MINNESOTA
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Batch E-Filing for Docket 24-352 - 25 Comments

1. Kai Dahl
2. Sophia Johnson
3. Teri Blauersouth
4. JoAnna Thomsen
5. Andrea Hoeschen
6. Winter Smith-Chau
7. Meagan Chau
8. Hangatu Omar
9. Kathryn Kenney-Peterson
10. Lauren K. Moody
11. Rusty White
12. Mr. Neville Bruce
13. Dr. Paul Harris
14. John Siekmeier
15. Lisa Bergerud
16. Terry Schaunaman
17. Dr. Kelley Jewett
18. Brad Werner
19. Ms Linda Olson
20. Mr. Dean Butts
21. Ms. Misty Butler
22. Mrs. Kristen Wesloh
23. Mikkayla Kemmet
24. Stacy Nelson
25. Katie Nesheim

From: Kai Dahl
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Carbon Neutrality needs to be Real. 24-352
Date: Monday, September 15, 2025 6:31:13 PM

My name is Kai Dahl, And I live in Minneapolis. The attempt to classify Biomass, Renewable Natural Gas and Trash burning as “Carbon Free” is ridiculous and only exists to justify building parasitic AI data centers in our great state.

This is of course regarding 24-352.

Thank you for reading this, and I hope you act accordingly

From: sjohnson413612@protonmail.com
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Changes to the 100% Carbon Free Standard Law
Date: Saturday, September 13, 2025 2:40:38 AM

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a Minnesota resident in Houston County. I do not support the proposed changes to the 100% Carbon Free by 2040 standard law as seen in case 24-352.
As I have participated in several initiatives to push farther into green energy, I have learned about the effects on trash burning and wood waste. These are NOT appropriate renewable resources to use for energy. The greenhouse gas emissions from these sources is significant and should not be considered “clean”.
Additionally, the Carbon Capture and Storage systems that supposedly prevent the carbon emissions being put out are not 100% solutions to the problem. This is a band-aid solution that is not going to correct anything, and we should be focusing on moving away from carbon emitting energy sources and focusing on making renewable sources widely available and less expensive.

Thank you for your time,
Sophia Johnson

From: Agate Counseling
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Comment for 24-352
Date: Monday, September 15, 2025 11:19:20 AM

My name is Teri Blauersouth. I am a resident of Minnesota, and want to express my extreme dissatisfaction with the current plan to *incorrectly* define methods of generating power such as biomass, "renewable" natural gas, and trash burning as "carbon free" as described in bill 24-352.

I am infuriated that our lawmakers are even considering flying in the face of the popular and legitimately decided on goals to make Minnesota a leader in climate protection by enshrining misinformation on our books by claiming things that simply and factually release more carbon than coal or natural gas as good enough. Myself and those who don't stand to gain profit from this misinformation aren't impressed with the idea that "the carbon would be in the cycle anyways so we might as well."

It's not fair and it's not right, but with other states lagging so far behind, and failure to address this at the federal level, states like Minnesota that have our act together have to pick up the slack and be reducing carbon whenever possible, not shrugging our shoulders and thinking half measures are good enough. That is what Minnesotans wanted and agreed on, and are trusting you to deliver. Adding and developing infrastructure that opposes that goal is a betrayal of trust in a time when government trust is already painfully low.

I'm especially disturbed that this proposed walkback coincides with proposed building of a bunch of power-hogging data centers of the sort that have been draining groundwater reserves and horrifically spiking power costs wherever they're built. I really hope that that's not what's behind this swerve, because the idea of these centers bringing in "jobs" when their industry gleefully markets itself as existing to elimate legitimate jobs is painfully short sighted.

Also- surely you're all old enough to remember the dot com boom and bust? With lawsuits like the Autopict one already coming through it's clear this industry is about to blow up due to a combination of insane resource hogging, massive over-promising and under-delivering, and shady behavior. And what would that leave us with? Industries in tatters, and a power grid built to pander to corporations at the cost of the environment and the average person.

Americans have been hurt by corporate greed and government enabling enough. Don't let power companies, fossil-fuel industries, AI companies, or any other corporate power keep hurting us. My young daughter deserves a livable climate her whole life, and I deserve lawmakers who make good on their promises without giving me $600 power bills like my friends who live near data centers have, now.

Plus, our clean energy companies could actually use a boost with federal support vanishing on them overnight.

Please keep your promises and protect your constituents, not corporations' empty and profit-driven promises. Do you trust everyone who may come after you to clean up the mess if their promises fall through? Because the average voter doesn't anymore.

With Hope,

Teri Blauersouth

From: Jo Thomsen
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Comments on Docket 24-352
Date: Monday, September 15, 2025 1:10:54 PM

Hello,

My name is JoAnna Thomsen and I'm a current resident of Plymouth and lifelong Minnesotan.

I'm writing today about Docket 24-352. I oppose biomass, "renewable" natural gas, and trash burning being labeled as "carbon free." This is scientifically incorrect and undermines the carbon neutrality goals our state set years ago.

In particular I do not approve of this change in light of goals to bring AI data centers to the state. AI is notorious for eliminating jobs, not creating them. Its data centers are similarly notorious for environmental harms and guzzling of natural resources. They are antithetical toward helping Minnesotans and the environment.

Please support our clean energy industry and our existing carbon neutrality goals by not changing the existing, hard won and scientifically supported definitions of carbon neutrality.

JoAnna Thomsen
jothomsen56@gmail.com
Mobile: 612-518-5737
Pronouns: She/Her

From: ANDREA HOESCHEN
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Docket 24-352 clean energy strategies
Date: Monday, September 15, 2025 8:52:49 PM

To whom it may concern,

My name is Andrea Hoeschen, and I'm a resident of Columbia Heights, Minnesota (zip: 55421). I am concerned about Docket 24-342 considering the inclusion of "alternative renewables" from the Eligible Energy Technologies standard such as woody biomass and trash burning or "renewable" natural gas from manure to cheat the standard passed in 2023 for 100 percent carbon free energy by 2040.

Truly renewable energy sources such as solar panels and windmills are becoming more cost effective every day. And one need only have suffered the weeks of awful air quality this summer from uncontrolled wildfires to understand how woody biomass burning is bad for the health of the communities affected by it, to say nothing of the implications of burning trash with the possibility of producing even more volatile chemicals, particulates and potential carcinogens. Neither is more factory farming and manure lagoons potentially affecting our clean water supply a reasonable alternative. Carbon "scrubbing" technology is a sleight-of-hand that uses MORE power to clean the consequences of generating the power in the first place, how can that actually work? It seems like a perpetual motion machine for generating waste.

Nowhere else in the world is pushing for these outdated climate solutions; these sources are short-term, not truly renewable, and merely putting off the costs of change rather than building our own industrial base and competing on a world footing instead of falling behind. We do not need to reinvent the wheel with yet another set of costly and subjective feasibility analyses to placate the fossil fuel industry.

We do not need to do this at all, and we CERTAINLY do not need to do this to attract AI centers to Minnesota, they are noisome nuisances and destructive to all of the communities they are located in. We do not need to poison our towns and consume our natural resources to try and attract these fraud machines that no one wants, that many credible studies have found are unfit for purpose in the industries they have been shoehorned into, and erode their users' ability to think independently.

In conclusion, please continue to operate within the clean energy standard as written - TRULY carbon-free by 2040.

Sincerely,
Andrea Hoeschen

Sent from Outlook

From: Winter Smith-Chau
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Docket 24-352
Date: Monday, September 15, 2025 5:40:58 PM

Hello,

My name is Winter Smith-Chau, I live in Minnesota, and I oppose biomass, "renewable" natural gas, and trash burning being INCORRECTLY labeled as "Carbon Free" and I want lawmakers to actually stick to the very popular and legitimately won carbon neutrality goals our state set years ago. I do NOT approve of these moves especially in light that major AI data centers jack up electric prices and destroy the environment for everyday Minnesotans. This is in regards to docket 24-352. Currently, we set such a good example for other states, and allowing these companies to use this type of language to hoodwink uninformed voters undermines everything that we stand for.

Kind regards,

From: M Chau
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Docket 24-352
Date: Tuesday, September 16, 2025 9:28:25 AM

Hello,

My name is Meagan Chau, I live in Minnesota, and I oppose biomass, "renewable" natural gas, and trash burning being INCORRECTLY labeled as "Carbon Free" and I want lawmakers to actually stick to the very popular and legitimately won carbon neutrality goals our state set years ago. I do NOT approve of these moves especially in light that major AI data centers jack up electric prices and destroy the environment for everyday Minnesotans. This is in regards to docket 24-352. Currently, we set such a good example for other states, and allowing these companies to use this type of language to hoodwink uninformed voters undermines everything that we stand for.

Kind regards,

From: Hangatu Omar
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Docket 24-352
Date: Monday, September 15, 2025 1:49:55 PM

Hello, my name is Hangatu Omar, I live in Minneapolis Minnesota, and I'm writing to convey my opposition to Docket 24-352 and rewriting Minnesota's Carbon-Free electricity laws. The rules are both incredibly popular and NECESSARY given the climate crisis and the Trump administration's war on science and climate action. Throwing that hard work in the trash to satisfy data center lobbyists is a betrayal, especially because data centers are proven to be an environmental disaster and often an act of environmental racism, as they're planted in poor areas where the residents have little political say. More pollution for our state is never the answer.

Sincerely,

Hangatu Omar

From: Kate Kenney-Peterson
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Docket Number 24-352
Date: Monday, September 15, 2025 5:00:02 PM

Docket Number 24-352

Good afternoon,

My name is Kathryn Kenney-Peterson and I live in Winona, MN. I am writing to state my opposition to rewriting Minnesota's carbon neutrality goals. Biomass burning, "renewable" natural gas, trash burning, and other similar processes are not "carbon free" and are in fact *worse* for our environent than coal and oil. The idea of "carbon capture" is the new "clean coal." It is thoroughly anti-science and another attempt to linger on fossil fuels and hold us back from true progress toward carbon neutrality.

I have always been proud of my state for its position on environmental progress. I don't want to see our hard-won goals fall by the wayside. I don't want to see AI data centers, an industry that prides itself on eliminating jobs, deplete our water table and push our energy bills through the roof. We are better than this. Minnesota is a state that cares deeply about its farmlands, blufflands, pine forests up north, and sky-blue waters. Please preserve our beauty. Do not roll back our carbon neutrality goals.

Thank you for your time,
Kathryn Kenney-Peterson
kathrynakp@gmail.com
925-822-5542

From: Lauren Moody
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: docket number 24-352
Date: Saturday, September 13, 2025 12:20:48 AM

My name is Lauren K. Moody, I live in Saint Paul, MN, 55104.

I am emailing to comment on docket number 24-352. A "carbon-free" technology is defined in the law (Minn. Stat. 216B.1691) as "a technology that generates electricity without emitting carbon dioxide."

Minnesota CANNOT step back from our leadership role in pioneering renewable energy! Renewable energy generates jobs and improves quality of life, while electricity production that emits ANY carbon dioxide (or methane etc) tanks qol, and the only jobs it might create are dead-ends.

Ruling that things like carbon capture/storage, biomass burning, wood waste, or trash incineration are "carbon free" is straight up lying. It's anti-science and betrays the goals Minnesotans popularly support. It also undermines our clean energy industry, which provides good, safe jobs.

I want law makers to stick to the very popular and legitimately won carbon neutrality goals our state set years ago. I particularly don't approve of any attempt to get around those goals in light of talk about attracting AI data centers, which are pollution machines.

Protect Minnesotans. Protect our children. Keep to the goals we've already set, and don't let industries that don't care about our people tempt you away.

From: rwhite3@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rusty White
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Saturday, September 13, 2025 10:42:13 AM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

to wealthy individuals and industries.

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

Sincerely,
Rusty White
Ely, MN 55731-8265
rwhite3@unl.edu

From:	ninepence@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Neville Bruce
To:	Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject:	Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date:	Saturday, September 13, 2025 2:50:20 PM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

to wealthy individuals and industries.

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

Sincerely,
Mr. Neville Bruce
Anchorage, AK 99501-4350
ninepence@hotmail.com

From: profcanoe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Paul Harris
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Saturday, September 13, 2025 3:27:25 PM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

to wealthy individuals and industries.

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

Sincerely,
Dr. Paul Harris
Moorhead, MN 56560-4170
profcanoe@yahoo.com

From: john.siekmeier@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Siekmeier
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Sunday, September 14, 2025 8:56:02 AM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

to wealthy individuals and industries.

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

Sincerely,
John Siekmeier
Saint Paul, MN 55115-1528
john.siekmeier@q.com

From:	lbergerud@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lisa Bergerud
To:	Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject:	Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date:	Monday, September 15, 2025 8:07:59 AM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

to wealthy individuals and industries.

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

Sincerely,
Lisa Bergerud
Minneapolis, MN 55407-3809
lbergerud@yahoo.com

From: eqlrghts@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of terry schaunaman
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Monday, September 15, 2025 8:10:42 AM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

to wealthy individuals and industries.

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

Sincerely,
terry schaunaman
Fargo, ND 58103-2508
eqlrghts@yahoo.com

From:	kelleyjewett@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kelley Jewett
To:	Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject:	Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date:	Monday, September 15, 2025 8:10:50 AM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

to wealthy individuals and industries.

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

Sincerely,
Dr. Kelley Jewett
Minneapolis, MN 55406-2114
kelleyjewett@yahoo.com

From:	bwerner1586@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Brad Werner
To:	Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject:	Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date:	Monday, September 15, 2025 8:10:53 AM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh “carbon-free” electric energy in Minnesota. The decisions and governance frameworks we put in place now will reverberate decades into the future.

I believe the legislation as passed is very flawed. We need a comprehensive plan that utilizes all energy sources. Renewables have multiple issues. There are heavy metals in solar panels. Most lenders will not mortgage land with solar panels as who is going to clean up the heavy metals when a tornado or some other event happens has never been addressed. Whether they pollute adjacent land, water or something else.

In addition the blades on wind towers have a limited life span. As of now when they wear out they are taken down and put in landfills. They are made out of fiberglass. I question hiw that is better for the environment than high density fossil fuels.

Also for every megawatt of renewable energy you have to build an equal non-renewable megawatt. Usually run by natural gas but could be other sources also. The reason being the wind doesn't always blow and the sun doesn't always shine plus storing electricity is difficult at best. So all that happens in the end is our electricity costs contiinue to rise unnecessarily.

As you wrestle with these questions, it's critical that you listen to the full range of voices who will be impacted by your decisions and how they will effect the affordability of power long term.

I appreciate your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Brad Werner
Echo, MN 56237-1540
bwerner1586@gmail.com

From:	spacedrift117@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Linda Olson
To:	Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject:	Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date:	Monday, September 15, 2025 8:11:00 AM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

to wealthy individuals and industries.

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

Sincerely,
Ms Linda Olson
Duluth, MN 55805-1250
spacedrift117@yahoo.com

From:	dbutts1257@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dean Butts
To:	Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject:	Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date:	Monday, September 15, 2025 8:11:00 AM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

to wealthy individuals and industries.

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

Sincerely,
Mr. Dean Butts
Rosholt, WI 54473-9551
dbutts1257@gmail.com

From:	mistylynnbutler@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Misty Butler
To:	Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject:	Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date:	Tuesday, September 16, 2025 9:31:07 AM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

to wealthy individuals and industries.

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

Sincerely,
Ms. Misty Butler
Montevideo, MN 56265-4565
mistylynnbutler@gmail.com

From: kristen.wesloh@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kristen Wesloh
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Saturday, September 13, 2025 7:36:46 AM

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

to wealthy individuals and industries.

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

Sincerely,
Mrs. Kristen Wesloh
Angora, MN 55703-8345
kristen.wesloh@yahoo.com

From: Mikkayla Kemmet
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Regarding Docket 24-352
Date: Monday, September 15, 2025 9:58:18 PM

Hello!

My name is Mikkayla Kemmet. I live right outside of Minneapolis, and I'm emailing today to tell you that I oppose the idea of docket 24-352, which, to my understanding, would have biomass burning, 'renewable' natural gas burning, and trash burning being falsely labeled as carbon-free sources of energy. They aren't carbon free. It would be much preferred if lawmakers stuck to the carbon neutral goals that were set in 2023 that were, in fact, quite popular with the people!

If this new definition were to go through, it would make life a lot tougher for Minnesotans. I personally really dislike this because of the additional goal to add AI data centers, which would drive electricity bills up the wall in an already tough economy. I don't want myself, my loved ones, and the general population to have to worry about money more than we already have to.

All in all, I'm really disappointed that our lawmakers would consider this idea, instead of going along with what the people wanted and fought for. Please do not let this new definition go through.

Thank you!

From: Wufoo
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Submitted Public Comment Form
Date: Monday, September 15, 2025 11:38:41 PM

Name *	Stacy Nelson
Provide the docket's number.	E002/M-23-524

Leave a comment on the docket. *

Please deny Xcel Energy's request for their TOU rate design request. This just puts more burden onto its customers, both financially and physically. There are a significant amount of users who are elderly with only window AC units – which we all are not as efficient as we would like – but that is what they have. By raising rates during this time period they will likely be forced to turn off their air and suffer in the heat.

Xcel needs to be much more proactive in educating and promoting how the general public can and should limit use of certain appliances or perhaps adjust thermostat up a degree or two during this period. An insert in a bill, which most people don't get a paper bill anymore, is not efficient. They must make an effort vs. just coming up with a plan to increase rates during certain hours. Seems like just another form of greed and consumers and very tired of it.

From: Wufoo
To: Staff, CAO (PUC)
Subject: Submitted Public Comment Form
Date: Monday, September 15, 2025 9:37:22 PM

Name *	Katie Nesheim
Address	4533 Snelling Ave Minneapolis, Minnesota 55406 United States
Phone Number	(952) 460-0268
Email	katie.nesh@gmail.com
Provide the docket's number.	24-352

Leave a comment on the docket. *

September 15, 2025

Public Utility Commission

RE: In the Matter of a Commission Investigation into a Fuel Life-Cycle Analysis Framework for Utility Compliance with Minnesota's Carbon-Free Standard Docket No. E-999/CI-24-352

Dear Chair Sieben and Commissioners,

My name is Katie Nesheim and I'm a lifelong citizen of Minnesota. I'm writing to express my opinion regarding the Minnesota Carbon-Free Standard, the definition of "carbon-free" technology under 216B.1691, subd. 1(b)), and the consideration of biomass for eligibility. Thank you for the opportunity to allow for public comment on the implementation of this law and your commitment to ensuring safe, reliable, and sustainable utility services for all Minnesotans.

The burning of wood and/or municipal solid wastes should not be considered as a carbon-free technology or eligible for full renewable energy credits. Burning wood waste and garbage both emit carbon dioxide during their operation which simply contradicts the definition under subd. 1(b)). Allowing these to remain technologies as "carbon free" does not encourage increased adoption of proven long term solutions, like solar and wind.

Additionally, burning wood waste and burning garbage harms people's health. Wood waste facilities often emit great amounts of nitrous oxides, volatile organic compounds, particulate matter, mercury, and carbon monoxide, endangering the health and safety of people nearby. These air pollutants contribute to cardiovascular and respiratory diseases, strokes, asthma, reproductive and developmental problems.

Waste incinerators similarly emit dangerous pollutants such as sulfur dioxide, particulate matter,

and lead. The HERC incinerator, Minnesota's most well-studied garbage incinerator, has been estimated to contribute to 1-3 local deaths per year and $11-24 million in health impacts annually.

I truly commend the Minnesota legislature for passing such a climate-focused electricity bill. I hope the Public Utilities will implement this law with the input of the public it is meant to serve. It is in the public's best interest to remove biomass as a carbon-free energy technology.

Sincerely,

Katie Nesheim