees to ensure that site restoration is successful and meets the objectives laid out in the management plan. The VMPWG provides these specific comments on the plan and recommends that Xcel Energy address these comments in its preconstruction VMP submittal:</p>	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process.
43	20256-219785-01	<p>Goals and Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The applicant should define the goals of the VMP and connect them to management objectives. Short-term and long-term management goals and objectives are also necessary for each management section. 	Comment noted.
43	20256-219785-01	<p>Management Sections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Project's Proposed Route will span a variety of land use and ecosystem types. The VMPWG recommends the applicant define Project "management sections" based on the different vegetation communities that will be restored along the route (e.g., turfgrass, agricultural production, forests, wetland, etc.). The Construction, Restoration, and Maintenance sections of the VMP should include general BMPs that will apply to all areas within the route, such as the clearing of dangerous trees, and be further split by management section for the discussion of section-specific BMPs, such as the maintenance requirements of a native pollinator restoration. 	Comment noted.

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
43	20256-219785-01	<p>Environmental Setting and Existing Conditions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The VMP should include a description of the project location, size, boundaries, and components. - The VMP must comply with applicable Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MN DNR) requirements related to state-listed endangered and threatened species in accordance with Minnesota's Endangered Species Statute (Minnesota Statutes, section 84.0895) and associated Rules (Minnesota Rules, part 6212.1800 to 6212.2300 and 6134). The applicant must keep records of compliance with this section and provide them upon the request of Department of Commerce or Commission staff. - The VMP should include an additional section that describes the environmental setting within the anticipated route, including the vegetation communities, land cover types, topography, soils, and hydrology, and address if there are restrictions that will be followed for sensitive areas (i.e., licenses for crossing DNR lands or public waters). - In addition to state-listed and endangered species, consider the following sensitive areas in your environmental setting section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Crossing lands with Tribal interest. o Lands with cultural or historic interest. o Identify calcareous fens and rare natural communities under WCA. 	Comment noted.
43	20256-219785-01	<p>Rare and Sensitive Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The VMPWG requests the applicant identify and address any rare species or sensitive resources within the proposed route. The following information should be included in the environmental setting section of the VMP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A conservation planning project report from MN DNR Minnesota Conservation Explorer tool (https://mce.dnr.state.mn.us/) to identify conservation areas of concern along the proposed route. o The rare species requirements from DNR Natural Heritage Review. 	Comment noted.
43	20256-219785-01	<p>Vegetation Clearing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project clearing should be designed to avoid impacts to bats, nesting birds, and migratory birds in preparation for route-specific permit conditions and avoidance measures. The applicant is advised that coordination with DNR may be necessary to ensure impacts are appropriately avoided. The VMP should include additional detail about tree removal timing and anticipated acreage to minimize impacts and comply with avoidance plans. The VMP should include species specific identification and monitoring to ensure consistency with applicable avoidance measures (e.g., NHIS or USFWS) or special permit conditions. - The applicant should clarify if any mitigative strategies will take place to reduce the impacts of tree removal. (e.g., providing brush piles for wildlife habitat, following guidance for seed mixes under wire area, harvesting forage/hay as a management tactic with landowner agreement.) - The applicant should clarify if there will be herbicide application to stumps and identify the type and application method of said herbicides. 	Comment noted.
43	20256-219785-01	<p>ROW Preparation and Construction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The VMP should further describe the different pre-construction activities planned for the ROW including surveying, establishing laydown areas, and installing temporary roads and travel lanes. - The applicant should describe the activities, steps, and equipment required for the construction of the transmission line. 	Comment noted.
43	20256-219785-01	<p>Temporary Erosion and Sediment Control BMPs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Project BMPs should be consistent with DNR's wildlife-friendly erosion control standards. - The applicant should describe the conditions under which temporary erosion and sediment control BMPs may be installed on site. - The applicant should develop an erosion monitoring plan for wet soil conditions that identifies the factors to be monitored and the appropriate responses in erosion scenarios. - The VMP should also identify if permanent erosion controls will be used. If they will, describe the conditions/locations where they will be installed and the types of permanent controls that will be used. 	Comment noted.
43	20256-219785-01	<p>Herbicide Application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Herbicide should be applied as a spot-treatment to limit the likelihood of spray drift. If broadcast spray applications are expected, the applicant should include a plan to prevent herbicide spray drift into existing native plant communities, sensitive areas, or landowner properties in the VMP. - The applicant should provide additional information regarding herbicide use including herbicide type, surfactant rate, and frequency. 	Comment noted.

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
43	20256-219785-01	<p>Restoration and Establishment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional information regarding the management, movement, removal, and disposal of soil during restoration is needed. - The applicant should provide more detail about how areas will be identified for natural revegetation vs. seed installation. - The discussion of site preparation should include more details about soil preparation prior to seeding, including methods for decompaction and loosening soils. The applicant should address where mulch is intended to be used, and areas where it will be avoided, such as in wetlands or sensitive ecological zones. 	Comment noted.
43	20256-219785-01	<p>Seed Mixes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The VMPWG requests that the VMP include a table listing the seed mixes that will be used for the project with a corresponding description of the locations each seed mix will be used. The VMPWG recommends the use of diverse, native perennial seed mixes in the appropriate Project management sections, such as landowner-approved pollinator vegetation or forest edges, which provide maximal wildlife and ecosystem benefits. BWSR and MnDOT seed mixes should be considered to address site specific needs. - Project seed mixes should be chosen with the following considerations, with the acknowledgement that they may not be applicable to the management sections that are restored to agricultural or residential lawn use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Plant species should be consistent with the surrounding vegetation, and both seed mixes and management should be tailored to geography, native ecosystem, and soil type. The applicant is advised to consider the effects of sunlight exposure, moisture levels, topography, and climate resilience on plant establishment when selecting seed mixes. o The applicant should utilize native seed mixes when appropriate or required by permit. Native seed mixes should be used on borders with Native Plant Communities, Minnesota Biological Survey Sites of Biodiversity Significance, and/or sensitive natural areas. Transmission line routes can provide habitat and act as dispersal corridors for wildlife, and the applicant is encouraged to promote the creation and restoration of wildlife habitat along the route. - EERA and partner agencies request that the applicant provide a list of species substitutions for each seed mix. The applicant can work directly with EERA, BWSR, and DNR or use the seed substitution list provided by BWSR. The goal is to ensure that the ecological niche and guild of a plant species is retained when substitutions are necessary. 	Comment noted.
43	20256-219785-01	<p>Vegetation Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The applicant should describe the periodic vegetation management techniques that will be utilized during the Project's Operation and Maintenance phase. Vegetation management methods should be timed to avoid impacts to ground-nesting birds, bats, pollinators, and other wildlife. Vegetation management methods should also be tailored to the specific management section and the appropriate land use type, such as the management of pollinator vegetation vs. turf grass. - The VMP should include an Operation and Maintenance vegetation management implementation plan that defines the management BMPs that will be utilized to reduce and avoid impacts to wildlife, such as timing of management activities and height and type of the equipment used. The vegetation management implementation plan should describe how the resulting cuttings and trimmings will be handled. - Vegetation management equipment should be cleaned prior to use to prevent the spread of invasive species along the route. 	Comment noted.
43	20256-219785-01	<p>Herbicide Use and Weed Control</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mowing can increase the presence of noxious weeds, and the mower can spread these species throughout the site. The use of mowing to prevent the development of noxious, invasive, and woody plants should be approached with caution. - Managing weeds is important in vegetation restoration. Weed control through herbicide management should only include spot treatments, not broadcast spray, and the VMPWG recommends that spot treatments be required, not preferred, as a management technique. The VMP should include a description of steps that will be taken to ensure that spray drift will not impact nearby land. The applicant is advised that widespread application of herbicides may act as a pre-emergent and reduce germination of desired vegetation. 	Comment noted.

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
43	20256-219785-01	<p>Monitoring and Inspections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The VMPWG recommends that monitoring and inspections be conducted by a qualified, thirdparty monitor with sufficient botanical experience in identifying native plants, native plant communities, invasive species, and non-native species typical of Minnesota in areas where specific vegetation communities are being restored or alongside areas containing sensitive resources or protected species. - The applicant should describe the monitoring plan for areas where seeding and erosion control measures have been implemented. The monitoring plan should define the threshold upon which reseeding measures will be needed. - An annual monitoring report allows for revisions to the Project VMP based on any shortcomings or challenges experienced during implementation. The VMPWG recommends the adoption of an annual reporting approach to keep the VMP “alive” and on track for successful implementation and long-term success. The contents of annual monitoring reports should be defined, and a submission protocol should be established within the VMP. 	Comment noted.
43	20256-219785-01	<p>Updates to the Vegetation Management Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The VMPWG understands that Xcel Energy is still finalizing aspects of the VMP and requests that Xcel Energy continue to coordinate with EERA and other state agencies as the VMP is finalized prior to construction. 	Comment noted.
43	20256-219785-01	<p>In summary, EERA recommends that the applicant continue to coordinate with the VMPWG as it finalizes the vegetation management plan, including the identification of existing rare and sensitive resources, refinement of the installation, management, and monitoring plans to fit different management sections, selection of appropriate seed mixes, and an updated monitoring and inspection and reporting plan. The VMPWG looks forward to the successful site restoration of the Mankato to Mississippi River Transmission Project. The VMPWG will provide additional review and recommendations to the Commission as part of EERA's pre-construction compliance review.</p>	Comment noted.
44	20256-219788-03	<p>Hello, we are the leadership team of the Rochester Aero Model Society (RAMS) Minnesota radio controlled airplane club, a club chartered with the Academy of Model Aeronautics (AMA). We lease land for our airfield from the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA). We would like to voice our concerns with the proposed Route 4 West alternative in Segment 4 of the transmission line project. Our flying field has a nationally recognized FAA-Recognized Identification Area (FRIA) and is located at 2633 85th St NW, Rochester, MN. The Route 4 West alternative runs along the south side of the FRIA. A large 161 kV transmission line would be significantly detrimental to our club to the point that it may result in the club's closing. The proposed Route 4 West alternative route crosses our main landing approach necessitating a shortening of our approach increasing the possibility of damage to our aircraft and reducing flight safety. Our runway cannot be modified because of the contour of the land. While we don't have specific infrastructure identified at this point, the map calls for the transmission line to cross from the North side of 85th street to the South side at the South East corner of our flying field. This would imply that there are poles on the North and South side of the road at the cross over points. The pole on the North side of the road would be straight off the end of the runway. I am attaching some photos of our FRIA space, and the club's location along 85th Street NW. Note that our runway has two surfaces, a smaller fabric surface which appears black in the photo, surrounded by a larger grass runway. The fabric runway is used by smaller aircraft (with smaller wheels), while the grass runway is used by our larger aircraft. It's the larger faster flying aircraft, which have a larger traffic pattern, using the grass runway that would be impacted the most by the transmission line.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Your opposition to Segment 4 West has been noted.</p> <p>Section 10.5.8 of the EIS discusses the RAMS club and its proximity to Segment 4 West. Information in this section was incorporated from your March 10, 2025 email.</p> <p>As described in Section 3.3.2.2, the applicant would contact each property owner to describe the need for the transmission facilities and how the project may affect each parcel. The applicant's ROW agents would also seek information from the property owner about any specific concerns that they may have with the project at which time final pole placement could be discussed.</p>
44	20256-219788-03	<p>We have been at this location since 1998 and our club has existed for more than 50 years. We are one of the largest FRAs in the state. A FRIA is a defined geographic area where drones can be flown if they don't have Remote ID equipment, thus our club offers a place for all who enjoy Radio Controlled aircraft to fly without extra requirements from the FAA or interfering with other activities at parks and schools. We currently have nearly 40 members and offer free training to youth and adults (usually 5-10 students per year) and offer a hands-on experience during our monthly funflys where the public are welcome.</p>	Comment noted.
44	20256-219788-03	<p>We would ask for the consideration in using the Segment 4 CapX Co-Location alternative. This seems to have the least disruption and cost of the alternatives.</p> <p>Again, we want to stress that a large transmission line running along 85th Street NW, the Route 4 West alternative, may be significantly detrimental to our club, to the point it might force us to shut down. That would be a loss for the community at large given our outreach, training and a hands-on experience beyond our nearly 40 members.</p>	Your preference for the Segment 4 CapX Co-Locate Option has been noted.

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
45	20256-219788-03	<p>My name is Paul Weber, I am a land owner along the proposed Highway 14 route near Claremont. I am writing this on behalf of myself and the following landlords with property adjacent; Donald McMartin, Chris and Nicole Runnels, Scott and Allison McMartin, and Craig and Hannah Weber. We are all opposed to this route for the following reasons.</p> <p>1. The proposed route travels along the Dodge Center Creek which is a tributary to the Zumbro River. This river provides for excellent wildlife habitat for local outdoorsmen to enjoy. This route is also within 300 yards of a State Wildlife Game Refuge that is open to the public to hunt. There are not many quality state game refuges available to the public and this transmission line would further reduce the quality of the hunting preserve and private hunting lands surrounding. In late 2024, a mountain lion was captured on a trail camera along this route. See picture below.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process.</p> <p>Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning wildlife are discussed in Section 6.9.12 of the EIS for Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14 Option).</p>
45	20256-219788-03	<p>2. As a farmer, I do not want to farm around these large structures. It costs time, money, and overall loss of efficiency to farm around the structures. That doesn't include the impact that these structures will have below ground. The long-term compaction of the soil and water management issues are immeasurable but guaranteed to occur. This will de-value our land as well.</p>	<p>Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning agriculture/farming are discussed in Sections 5.7.1, 6.7.1, 7.7.1, 9.7.1, and 10.7.1 of the EIS.</p> <p>Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning property values are discussed in Sections 5.5.7, 6.5.7, 7.5.7, 9.5.7, and 10.5.7 of the EIS. Appendix I provides a Property Value Supplement.</p>
45	20256-219788-03	<p>3. The additional miles of line is unnecessary when using the highway 14 proposal. It is not the most direct route, costing more capital and time into the project. The northern route is a better option because it saves \$55 million dollars and 19 miles of line. Therefore, any of the northern route proposals are better options. Regarding my property, the proposed line travels south along 120th ave, approximately 2,000 feet, then travels east, and then back through my farmland to end up in the same ROW along Highway 14, unnecessarily traveling approximately 4,000 feet. see map below.</p>	<p>Your opposition to Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14 Option) has been noted.</p>
45	20256-219788-03	<p>Finally, how are we to learn more about this project more thoroughly than the information on the internet when majority of the names and numbers listed to contact do not return phone calls. Also, the information that was mailed to landowners failed to clearly state that the Highway 14 route was an alternative option.</p>	<p>Mailings sent to landowners (including those along the Route Segment 17 Hwy 14 Option) after scoping included a January 31 letter from the applicant and a May 13 letter from PUC. The applicant's January 31, 2025, letter provided information about the project, information on how to submit public comments, and a map of all of the route and alignment alternatives being studied in the EIS (refer to docket ID number 20255-218883-01).</p> <p>The PUC's May 13, 2025 letter provided notice of the public hearings and provided information regarding the DEIS comment period.</p>
46	20256-219788-03	<p>I am providing comments in the form of a PowerPoint presentation regarding Segment 4 East and supporting the CapX Co-Locate Option.</p> <p>(Note, comment includes map with future development projects including Lake Shady lakebed 93 acre park Master Plan, residential homes, commercial businesses).</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process.</p>
46	20256-219788-03	<p>Panoramic view of Lake Shady lakebed, part of Oronoco park looking east from Highway 52</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Numerous poles would be placed along Highway 52 inside the highway and Route Width - Transmission line of poles and wires would affect aesthetics and environment when residents are able to enjoy the lakebed park, paths and gazebo - The lakebed has numerous deer and pheasants living in the lakebed for residents to enjoy while walking on the paths - The lakebed has a very high aesthetic value due to what the lakebed has to offer with higher viewer sensitivity 	<p>Chapter 10 of the EIS discusses and compares potential impacts and mitigation measures associated with human settlement, health and safety, land-based economies, archeological and historic resources, and the natural environment for the different Segment 4 options. Section 10.5.5.1.2 discusses impacts to the Lake Shady lakebed.</p>
46	20256-219788-03	<p>Approximate Pole Location is in front of Thompson Overhead Door Company store, east side of Highway 52</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transmission line route from the west side of 52 comes back across to the east side of 52 to a pole in front of the business - ~20 of 70 non-residential buildings are business in the ROW /Route Width Within the Oronoco City Limits – Table 10-37, page 779, Draft EIS <p>(Note comment includes image with a rendering of transmission line and structures).</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
46	20256-219788-03	<p>Two Sisters Kitchen and Bar Restaurant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Opened Aug 2024 - Multi-million \$ project - 150 ft into 1000 ft ROW - Line is overwhelming and close to the restaurant - Outside patio sitting <p>(Note comment includes image with a rendering of transmission line and structures).</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
46	20256-219788-03	<p>Oronoco City Council approved Resolution 2024-04</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support alternative route along CapX Co-Locate Option, 100 ft ROW from North Rochester Substation to Chester line connection. • Construction access to CapX Co-Locate Option would benefit building the 100 ft ROW for the 160kV line. 	Resolution 2024-04 is discussed in Section 7.5.5.1.2 of the EIS.
46	20256-219788-03	<p>Commercial and Housing issues in Oronoco</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Routing the 160kV line next to Highway 52 ROW will disrupt homes and business on either side of Highway 52 through the Oronoco City limits. • Minimizing aesthetic impacts of Route 4 East through the Oronoco City limits would support the consideration of using Segment 4 CAPX Co-Locate Option with the 161kV transmission line. <p>Route 4 East - Additional Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portions of Route 4 West Modification and 4 East Route along 75th St NW, between 18th Ave NW to 20th Ave NE, ~2.5 miles in length, there are (~30) homes in the Route Width. • Compare this to (259) homes in the 50-1,600 ft Route Width for the entire Segment 4 East of 19.6 miles. Reference Table 10-4, page 644, draft EIS • Directly to the south of this Route Width section on 75th St NW are hundreds of homes that their aesthetic view to the north will be impacted by the transmission line. • Compare this to (40) homes in Route Width for 50-1,600 ft Route Width of Segment 4 CapX Co-locate Option that is 16.4 miles long and \$28.6 million less cost than the Xcel Energy's 4 West Modification Preferred route. <p>Reference Table 10-4, page 644, draft EIS and Source: Docket No. E002/TL-23-157, OAH Docket No, 65-2500-4099, Direct Testimony of Tony Wendland, March 28, 2025, Table 4, page 8 The CapX Co-Locate Option impacts fewer residence homes and business than Route 4 East / Route 4 West Modification along 75th St and costs less than Xcel Energy's 4 West Modification Preferred Route.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Your preference for the Segment 4 CapX Co-Locate Option has been noted.</p>
47	20256-219788-03	I am sharing my comments from the May 28, 2025, Zumbrota Public Hearing regarding the DRAFT EIS with Honorable Ann O'Reilly supporting the CapX Co-Locate Option for the 161kV line from North Rochester Substation to the Chester Junction.	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process.
47	20256-219788-03	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to share updates regarding the city of Oronoco and how it could impact the decision-making process as to the consideration of 4E route.</p> <p>I've shared comments and presentations last summer that are documented regarding the scoping of the 4E route along highway 52 and the impact of the transmission line along Lake Shady lakebed that is part of the Oronoco Park in the city limits.</p> <p>Tonight, I would like to share additional comments regarding developments within the city limits along highway 52 that have been initiated since I mentioned in public hearings last year.</p> <p>Please follow along with the 6-page PowerPoint that you have in front of you.</p> <p>In early 2024, Oronoco's first and only Municipal Sewer system became operational and over 500 residences, several residential developments, and business lots now have access to the new sewer system and some lots with new water connections.</p> <p>Consequently, this has spurred development for residential housing, businesses and commercial development next to the 4E route through Oronoco.</p>	Comment noted.
47	20256-219788-03	<p>Update - There are four new developments or businesses that are close too and/or their properties would be affected by the 4E route:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Residential Development of 43-acres for (106) single family and townhomes whose views would be affected with the 100-150 ft tall poles for the 161V line, ~ 400 ft from the entrance. Land has been purchased by the developer and being planned. 2) Cedar Woodland Condos, a (54) unit condo planned with a westerly view ~300 ft from overlooking the 161V line poles and wires. Land has been purchased and construction to start late summer 2025 3) A new restaurant, Two Sisters Kitchen and Bar which includes outdoor seating, is located across MN Ave from the 4E route. The westerly view would be looking at the transmission line. 4) A 72-acre commercial development is currently in the annexation process where the 4E route would encroach on the west side of the property. 	Information has been added to Section 10.5.5.1.2 of the EIS.

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
47	20256-219788-03	<p>There are multiple Potential Impacts that the 4E route through Oronoco city limits will have on these developments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regarding Human Settlement o Aesthetics <p>§ Granted these are subjective views of the poles and lines of 4E route within the Oronoco city limits could affect residents' well-being. Note: the 4E route is approximately 13,500 ft through the city limits and the poles to support the 161V line are 350-700 feet apart. This means there could be between (19) and (38) poles in the city limits. The 4E segment route crosses highway 52 in 2 of the 6 total locations within the city limits.</p>	Comment noted. Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning aesthetics are discussed in Section 10.5.1 of the EIS.
47	20256-219788-03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Land Use and Zoning <p>§ The 4E route along or through the area close to properties could affect property values.</p>	Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning property values are discussed in Sections 5.5.7, 6.5.7, 7.5.7, 9.5.7, and 10.5.7 of the EIS. Appendix I provides a Property Value Supplement.
47	20256-219788-03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Recreation <p>§ As mentioned in earlier public hearing, the large park area in Lake Shady lakebed would be affected by the construction and long-lasting effects aesthetics of the 4E route.</p>	Section 10.5.5.1.2 discusses impacts to the Lake Shady lakebed.
47	20256-219788-03	<p>Archaeological and Historic Resources</p> <p>§ 4E route has (28) Historical architectural of (33) Total Archaeology and Historic Architecture resources in route width and ROW. Within the Oronoco city limits of 4E route, (21) of the (28) Historic architectural resources are in the route width and ROW. This high amount of Historic architectural resources could cause issues with MNDOT spotting pole locations along highway 52.</p>	Comment noted.
47	20256-219788-03	<p>As the PUC reviews the Segment 4 Relative Merits, please take these comments into consideration. Aesthetics and other Potential Impacts of the 4E route power line through Oronoco can be eliminated by selecting other routes that are located away from the 1,802 residents and growing, in Oronoco with double-circuiting or paralleling existing transmission lines.</p>	Your opposition to Segment 4 East has been noted.
48	20256-219788-03	<p>I am the owner of the business above we moved to Oronoco in 2020. The location of our business is directly off 52 North. We purchased the land due to the location and visibility off 52 N. We currently have signage on our building and a billboard on our property. We have concern that the power line - pole will impact our location for visibility. I would like to see the power line go the "CapX Co-locate option" 161 kV since there is already established lines in that location. If the 4 East alternate route option was chosen we feel we would be impacted.</p>	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning aesthetics are discussed in Sections 5.5.1, 6.5.1, 7.5.1, 9.5.1, and 10.5.1 of the EIS. Your preference for the Segment 4 CapX Co-Locate Option has been noted. Your opposition to Segment 4 East has been noted.
49	20256-219788-03	<p>I reside on the alternate route on Segment 2 of the 345 kV transmission line. Choosing the alternate route would affect my property value and cause visual problems.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning property values are discussed in Sections 5.5.7, 6.5.7, 7.5.7, 9.5.7, and 10.5.7 of the EIS. Appendix I provides a Property Value Supplement.</p> <p>Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning aesthetics are discussed in Sections 5.5.1, 6.5.1, 7.5.1, 9.5.1, and 10.5.1 of the EIS.</p>
49	20256-219788-03	<p>After attending the public meeting held in Faribault on May 29th, I believe the Preferred route would have the least effect on the environment. The preferred route was designed to minimize impacts by avoiding densely populated areas and preserving the integrity of the local areas.</p> <p>In closing, I respectfully request the Commission stay with the Preferred route and not consider the proposed alternate route for segment 2.</p>	Your route preference has been noted.
50	20256-219788-03	<p>We are writing to express our favor for the preferred route and our opposition to the alternate route for Segment 2 of the 345 kV transmission line project, referenced in Docket Numbers CN-22-532 and TL-23-157.</p> <p>The preferred route, as seen on maps provided by the Utilities Commission, runs along the North line of my property through a forested area, home to deer, turkeys, grouse and many other native species. It does the same for property owned by Mike and Chris Brown, Dave and Renee Brauer, Jason Krohn and Dan Sheady, owners also on this section of Decker Avenue alone. These are properties that are owner occupied. The construction process and resulting power line usage and maintenance would result in degradation to the properties along the route.</p> <p>The preferred route creates much less disruption to owner occupied homes along the route. We encourage the Commission to select the preferred route and reject the alternate route.</p>	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Your route preference has been noted.

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
51	20256-219788-03	<p>My name is Leonard Laures I have lived at 1520 75th St NE Rochester Mn since 1963. We have seen a lot of growth over the years. Expansion of the road R/W that expanded the utility easement that caused us to lose our road screenings and a few very mature Oak trees due to improper trimming practices over the years. Now the preferred route will threaten many more trees. We are not opposed to the new line just the impact on our property and our neighbors. At a glance one can see 90% of the residents living on 75th are on the south side. There has been no reasonable explanation as to why it can't go on the north side. As a elected official for over 20 years I have always supported smart growth and policies This decision seems to be more for the convenience of the power company rather than the impact on residents. Keeping the transmission line on one side and distribution on the other seems a simpler choice. Unfortunately I do not support the current plan and plan to oppose any expansion of the current easements.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Your property along Segment 4 East is shown on Map 66-22. In front of your house, the anticipated alignment is on the south side of the road. Directly east of your house, the anticipated alignment does move to the north side of the road. The route width in this area encompasses space on both sides of the road, meaning the final alignment and ROW could potentially be sited on the north side of the road.</p>
52	20256-219788-03	<p>I am writing to voice my opinion to the New Xcel Energy Power Line Expansion. I grew up on 450th Street in Kenyon and lived there for 45+ years. I currently own land and farm there. My concerns are as follows:</p> <p>1) The 1000 ft right-of-way is extremely excessive. Poles could easily be within a 100-200 foot right-of-way.</p> <p>2) Line placement of the farms I own and the houses along the several mile area that is very close to 450th Street is not ideal. The idea of going around homes and crossing roads zig-zag style seems very costly and cumbersome. Wouldn't you be better served to buy the home on one side if you needed this route? I believe that the route along the new Highway 14 would be much better suited. It has the wide right-of-way already. You would not go around as many homes.</p> <p>3) The need to bring electric power, from solely wind or solar, across the State of Minnesota to other states and not just to the Twin Cities Area doesn't seem to make sense. Build it where you need it (wind/solar). Will it be obsolete in a couple of decades?</p> <p>4) My final thought and opinion is that 450th street has had more than it's fair share of cancers. In a 4 mile part of 450th Street that includes 9 farm homes, 7 people, including my Mother and my wife (twice) had bouts of cancer. Only 3 have survived. Ages ranges from 33-70 years old. All of this has been in the past 25 years. My wife had cancer a second time (not a recurrence and not a known genetic pre-disposition) and what was the cause? She was doing chemo when we moved to a new place, not by a large powerline. Who knows?</p> <p>Please consider these thoughts as my vote for NOT using the 450th street route.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. As discussed in Section 3.3 of the EIS, if the Commission issues a route permit, the permit would designate a "route." The requested route width can vary and be up to 1.25 miles wide. The HVTL must be constructed within the route designated by the Commission unless, after permit issuance, permission to proceed outside of the route is sought by the applicant and approved by the Commission. The ROW is the specific area required for the safe construction and operation of the transmission line, and for Segment 4 East the ROW would be 100 feet. The ROW acquisition process is described in Section 3.3.2.2 of the EIS. Your preference for the Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14 Option) has been noted.</p> <p>Construction of a large energy facility in Minnesota requires a certificate of need from the Commission (Minnesota Statute § 216B.243). The applicant filed a joint certificate of need and route permit application on April 2, 2024. Project need is discussed in Chapter 4 of the application: https://www.edockets.state.mn.us/documents/%7B00CD9F8E-0000-C621-8B0C-0A9959360AEE%7D/download?contentSequence=0&rowIndex=232 and Section 4.1 of the EIS.</p> <p>Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning human health and safety are discussed in Sections 5.6, 6.6, 7.6, 9.6, and 10.6 of the EIS.</p>
53	20256-219821-01	<p>On behalf of the City of Eagle Lake, I am submitting this comment to express our strong opposition to the proposed alternate route identified during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process, which would run along the north side of Highway 14 adjacent to Eagle Lake.</p> <p>There are two primary reasons for our opposition:</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process.</p>
53	20256-219821-01	<p>Conflict with Ongoing Corridor Planning and Future Infrastructure Needs The City of Eagle Lake is actively participating in a Highway 14 corridor study in partnership with the Mankato Area Planning Organization (MAPO), the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT), and Blue Earth County. This collaborative effort aims to identify and implement necessary safety improvements and roadway modifications to support the safe and efficient movement of traffic, while also accommodating the continued growth of our community. If the proposed transmission line route were to be implemented, it could conflict with or limit the flexibility of future roadway improvements. Should modifications to the highway corridor require infrastructure adjustments, the presence of transmission line poles along this segment would likely necessitate costly relocation efforts and create unnecessary complications.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
53	20256-219821-01	<p>Impact on Future Development and Land-Based Economies The area north of Highway 14, where the alternate route is proposed, was annexed into the city limits in recent years and is identified as a key area for future development as Eagle Lake continues to grow. Placing high-voltage transmission lines along this corridor would hinder development potential, discourage investment, and negatively impact land-based economic opportunities in the area.</p>	<p>Section 7.5.5.1 of the EIS notes the city's Strategic Economic Development Plan. It was not noted in the plan that the area north of Highway 14 was identified as a key area for future development as Eagle Lake grows. This information has been added to Section 7.5.5.1 of the EIS.</p>
53	20256-219821-01	<p>For these reasons, the City of Eagle Lake respectfully urges the Commission to carefully consider the long-term implications of this alternate route and to select a path that does not interfere with essential transportation planning or hinder the growth and economic vitality of our community.</p>	<p>Your opposition to Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14 Option) has been noted.</p>

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
54	20256-219817-01	<p>My husband and I own farmland in Cherry Grove Township, Section 17 T109N R17W, that will be impacted by the “preferred” route 2 South, Mankato to Mississippi River Transmission 345 KV Transmission Line Project. The farm that I own has been in my family since 1872. This property is part of a multigenerational legacy and holds significant cultural, historical, and agricultural value. We have plans on building a home and a shop that would be highly impacted if route 2 South Mankato to Mississippi River Transmission 345 KV Transmission line project. See the attached picture for where we are planning on the build.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Section 6.5.5.2 of the EIS has been updated to reflect the potential for transmission line to preclude specific types of future development within the ROW.</p>
54	20256-219817-01	<p>The route selection process considers certain factors under Minnesota Administrative Rules 7850.4100. The yellow highlighted areas are in direct conflict with route 2 South. (Note, no highlighting was present in the comment).</p> <p>7850.4100 FACTORS CONSIDERED.</p> <p>In determining whether to issue a permit for a large electric power generating plant or a high voltage transmission line, the commission shall consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. effects on human settlement, including, but not limited to, displacement, noise, aesthetics, cultural values, recreation, and public services; B. effects on public health and safety; C. effects on land-based economies, including, but not limited to, agriculture, forestry, tourism, and mining; D. effects on archaeological and historic resources; E. effects on the natural environment, including effects on air and water quality resources and flora and fauna; F. effects on rare and unique natural resources; G. application of design options that maximize energy efficiencies, mitigate adverse environmental effects, and could accommodate expansion of transmission or generating capacity; H. use or paralleling of existing rights-of-way, survey lines, natural division lines, and agricultural field boundaries; I. use of existing large electric power generating plant sites; J. use of existing transportation, pipeline, and electrical transmission systems or rights-of-way; K. electrical system reliability; L. costs of constructing, operating, and maintaining the facility which are dependent on design and route; M. adverse human and natural environmental effects which cannot be avoided; and N. irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources. 	<p>Chapter 6 of the EIS discusses and compares potential impacts and mitigation measures associated with human settlement, health and safety, land-based economies, archeological and historic resources, and the natural environment for Segment 2.</p> <p>The Commission is charged with locating transmission lines in a manner that is “compatible with environmental preservation and the efficient use of resources” and that minimizes “adverse human and environmental impact(s)” while ensuring electric power reliability per Minnesota Statute § 216E.02.</p> <p>Minnesota Statute §216E.03, subdivision 7(b) identifies considerations that the Commission must consider when designating transmission lines routes. These considerations are further clarified and expanded by Minnesota Rule 7850.4100, which identifies the 14 factors the Commission must consider when making a transmission line route permit decision. The Commission is not required to select a route that will completely avoid impacts to these factors or resources, as all potential routes under consideration would likely have an impact, to some extent, on the factors and resources being evaluated.</p>
54	20256-219817-01	<p>In contrast, the blue highlighted areas are aligned with the Highway 14 alternative route. This is why the Hwy 14 ROW Route (aka “Route Segment 17”) is the ONLY acceptable route for this project. The initial cost may be high, but has limited impact to the livelihood of rural MN landowners. Tell MNDOT and Xcel to work out a plan to put it in the ROW of Hwy 14. Let the rate payers—whether instate or out-of-state— bear the financial burden for this project. The Hwy 14 ROW (aka Route Segment 17) is already condemned, use it! Stop TAKING privately owned agricultural land.</p> <p>(Note, no highlighting was present in the comment).</p>	<p>Chapter 7 of the EIS discusses and compares potential impacts and mitigation measures associated with human settlement, health and safety, land-based economies, archeological and historic resources, and the natural environment for Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14 Option).</p> <p>Your preference for Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14 Option) has been noted.</p> <p>Although Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14 Option) follows existing road ROW, it would still have impacts to private land and agriculture, as the anticipated alignment and ROW would not be located entirely within the Highway 14 ROW.</p>
54	20256-219817-01	I strongly urge the Commission and Xcel Energy to reject Route 2 South and adopt the Highway 14 alternative, which better balances infrastructure needs with long-term Stop taking farmer's land	Your preference for Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14 Option) has been noted. Your opposition to Segment 2 South has been noted.
55	20256-219818-01	<p>The proposed routing communicated in a May 8, 2025 letter to me from Xcel Energy showed a 150ft. total easement width for the proposed Mankato to Rochester line and showed it running parallel to the existing 345 kV line from CapX2020 near my south farm property line, referred to as “2 North”. Another letter on May 13, 2025 from the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission stated the “applicant has requested a route width of 1,000 ft. along most of the proposed alignments (500 ft. to either side of the proposed centerlines)... The 345 kV portion of this project typically requires a permanent 150 ft. right-of-way.”</p> <p>I strongly oppose the 1,000 ft. easement width as this would allow the utility to place power lines directly over my farmstead buildings and potentially have a tower very close to the building site. This would negatively impact my family with potential ELF exposure and lower property values with a high power line that close to the building site. The maximum width allowed should be 150ft total, 75ft on each side from the centerline.</p> <p>See the attached map from Excel Energy with the potential easement boundaries using the 1,000 ft. easement width and proximity to my building site.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process.</p> <p>As discussed in Section 3.3 of the EIS, if the Commission issues a route permit, the permit would designate a “route.” The requested route width can vary and be up to 1.25 miles wide. The HVTL must be constructed within the route designated by the Commission unless, after permit issuance, permission to proceed outside of the route is sought by the applicant and approved by the Commission. The ROW is the specific area required for the safe construction and operation of the transmission line, and for Segment 4 East the ROW would be 100 feet. The ROW acquisition process is described in Section 3.3.2.2 of the EIS.</p>

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
55	20256-219818-01	<p>As I understand the letter from Xcel Energy there is now a project to add a second 345 kV line to the existing structures from CapX2020. That line, together with the existing line, and the new proposed Mankato to Rochester line will make three 345 kV lines at the edge of my farm and close to the building site. If the North 2 route is selected, we must expect a fourth 345 kV line will be added to the Mankato towers under the Minn. Stat. 216E.03, subd. 7 route considerations. This would concentrate 1380kv over our grazing pastures. With either 3 or 4 of these high power lines, I am very concerned about the ELF impact on our livestock that are used to regenerate these highly erodible soils, and the people living in the nearby farm houses along the entire route. I know this issue has been studied extensively by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), part of the World Health Organization (WHO), making the assessment, "IARC has classified ELF magnetic fields as "possibly carcinogenic to humans." This research also did not consider the effects of having 4-345kv (a tremendous 1380kv) concentrated within several feet of each other. Given this unknown, I think all possible steps should be taken to reduce the risks of electric and magnetic fields of this scale to humans, wildlife and livestock as directed in Minn. Stat. 216E.03, subd. 7(b)(1).</p>	<p>Comment noted. Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning human health and safety, including EMF, are discussed in Sections 5.6, 6.6, 7.6, 9.6, and 10.6 of the EIS.</p>
55	20256-219818-01	<p>REQUEST: I would request the Commission to choose the 2 South route for the Mankato to Rochester line.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is a more direct route as shown on the maps due to shorter distance and fewer corner posts requiring additional anchors, which should conserve resources in accordance with Minn. Stat. 216E.03, subd. 7(a). 2. This will reduce the concentration of electric and magnetic fields concentrated one area as directed by Minn. Stat. 216E.03 subd. 7(b)(1). 3. It eliminates the potential of a tower from one line failing and damaging the other line due to natural disasters or domestic terrorism to align with route selection criteria 7850.4200(k), electrical system reliability. 4. The more direct (2 South) route will reduce costs of operating and maintaining the facility to align with the selection factor 7850.4100(L). 5. The concentration of up to 1380kv in total electrical lines will severely impair the agricultural around the North 2 route. Livestock production under these lines will be adversely impacted, which will restrict the use of this ground to field crop production. Many of the fields used for livestock in our region have highly-erodible characteristics. If this farmland has to be transitioned out of permanent grasslands to row crop production due to grazing livestock losing viability, there will be severe adverse environmental impacts to the water, flora and fauna in the area as these fields are tilled up and heavy rain events erode the soil into our state's waters. Minn. Stat. 216E.03, subd. 7(b) (2), (b)(5), and (b)(10), along with 7850.4100(C), (E), (G), (M), and (N) all provide sufficient grounds for the commission to reject the North 2 route in accordance with the requirements in Minn. Stat. 216E.03, subd. 7(e). 	<p>Your preference for Segment 2 South has been noted.</p>
56	20256-219820-01	<p>I live and farm south of Dodge Center, Minnesota. I oppose the Hwy 14 alternate route for the transmission line. While I feel constructing transmission lines in highway/roadway right of ways is an acceptable option, in the area east of Dodge Center the proposed transmission line deviates from the Hwy 14 corridor and traverses through many acres of prime farmland, including some land that I farm. The transmission line will adversely affect how I can farm my land and negatively affect my business. We regularly hire airplanes or helicopters to apply pesticides to my crops and having transmission lines and towers on or near my fields will affect that practice. In addition to current practices that I implement on my farm, the potential future practices could be limited by the construction of this transmission line, for example, irrigation equipment. The impacts of this transmission line will negatively affect future generations on this family farm. I appreciate the opportunity to express my concerns.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning agriculture/farming are discussed in Sections 5.7.1, 6.7.1, 7.7.1, 9.7.1, and 10.7.1 of the EIS.</p>
57	20256-219810-01	<p>Northern States Power Company, doing business as Xcel Energy, respectfully submits these comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) prepared by the Minnesota Department of Commerce, Energy Environmental Review and Analysis (EERA) for the Mankato – Mississippi River Transmission Project (Project).</p> <p>Xcel Energy appreciates EERA's preparation of a thorough DEIS that addresses all of the issues and alternatives identified in the December 2, 2024 scoping decision. Xcel Energy provides an enclosed table with its limited comments on the DEIS as Attachment A to this letter. These limited comments are intended to provide clarifications to the information in the DEIS where it may be helpful to the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission and the Administrative Law Judge in their review of the Project and EERA in preparing the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). In addition, consistent with the Third Prehearing Order in this matter, Xcel Energy will file its responses to public hearing comments on August 1, 2025, along with its initial brief and proposed findings of fact.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Comment noted.</p>

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
57	20256-219810-01	<p>DEIS Reference (chapter, page number) Executive Summary, p. 12, Surface Waters and other applicable sections DEIS Text or Table “All watercourses and waterbodies would be spanned and no in-water work would occur as a result of the project.” Proposed Clarification or Revision Clarify that no in-water work is currently anticipated. There are several large lakes, such as Eagle Lake, located along the route alternatives and spanning these large lakes in their entirety may not be possible depending on the route selected.</p>	<p>The text in the executive summary has been updated to more accurately reflect the conclusions in Sections 5.9.9, 7.9.9 and 10.9.9.</p>
57	20256-219810-01	<p>DEIS Reference (chapter, page number) Chapter 3, p. 72, Project Costs DEIS Text or Table Table 3-8 provides the estimated costs for the Project based on Xcel Energy’s Direct Testimony. Proposed Clarification or Revision Xcel Energy provided updated estimated Project costs in its Surrebuttal Testimony. This table should be updated to reflect these more current cost estimates.</p>	<p>Table 3-8 has been updated with cost estimates based on the surrebuttal testimony.</p>
57	20256-219810-01	<p>DEIS Reference (chapter, page number) Chapter 6, pp. 241-371, Segment 2, West Faribault to Pine Island (North Rochester Substation) – Affected Environment, Potential Impacts and Mitigation DEIS Text or Table This section summarizes the human and environmental resources that could be impacted by the route alternatives proposed for Segment 2. Proposed Clarification or Revision In a filing on May 5, 2025, Xcel Energy requested to expand the route width for portions of Segment 2 North and Segment 2 South near the North Rochester Substation. This request was made to allow the Project’s 345 kV line to be constructed adjacent to the existing Hampton – North Rochester 345 kV line rather than double-circuited with this line. This change is needed because one of the transmission projects that was approved by MISO as part of its LRTP Tranche 2.1 projects involves adding a second circuit to the existing Hampton – North Rochester 345 kV line such that the Project’s 345 kV line cannot be double-circuited with this line as proposed in the Application. In its May 5, 2025 filing, Xcel Energy provided a summary of the environmental impacts associated with this change. Xcel Energy requests that the final EIS include an analysis of this expanded route width and revised alignment for Segment 2 North and Segment 2 South.</p>	<p>The increased route width has been added to Section 3.3.1 of the EIS and is shown on associated maps, including Map 26 which is the detailed map book for Segment 2. Section 6.9.7 and Table 6-20 of the EIS have also been updated to reflect the increased acreage crossed of the SBS with a below rank.</p>
57	20256-219810-01	<p>DEIS Reference (chapter, page number) Chapter 6, pp. 246-247, Use or Paralleling of Existing Rights-of-Way DEIS Text or Table This section and Table 6-2 summarize the opportunities for double-circuiting for Segment 2 North and Segment 2 South. Proposed Clarification or Revision As noted above, in a filing on May 5, 2025 and in Rebuttal Testimony, Xcel Energy explained that portions of Segment 2 North and Segment 2 South could no longer be doublecircuited with the existing Hampton – North Rochester 345 kV line since a recent project approved by MISO will use the open position of this existing double-circuit capable 345 kV line. This section and Table 6-2 should be updated to reflect this updated design for this portion of Segment 2.</p>	<p>Table 6-2 has been updated to reflect the shift of Segment 2 North and South from double-circuiting to paralleling with respect to the existing 345 kV lines leading to the North Rochester Substation.</p>
57	20256-219810-01	<p>DEIS Reference (chapter, page number) Chapter 6, p. 248, Human Settlement DEIS Text or Table Table 6-3 summarizes the opportunities for double-circuiting and paralleling existing right-of-way for Segment 2 North and Segment 2 South. Proposed Clarification or Revision As noted above, in a filing on May 5, 2025 and in Rebuttal Testimony, Xcel Energy explained that portions of Segment 2 North and Segment 2 South could no longer be doublecircuited with the existing Hampton – North Rochester 345 kV line since a recent project approved by MISO will use the open position of this existing double-circuit capable 345 kV line. This table should be updated to reflect this updated design for this portion of Segment 2.</p>	<p>Table 6-3 has been updated to reflect the shift of Segment 2 North and South from double-circuiting to paralleling with respect to the existing 345 kV lines leading to the North Rochester Substation.</p>

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
58	20256-219968-01	<p>Blue Earth County Public Works Department offers the following comments in response to the draft EAW route options:</p> <p>1. 1-North option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. This alternative crosses or potentially impacts County Roads 5, 57, 26, 3, 12, 26, & 27. b. Blue Earth County currently has plans within the next 10 years to partially or fully reconstruct impacted segments of County Roads 3 & 26 c. These projects may include grading and realignment at vertical and horizontal curves. d. Per Blue Earth County ordinances the transmission poles must meet the minimum 130' set back from road centerline (see attachment) <p>(Note, comment includes a copy of Sec. 24-305. Essential Services.)</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process.</p> <p>As noted in Section 5.5.5 of the EIS, a route permit would supersede and preempt zoning under Minnesota's Power Plant Siting Act. Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning transportation, including county roads, are discussed in Section 5.5.10.</p>
58	20256-219968-01	<p>2. 1-South option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. This alternative crosses or potentially impacts County Roads 5, 82, 3, 12, 86, 27, 26, 187, 189, b. This alternative appears to impact Duck Lake Park. This is a very popular day-use park with a fishing pier, lake access and boat ramp, swimming beach, playground and picnic areas. Impacts that will be of detriment to park users enjoyment of the public park should be eliminated or greatly minimized. Detrimental impacts include but are not limited to noise, deforestation, visual impacts that detract from the natural lake setting, construction traffic, and c. Blue Earth County currently has plans within the next 10 years to partially or fully reconstruct impacted segments of County Roads 3 & 26 d. These projects may include grading and realignment at vertical and horizontal curves. e. Per Blue Earth County ordinances the transmission poles must meet the minimum 130' set back from road centerline (see attachment) <p>(Note, comment includes a copy of Sec. 24-305. Essential Services.)</p>	<p>Potential impacts to and mitigation for Duck Lake Park are discussed in Sections 5.5.1 and 5.5.8 of the EIS.</p> <p>As noted in Section 5.5.5 of the EIS, a route permit would supersede and preempt zoning under Minnesota's Power Plant Siting Act. Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning transportation, including county roads, are discussed in Section 5.5.10.</p>
58	20256-219968-01	<p>3. Highway 14 option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. This alternative crosses or potentially impacts County Roads 5, 82, 12, 86, b. Any future reconstruction projects on these roads may include grading and realignment at vertical and horizontal curves. c. Per Blue Earth County ordinances the transmission poles must meet the minimum 130' set back from road centerline (see attachment) <p>(Note, comment includes a copy of Sec. 24-305. Essential Services.)</p>	<p>As noted in Section 5.5.5 of the EIS, a route permit would supersede and preempt zoning under Minnesota's Power Plant Siting Act. Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning transportation, including county roads, are discussed in Section 5.5.10.</p>
58	20256-219968-01	<p>We anticipate that Xcel Energy will coordinate construction of this project directly with the County through the development and execution of a 'Haul Road Use and Temporary Access Agreement' as was previously completed during the Huntley-Willmarth project. Please note the attached Blue Earth County Ordinance ch. 24 for your reference regarding essential services and transmission lines in Blue Earth County. Please feel free to contact me with any questions or for additional information on any of the roads or projects listed above.</p>	Comment noted.
59	Mankato hearing	<p>Segment 1 south alternative. And there's a five-mile section between Waterville and Elysian and there are roughly eight or nine building sites for homes on the north side of 60. And I assume that the environmental impact statement would have been completed already, but I found out today that it hasn't, but I think that will reveal that virtually every one of those buildings on the north side of Highway 60, with exception of one, would fall within the right of way of the new proposed line. They're all residential homes. A couple of those are farming residents, so there's a building site and farmland, but there's roughly eight or nine just on the north side of Highway 60 that are residents that would fall within the right of way of the new line.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process.</p> <p>Figure 5-1 and information provided in Appendix G summarize the number of homes in the proposed ROW of Segment 1 South. There are 11.</p>
59	Mankato hearing	<p>Which would, in turn, devalue our property substantially if we were to sell in the next couple of years. And we want to sell that place and people would find out that there's an easement or a right of way for a transmission line that goes right through it. It would have a large effect on the market value of our property.</p>	<p>Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning property values are discussed in Sections 5.5.7, 6.5.7, 7.5.7, 9.5.7, and 10.5.7 of the EIS. Appendix I provides a Property Value Supplement.</p>
60	Mankato hearing	<p>But one of the things that I have repeatedly addressed is the fact that that body of water, so that Route 1 segment, that is actually the Sakatah Singing Hills Trail There used to be a rail line long ago and now it's been turned into a recreational trail. About ten years ago, for a period of time, between Mankato and Faribault, in three different sections they redid that trail. And in the last ten years since they have redid that section by us, we've seen so many trees get cut down because power lines are always affected. The trail itself has been beaten down, because either the DNR needs access or Xcel needs access. Or we have people, as you can see, there's two roads, there are people who actually drive on that trail. And so if you would replace the simple wooden poles that actually go through the lake area right now, it would completely change the aesthetics.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process.</p> <p>Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning aesthetics, including to the Sakatah Singing Hills State Trail, are discussed in Section 5.5.1 of the EIS.</p>

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
60	Mankato hearing	Because if you're an avid user of that trail like I am, when you go through that area you will see beavers, you will see geese, you'll see a bunch of different types of wildlife that actually nest along the area of the trail there because those waters, it doesn't come right up to the trail, but there's vegetation there.	Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning wildlife are discussed in Section 5.9.12 of the EIS.
60	Mankato hearing	And so what I think what they would need to do to replace those simple wooden poles with these larger metal ones, I'm not just thinking when they're actually standing there, the impact of the equipment that has to come through, because you can see no roads that lead to that section, you'd have to use the trail. So when they're done and getting everything up, they are probably taking down more trees, and all of a sudden they are done and what kind of shape is the trail going to be in?	Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning wildlife are discussed in Section 5.9.8 of the EIS. A figure of the trail area has been added to this section to illustrate the limited access.
60	Mankato hearing	So, like Mr. Dauk, if you recall, on the other side of Madison Lake, that piece of trail right there, whenever I go for a run I look forward to that section of trail because there's shade. There's no shade along the rest of the trail because somebody long ago decided to have power lines on the south side of the trail. So any time there's a storm, the trees affect the power lines. So the trees get cut down and so that's something we don't want to see.	Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning recreation are discussed in Section 5.5.8 of the EIS. This section has been updated to include the potential impact of lack of shade for runners.
60	Mankato hearing	And I talked to a guy earlier when we were here, and one of the things that just kind of rubs me the wrong way every time I've come to one of those things or I look at maps is the fact that that body of water that is between U.S. Highway 14 and the Sakatah Trail is called Eagle Lake South, and it is a designated wildlife lake. And there are less than 70 of those in Minnesota. Eagle Lake South.	Eagle Lake's designation as a shallow wildlife lake is discussed in Section 5.9.12 of the EIS.
61	Waterville hearing	My concern is we have a wetland. And, you know, we're concerned about the impact of the water table. It changes when we go through droughts, the water changes at our house. So I was curious if drilling these poles above our land, because we're on a slope, if it would affect our well water? And I brought it up before in the past, or if anyone knows anything about it. Does the environmental impact consider those things as well?	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning groundwater are discussed in Section 5.9.5 of the EIS.
62	Waterville hearing	And then Nancy Prehn asked how many will be affected by the third round, okay, and nobody knew, nobody could say. Yet for an EIS, how can you do an EIS if you can't say how many landowners will be affected by a particular route. Even taking segment, segment, segment, and adding them up, that seems like an inadequate EIS. So I hope when the FEIS comes out, that that's known, but there are people here who should know.	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Analyzing routes by parcels is outside the scope of the EIS. Rather, the ROW and Route Width are reviewed as spatial areas. Responding on the total number of parcels can be difficult unless the question is carefully stated. For example, the number of parcels crossed by the anticipated alignment versus the total number of parcels included within the route width would yield different answers. Additionally, mailing addresses are commonly combined into one row in a mailing list.
62	Waterville hearing	Also, concrete is mentioned, and that is an important thing because concrete can leach into water tables and that's something that should be considered. I haven't checked out the EIS on that, so I'm not sure if that is there or not.	Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning groundwater and concrete foundations are discussed in Sections 5.9.5, 6.9.5, 7.9.5, 9.9.5, and 10.9.5 of the EIS.
63	Owatonna hearing	I would like to question, mainly just encourage the Company, the Applicant, and the Public Utilities Commission to fully vet the Highway 14 or segment 17 alternative, especially from a socioeconomic standpoint. Highway 14 has a closer access to -- Highway 14 has closer access to wind farm in Freeborn County and Dodge County. Highway 14 is a major flowing commerce and transportation corridor. Nothing against the Highway 60 corridor, but the Highway 60 corridor is lake region with vacation homes. Segment 1 and 2 are weaving in and around several things, so from an environmental standpoint, from a layman's standpoint, it doesn't quite make a lot of sense to me. I understand that the alternative segment 17 alternative is approximately 19 miles longer of the 130 mile proposed project. It's only 15 percent more. So in the grand scheme of things, from a business standpoint and cost standpoint, when you do a thorough cost benefit analysis, again, from a business standpoint, from an investment standpoint, in my opinion I feel like the Highway 14 corridor has much greater potential for economic development.	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Section 7.5.5.1.2 of the EIS has been updated to reflect the support for infrastructure development near communities like Waseca. Section 7.5.5.2 has been updated to acknowledge the potential future economic benefits the HVTL could bring to communities like Waseca.
64	Owatonna hearing	I'm not in favor of the alternative or section, I think it's 17, as I've kind of deciphered from the conversation for a couple of reasons. My experience for the -- minor experience with Xcel over the last winter with a project that they were doing on my property replaced three poles, they made a mess. And I have not been made whole. If they do that on a small project how are they going to treat some of the other farmers along the line? I've had very little conversation and I have a contract with US Department of Agriculture to cover crops. I had to till or break that contract in order to fix what they did over this winter. So I'm very concerned about what is the mitigation to farmers and other property owners that are along the line and have that conversation and making sure that people that have their property are in conversation as it's taking place. So I'm not in favor of the alternative soils, they're soils that create some construction issues. So I think the other alternative is far better than section 17 route because many of the soils along there are pea soils, they're soils that create some construction issues. So I think the other alternative is far better than Section 17.	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Your opposition to Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14 Option) has been noted. Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning agriculture/farming are discussed in Sections 5.7.1, 6.7.1, 7.7.1, 9.7.1, and 10.7.1 of the EIS.

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
65	Owatonna hearing	The north route, the biggest concern there is that the line will go close to two 30,000 gallon LP tanks, it will go close to that, near those. The other, there's a wi-fi tower that's near us, it's actually on top of one of our silos, so we were just wondering how that is impacted, and the other is actually closer to our home, the south option. That's how it affects us, that's all.	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. The applicant would work around existing utility infrastructure, such as LP tanks. Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning electronic interference, including wi-fi, are discussed in Sections 5.6.6, 6.6.6, 7.6.6, 9.6.6, and 10.6.6 of the EIS.
66	Owatonna hearing	So I think I'm still open-minded around the route, but I've gone through the land condemnation project in putting Highway 14 through, so one of my grave concerns are tile issues. I've also had counties going through my land putting in roads, so tile issues are, from my experience, have been poorly addressed, and I would even add extremely poorly addressed. So that would be one of my major concerns, is getting somebody on board that understands what ripple effect you have when towers are installed.	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning agriculture/farming, including drain tile, are discussed in Sections 5.7.1, 6.7.1, 7.7.1, 9.7.1, and 10.7.1 of the EIS. The Route Permit (refer to Appendix H) would include the following conditions: The Permittee shall avoid, promptly repair, or replace all drainage tiles broken or damaged during all phases of the Transmission Facility's life unless otherwise negotiated with the affected landowner. The Permittee shall keep records of compliance with this section and provide them at the request of Department of Commerce staff or Commission staff.
67	Owatonna hearing	So today I just wanted to speak on --earlier Xcel had noted how at the beginning of their routing process back in April of 2024 they had the ability to discuss kind of their routing options with like local governments and kind of what they went through when they had done their initial routing, kind of that northern area. Now that Dodge has been kind of brought into the fold with this Highway 14 alternative, or alternative 17 I think is how you've been referring to it. We didn't get the luxury, I guess, to be included in that process. Additionally, we received notice of this public hearing about a week and a half ago, and that is including a holiday weekend in between, and now we only have until June 10th to respond with a comment. I'm kind of asking, additionally, if we can get an extension to that comment, because we'd like to supply, you know, a thorough comment on behalf of a county. So, you know, there must have been some kind of lack of notification that happened along the way with this. That's kind of a comment that I'd like to throw out there, that we be given a little bit more time than June 10th so that we can give a thorough comment on behalf of the county. Off the top of my head I can already see that there's going to be this jag that they have, south of Dodge Center, there's an airport there. So that's something that we're going to be wanting to look at as a concern. Additionally, it's going to be going south of Kasson, so there's going to be concerns there. You know, it does follow 14, but there are going to be jags along the way. So from a environmental standpoint and a zoning perspective we are going to want to do our due diligence in our review, and I just ask that we be given a little bit longer to do so, being that we were just notified about this alternative, you know, a week and a half ago with a holiday weekend in between.	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Mailings sent to landowners (including those along the Route Segment 17 Hwy 14 Option) after scoping included a January 31 letter from the applicant and a May 13 letter from PUC. The applicant's January 31, 2025, letter provided information about the project, information on how to submit public comments, and a map of all of the route and alignment alternatives being studied in the EIS (refer to docket ID number 20255-218883-01). The PUC's May 13, 2025 letter provided notice of the public hearings and provided information regarding the DEIS comment period.
68	Zumbrota hearing	I have a few concerns. So located fairly close to the proposed line, I have two turkey finish barns. Stray voltage, or EMF, as you referred to it, is a concern of mine. I don't have a lot of knowledge of that, but I do know that my birds would probably prefer that the line wasn't there. They would probably do just as well without the line there as if it was.	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning human health and safety, including EMF and stray voltage, are discussed in Sections 5.6, 6.6, 7.6, 9.6, and 10.6 of the EIS. Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning birds are discussed in Sections 5.9.12, 6.9.12, 7.9.12, 9.9.12, and 10.9.12 of the EIS.
68	Zumbrota hearing	There's never anything at these meetings where, oh, this is the number you call when you have a problem. All I hear is lots of other things. But once that line is put up you're not moving the line and I'm not moving those barns. So there's an issue. I wish that there would be more information given on that.	The applicant, in this case Xcel Energy, would be the point of contact for any problems with the lines. The Route Permit (refer to Appendix H) would include the following conditions related to Complaint Procedures: At least 14 days prior to the pre-construction meeting, the Permittee shall file with the Commission the complaint procedures that will be used to receive and respond to complaints. The complaint procedures shall be in accordance with the requirements of Minn. R. 7829.1500 or Minn. R. 7829.1700, and as set forth in the complaint procedures attached to this route permit. Upon request, the Permittee shall assist Commission staff with the disposition of unresolved or longstanding complaints. This assistance shall include, but is not limited to, the submittal of complaint correspondence and complaint resolution efforts.

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
68	Zumbrota hearing	As far as the routing, I don't understand why we always have to choose a new route, a virgin route. Why aren't we sending these things where there's already a line? You've already destroyed the landscape of what things look like. Why can't they send this line there, why do you have to come across a new piece of property. If the lines -- in my estimation, where people have already given up their rights.	The EIS discusses following existing rights-of-way. Minnesota Rule 7850.4100 requires the Commission to consider use or paralleling of existing rights-of-way, survey lines, natural division lines, and agricultural field boundaries. Minnesota Statute 216E, subdivision 7(e), states that the Commission must consider routing a high voltage transmission line along an existing high voltage transmission line or highway right-of-way and to the extent these are not used it must state the reasons why.
69	Zumbrota hearing	I'm opposed to the 161kV line. You know, this is coming right on 75th Street and looking at 75th Street, that's coming from 18th Street to the Zumbro River. We have homes that are -- most of them are 800,000 to a million or more, very expensive homes, and this puts the line right through there. We purchased these homes 20 years ago, most of them are even newer than that. But if that line would have been there I would never buy that property, okay. A lot of my neighbors are already talking if they build this we're going to sell, we're going to move, and I'm sure it's going to affect the property value. They tell me that it's not but I don't agree with them. I know it will. From 18th Street going west there's some -- lots of giant properties that were sold and they're going to build new homes. If people are going to have those big giant poles there with a 161 kilovolts going through there, they're not going to buy them. I wouldn't. The alternative to 161kV, it goes through a lot of farm land, which is to me, of course I don't own that land, but there's less people there. And one of the things you mentioned up there says you want to minimize the impacts of human settlement and land use. This is perfect for why you need to reroute it to the alternative one, because you are impacting on a lot of people and future land use of those other properties that until recently -- we're talking like they sold 60 acres and they have another 108 acres for sale, and all of those are for homes. If you have this line going right through there, would you buy that? No. I wouldn't. I don't think anybody in their right mind would.	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Your opposition to Segment 4 East has been noted. Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning property values are discussed in Sections 5.5.7, 6.5.7, 7.5.7, 9.5.7, and 10.5.7 of the EIS. Appendix I provides a Property Value Supplement. Chapters 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10 of the EIS discuss and compare potential impacts and mitigation measures associated with human settlement, health and safety, land-based economies, archeological and historic resources, and the natural environment.
70	Zumbrota hearing	I'll get hit no matter what. It's coming. CapX went through my farm, condemned it in 2020. My concern is in the environmental impact and impact on humans. When the first line came through I was milking cows at the time. I had my concerns. I was reassured nothing would be affected the environment other than this big power system. Well, as was stated, it's a 375 or 345, whatever it is, excuse my numbers. When that line was energized, lo and behold, it interfered with the cathodic protection of the natural gas pipeline, which is buried next to that line. We then, therefore, had interaction between the two -- call them the two dinosaurs in the room, petroleum and electricity. Well, petroleum had the documentation and the proof of their system operating before the switch was thrown on the electric line. When that switch was thrown it introduced electrical -- something different, and I'm not an engineer, I don't know the proper terminology. All I do know is it interfered with the protection of that pipeline. Therefore, they had to come back and the power line had to mitigate the situation, they buried a copper line in the ground, between the pipeline and the electric line at the same depth as the pipeline, with the intent to capture that electrical current flowing through the ground to keep it off the pipeline. That's great, they mitigated that side. They did not mitigate my side, kind of disheartening, but we have mitigation on that existing line, on half of it, with the 345 that exists. Now we're going to double it, because somebody out east decides they need more power. There's no benefit to us, we're just in the middle. We're in the fly over area, but somebody out east needs more power, so it's going to cross through our property, our land. I would sure hope that some mitigation could be done to contain that right-of-way. I would strongly suggest that that underground mitigation be done on both sides and be part of the plan right from the beginning, so that we don't have to go through the point fingers and say, well, it shouldn't have happened but it did. Because we know that is fact from the first line going in. We have to protect the environment from this system.	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. The EIS does address induction mitigation needs, for example refer to Section 5.5.10.6 which states: Where the project crosses pipeline ROWs, mitigation might be required. If induction mitigation is necessary, the pipeline company would have to approve the mitigation being installed and the applicant would be responsible for the added project costs.
70	Zumbrota hearing	My other concern is with the proposal that came out last week, with it being a thousand foot corridor instead of the 150. I would strongly, strongly disagree with the need for a thousand foot corridor. If that's the case, you start stacking these systems in here and the hair on the back of my dog's neck will stand up, when you start energizing that much power on that side of my farm. But we don't know the impact of that because it hasn't been done.	As discussed in Section 3.3 of the EIS, if the Commission issues a route permit, the permit would designate a "route." The requested route width can vary and be up to 1.25 miles wide. The HVTL must be constructed within the route designated by the Commission unless, after permit issuance, permission to proceed outside of the route is sought by the applicant and approved by the Commission. The ROW is the specific area required for the safe construction and operation of the transmission line, and for Segment 4 East the ROW would be 100 feet. The ROW acquisition process is described in Section 3.3.2.2 of the EIS.

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
71	Zumbrota hearing	<p>So I'm going to talk about section 4 west, which is not a preferred route. But we are in 2 the corner box area of the map in zone 4 west, that doesn't look like it. It's an alternative route proposal. So there's a couple alternatives there, and I spoke to this last year and such when we had a meeting. We already have a 345 volt line going through our property, and I know they have changed the preferred route, so that's kind of nice to see. But I'm just speaking on behalf of the fact that if they go with alternatives here, it's like okay, we would prefer that it would run down 85th Street and follow the highway, and much like what the mayor was talking about with Oronoco. It's like you already have a right-of-way there, it's always nice not to block in agriculture land. We have abundant wildlife. And it doesn't show up on this map very well, but there's a lot of little springs set in here, and so we see muskrat, we see fox, red fox, we've seen coyotes, skunks, raccoon, deer, everything. It's like the terrain from up there and following 75th Street East there's a lot of bluff country. There's leaf peepers in the fall. There's a lot of mountain biking going on, and it would decrease that whole view of those folks enjoying those types of activities.</p> <p>So for me it's like, well, okay, we already have a 345 volt. Nobody wants it in their backyard, of course. We bought the property with that but we also don't want the poles -- a second set of poles there if at all possible.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Your opposition to Segment 4 West has been noted. Potential impacts and mitigation measures to wildlife for Segment 4 are discussed in Section 10.9.12 of the EIS.</p>
71	Zumbrota hearing	<p>The stray voltage, I have personally parked my car under the current 345 line and have grabbed the handle to go back into my car and have felt the tingle from my hand all the way to my feet. So you don't want to have agricultural equipment sitting under there. I know that somebody here, I think it was Dale McNamara at some point had said when they were building his shed after a fire, they heard the workers couldn't work on his shed for very long because of the electrical current that was being drawn from there. So I do have some concerns health wise and whatnot.</p>	<p>Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning human health and safety, including stray voltage, are discussed in Sections 5.6, 6.6, 7.6, 9.6, and 10.6 of the EIS.</p>
71	Zumbrota hearing	<p>And when you have the big corridors like 14 or Highway 52, they already have the poles and the existing structure there, and not that I want to push it off into anybody else's backyard, but I like the idea that there's a preferred route and the superintendent for New Haven Township, I thought did a very nice job, talking about the cost benefits and everything else about the proposed routes and stuff.</p>	<p>The EIS discusses following existing rights-of-way. Minnesota Rule 7850.4100 requires the Commission to consider use or paralleling of existing rights-of-way, survey lines, natural division lines, and agricultural field boundaries. Minnesota Statute 216E, subdivision 7(e), states that the Commission must consider routing a high voltage transmission line along an existing high voltage transmission line or highway right-of-way and to the extent these are not used it must state the reasons why.</p>
71	Zumbrota hearing	<p>I would go 4 east, but that would not be my preferred. I would do the other one, the co-locate. But I don't want to see -- like if they decide they're going to do the alternative route I do not want any power lines through the ag land. It should follow the road at that point, is my opinion. I hope that makes sense.</p>	<p>Your preference for the CapX Co-Locate Option has been noted.</p>
72	Zumbrota hearing	<p>I own property in Ashland Township, which is on the alternative route segment 17, I believe. I just became aware of that option in the mail less than two weeks ago from the PUC. And it's hard to have a presentation when you just found out that your property is going to be affected less than two weeks ago, but here I am, first meeting.</p> <p>I just think for farmers to be able to react to option 14 -- segment 17, it's the Highway 14 option, we've only -- how long have we known about this? I think it's very unfair for -- this has been in the process since '22, and here we are, how's the landowner on Highway 14 option supposed to react with another twelve days maybe until June 10th and we're done. But notice that option -- section -- route 17 or the Highway 14 option doesn't follow 14 in that vicinity. It goes way down into farm land where I am and then it comes back up and splits through my neighbor's 320 acre tract right up the middle, cuts it into two pieces. You know, farmers consider this type of land like you consider your front lawn. This is our black gold. This is our paycheck. This is how we make our living. And here we are, you know, I don't want it in my back yard and I don't want it in your back yard, but where are we going to go with this thing? It seems like this is the path of least resistance, throw this option out there at the last minute, when it's been in the works for two and a half to three years. It's hard for me to object to this, except why can't we put that power line through a pipe and keep it on 14? Because if Dodge County Airport ever wants to expand, they're boxed in from now on with this power line. They can't extend their runway, because the planes are going to land on an electric wire just to the south.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Mailings sent to landowners (including those along the Route Segment 17 Hwy 14 Option) after scoping included a January 31 letter from the applicant and a May 13 letter from PUC. The applicant's January 31, 2025, letter provided information about the project, information on how to submit public comments, and a map of all of the route and alignment alternatives being studied in the EIS (refer to docket ID number 20255-218883-01).</p> <p>The PUC's May 13, 2025 letter provided notice of the public hearings and provided information regarding the DEIS comment period.</p> <p>Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning agriculture/farming are discussed in Sections 5.7.1, 6.7.1, 7.7.1, 9.7.1, and 10.7.1 of the EIS.</p>
72	Zumbrota hearing	<p>I don't care to see the power line go through my farm. I made a significant investment in this property years ago and, I mean, can we have an answer to why we can't bury this power line down 14 and the airport vicinity, keep it away from me. How is this power line going to affect the people who drive Highway 14? Do we have any problems with cell traffic, cell phones under the power line?</p>	<p>System alternatives to the project, such as placement underground, are discussed in Chapter 4 of the EIS.</p> <p>Chapter 7 of the EIS discusses and compares potential impacts and mitigation measures associated with human settlement, health and safety, land-based economies, archeological and historic resources, and the natural environment for Route Segment 17 (Hwy 14 Option).</p>

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
73	Zumbrota hearing	I read through a lot of the public comments from all of the previous periods, or through last year, and the one thing that I noted is the lack of significant opposition to the CapX Co-locate. You've heard it already a couple times tonight, and I think, again, when we look at the bullets that this project is supposed to check and we look at what people are having problems with versus what no one is speaking against, it's very clear that the CapX Co-locate is checking virtually all the boxes.	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Comment noted.
73	Zumbrota hearing	One of the questions that I could not get answered is the fact that our home is serviced by People's Energy Cooperative, and yet they are not part of this project in any way. So when I reached out to them to understand what I might see as a benefit should our route be chosen and these power lines be put in my front yard, no one could clearly answer to me whether or not I would actually ever see or when I would see power distribution through this project, unlike somebody who is on RPU in Rochester, for instance. So that's a question that I don't expect the answer to tonight. But I've been a little confused by, as how this could run through another utility's land, if you will, but not actually service it.	As identified in Sections 1.1 and 4.1 of the DEIS, this project is designed to meet needs associated with present and future transmission needs, which are distinct from distribution needs associated with the provisioning of power to the end user at a home or business. People's Energy Cooperative manages distribution of power.
73	Zumbrota hearing	The other point that I want to make really quickly, I have not seen any mention of the legislation passed last year for Next Gen Highways, which is a push to try to locate utilities, transmission lines, things like that, along either major highways or existing highway routes. I'm surprised that I didn't see that mentioned either in any commenting or in any of the documents, so I just want to raise that as something to be considered, that according to the legislation, who is supposed to be representing the people? There is a desire to use existing routes like highways, et cetera, which I guess would be 52 in this case and 75th Street, or 63, to try to consolidate things like this and try to minimize environmental impacts. So, again, just in my homework I was surprised that I didn't see anything about that.	The EIS discusses following existing rights-of-way. Minnesota Rule 7850.4100 requires the Commission to consider use or paralleling of existing rights-of-way, survey lines, natural division lines, and agricultural field boundaries. Minnesota Statute 216E, subdivision 7(e), states that the Commission must consider routing a high voltage transmission line along an existing high voltage transmission line or highway right-of-way and to the extent these are not used it must state the reasons why. The EIS has been updated to include a reference to Minnesota Statute § 161.45.4. Subdivision 4 was added to the statute in 2024.
73	Zumbrota hearing	The last thing I just want to say is, after looking through all of the documentation I was a little shocked when I read the property value supplement. So my property may or may not be affected by this, but many who are here will be. Reading through what studies were being leveraged to develop property value allotments, if you will, was a little bit shocking. I would just encourage the PUC or anybody who is involved in this to do a little bit more thorough research and try to get some better support for what property value assessments should be taken into account. A lot of the methodology that was cited was very flawed, as well as were the conclusions. It was just quite concerning to see if that's what's going to be leveraged during the negotiations with landowners, I'd like to see something that's a little more modern and little more representative of the situation we're in today, not studies from the 1950s or 1960s.	Comment noted. The references cited in Appendix I, Property Value Supplement, were dated 2010, 1978, 1982, 2000, 2019, 20174, 2012, and 2018. The sources were not from the 1950's or 1960's. It is not possible to respond on the methodologies without a specific comment on what parts of the methodologies were identified as flawed.
74	Zumbrota hearing	My main concern is, when we bought this property we knew the power lines were there and you see behind my house there there's a tree line. That tree line nicely keeps people who build there from seeing a lot of the power lines and a lot of the towers. But my concern is, as soon as you go in there with these big metal towers and raise them two, three times higher, then I'm just going to see those, that's all I'm going to see. So property values possibly may decrease there, I'm concerned about that. The other thing is just, you know, aesthetically it's going to be a pain. Wildlife wise, it already has two sets of power lines going through it, so that isn't probably going to change a whole lot, it's just the concern that raising the lines up much higher is going to be aesthetically displeasing to all these people who will be building there. There's already four houses since our house that have gone up. So it is being developed pretty quickly.	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning property values are discussed in Sections 5.5.7, 6.5.7, 7.5.7, 9.5.7, and 10.5.7 of the EIS. Appendix I provides a Property Value Supplement. Potential impacts and mitigation measures concerning aesthetics are discussed in Sections 5.5.1, 6.5.1, 7.5.1, 9.5.1, and 10.5.1 of the EIS. Potential impacts and mitigation measures to wildlife for Segment 4 are discussed in Section 10.9.12 of the EIS.
75	Zumbrota hearing	The main item I want to talk about tonight is that 1,000 foot width on the route request. So initially in the May 8th letter that we received, we received a map showing the 150 foot easement, and then in the letter that came on May 13th we were told that they were requesting a route width of 1,000 feet up to one and a quarter miles in some places. They said it was around the substation but they were fairly vague about what the actual route width was. As mentioned previously, I understand the actual easement right-of-way they're expecting is 150 feet, which makes it hard to understand why they're requesting a thousand feet.	Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. As discussed in Section 3.3 of the EIS, if the Commission issues a route permit, the permit would designate a "route." The requested route width can vary and be up to 1.25 miles wide. The HVTL must be constructed within the route designated by the Commission unless, after permit issuance, permission to proceed outside of the route is sought by the applicant and approved by the Commission. The ROW is the specific area required for the safe construction and operation of the transmission line, and for Segment 4 East the ROW would be 100 feet. The ROW acquisition process is described in Section 3.3.2.2 of the EIS.

Comment ID	eDocket ID	Comment	Response
76	Zumbrota hearing	<p>I want to second the person who made comments about not getting notification. I live on 75th Street. I am right next to one of the properties mentioned earlier. My first notification of this was two weeks ago, when I got a packet saying final public review is today. That's not much time to prepare. I happened to know about it a little bit earlier because of Shane. You e-mailed the club, and I'm the club vice-president, I'm the first person to respond back to you. So I have interest on 75th Street, because I live on 75th Street. I have interest on 85th Street, because that is where the club resides. For myself I was coming into this with like open mind to allow it on my property, but having heard what's going to happen to my property, I will lose all of my old growth privacy trees and I will have an open view of 75th Street, Highway 63, which because we've already lost property value because of the Highway 63 transition, I would be losing significantly more property value by losing my old growth trees and losing my privacy. As far as the RAMS Club, the line on 85th Street would run within a reasonable distance of the end of our runway, and while it would probably not offer significant impact to our activities, it would reduce our flyable area and have possible impacts to our enjoyment of our field, to the point where is a small losing of our field because they're unable to farm there, it is very hard to get a new one. We represent about 30 people in general who are members of the club, but we also do outreach at schools. I teach children how to fly, so it is a community organization that has value to the greater community.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. Section 10.5.8 of the EIS discusses the RAMS club and its proximity to Segment 4 West.</p>
77	Faribault hearing	<p>My question for the farm land is, and this is a new proposed line, there's tile lines going north right where that cursor is setting. Would this construction, compaction, breaking tile lines, I have a concern with getting those repaired, because they probably show up later than after they just leave the project.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and for participating in the permitting process. The route permit would require that the permittee: "avoid, promptly repair, or replace all drainage tiles broken or damaged during all phases of the Transmission Facility's life unless otherwise negotiated with the affected landowner. The Permittee shall keep records of compliance with this section and provide them upon the request of Department of Commerce staff or Commission staff." A sample route permit is provided in Appendix H.</p>
77	Faribault hearing	<p>So that would be a concern, that's why I'm opposed to that line and development from the south end. Then you go further east with the cursor, please, following that purple line go east, right there is the Divine Mercy Church, Divine Drive, there is a -- in addition to that there's a 60 acre development being proposed. So therefore I'm opposed to it being their primary preferred line.</p>	<p>This potential development has been added to Section 6.5.5.2 of the EIS.</p>