



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

1. Ms. Alice West
2. Ava Huebner
3. Bonnie Fox
4. Mr. Buff Grace
5. Colleen and Joe Omeara
6. Elsie Jorgensen
7. Mr. Grant Tiefenbruck
8. Heidi Ahlstrand
9. Isabel Alexenko
10. Ms. Juliann Rule
11. Miss Katherine Hinson
12. Mr. Kenneth Stewart
13. Lori Cox
14. Ms. MaryAnn VandeVusse
15. Mrs. Peg Challengren
16. Peter Kennedy
17. Peter Vachuska
18. Scott Mills
19. Tom Mahoney
20. Ms. Verlaine Halvorsen

From: alice.m.west@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Alice West](#)
To: [Staff, CAO \(PUC\)](#)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 3:39:46 PM

[You don't often get email from alice.m.west@everyactioncustom.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

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. Alice West
Grand Marais, MN 55604-3109
alice.m.west@gmail.com

From: [Ava Huebner](#)
To: [Staff, CAO \(PUC\)](#)
Subject: Comment on PUC docket 24-352
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 5:38:20 PM

You don't often get email from avahuebner@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

Hello,

My name is Ava, and I live in St. Cloud MN. I heard that with 24-352 the state legislature is looking to adopt a definition of “carbon-free energy” that includes trash, biomass, and natural gas burning. This is in opposition to science and any commitment to reduce our carbon footprint, as these proposed energy sources emit more carbon than coal. It also undermines our clean energy industry, which provides good, safe jobs. I want law makers to actually stick to the very popular and legitimately won carbon neutrality goals our state set years ago.

I also can clearly see that this is meant to attract the AI industry. I do not want massive data centers taking up space in my lovely state anywhere, where it will inevitably pollute the land and burden nearby communities with outrageous energy bills. Please help keep our public policy science-based and in our land and communities’ best interests.

Thank you,
Ava

From: bonnief7@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Bonnie Fox](#)
To: [Staff, CAO \(PUC\)](#)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 2:01:33 PM

[You don't often get email from bonnief7@everyactioncustom.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

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,
Bonnie Fox
Afton, MN 55001-9734
bonnief7@gmail.com

From: buff@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Buff Grace](#)
To: [Staff, CAO \(PUC\)](#)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 9:28:23 AM

[You don't often get email from buff@everyactioncustom.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

Everyone in Minnesota now and into future generations is depending on you 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. Buff Grace
Stillwater, MN 55082-5937
buff@mnipl.org

From: cjomeara@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Colleen and Joe OMeara](#)
To: [Staff, CAO \(PUC\)](#)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 2:01:58 PM

[You don't often get email from cjomeara@everyactioncustom.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

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 Mrs Colleen and Joe OMeara
Minneapolis, MN 55411-2325
cjomeara@q.com

From: ejsvge65@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Elsie Jorgensen](#)
To: [Staff, CAO \(PUC\)](#)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 9:01:34 PM

[You don't often get email from ejsvge65@everyactioncustom.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

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 PMtechnologies 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,
Elsie Jorgensen
Ely, MN 55731-8265
ejsvge65@yahoo.com

From: gftiefenbruck@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Grant Tiefenbruck](#)
To: [Staff, CAO \(PUC\)](#)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 10:02:17 AM

[You don't often get email from gftiefenbruck@everyactioncustom.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

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. Grant Tiefenbruck
Cottage Grove, MN 55016-3436
gftiefenbruck@comcast.net

From: ironrancher@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [heidi ahlstrand](#)
To: [Staff, CAO \(PUC\)](#)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 2:01:56 PM

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,
heidi ahlstrand
Owatonna, MN 55060-5688
ironrancher@yahoo.com

From: [NeonBreeze451](#)
To: [Staff, CAO \(PUC\)](#)
Subject: Entirely Opposed To Docket Number 24-352
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 7:10:05 PM

You don't often get email from neonbreeze541@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

Good evening,

My name is Isabel Alexenko and I am a lifelong Minnesota resident. I am emailing regarding my opposition to Docket Number 24-352. Minnesota already has clear and robust standards for what is considered renewable energy and many of the newly opposed items are far worse for the environment than already existing infrastructure. Furthermore I am entirely opposed to any developments regarding AI datacenters. We have seen disastrous consequences in other states, chief among them being high water and electricity bills. Do not risk the livelihoods of everyday Minnesotans chasing this AI fad.

Thank you for your time.

From: schugrule@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Juliann Rule](#)
To: [Staff, CAO \(PUC\)](#)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 2:01:48 PM

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

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. Juliann Rule
Avon, MN 56310-9636
schugrule@aol.com

From: angelfishhinson@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Katherine Hinson](#)
To: [Staff, CAO \(PUC\)](#)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 2:02:02 PM

[You don't often get email from angelfishhinson@everyactioncustom.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

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,
Miss Katherine Hinson
Gilbert, AZ 85295-7212
angelfishhinson@aol.com

From: kenstewart4493@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Kenneth Stewart](#)
To: [Staff, CAO \(PUC\)](#)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 3:22:51 PM

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

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. Kenneth Stewart
Minneapolis, MN 55417-2125
kenstewart4493@gmail.com

From: rootsreturn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Lori Cox](#)
To: [Staff, CAO \(PUC\)](#)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 2:37:32 PM

[You don't often get email from rootsreturn@everyactioncustom.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

Thank you for the opportunity confirm 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,
Lori Cox
Carver, MN 55315-5010
rootsreturn@gmail.com

From: mavandevusse@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [MaryAnn VandeVusse](#)
To: [Staff, CAO \(PUC\)](#)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 3:38:38 PM

[You don't often get email from mavandevusse@everyactioncustom.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

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. MaryAnn VandeVusse
Savage, MN 55378-5648
mavandevusse@aol.com

From: sadited2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Peg Challengren](#)
To: [Staff, CAO \(PUC\)](#)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 2:01:55 PM

[You don't often get email from sadited2@everyactioncustom.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

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 Peg Challengren
Apple Valley, MN 55124-7660
sadieted2@gmail.com

From: peter.kennedy17@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Peter Kennedy](#)
To: [Staff, CAO \(PUC\)](#)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 2:01:41 PM

[You don't often get email from peter.kennedy17@everyactioncustom.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

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,
Peter Kennedy
Murdock, MN 56271-8038
peter.kennedy17@icloud.com

From: peter.vachuska@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Peter Vachuska](#)
To: [Staff, CAO \(PUC\)](#)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 2:01:53 PM

[You don't often get email from peter.vachuska@everyactioncustom.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

Dear Minnesota Public Utilities Commission,

I feel the PUC should prioritize the following considerations in Minnesota's definition of carbon-free energy:

- The urgent need to halt the expansion of fossil fuel resources.
- Recognize the fact that anything that burns fuel which emits carbon and cannot be “carbon-free” under the 100 percent standard.
- Only include solutions that result in real-zero emissions, such as solar and wind energy.
- Don't support the continued use of fossil fuels or their infrastructure -- things like burning consumer trash, hydrogen blending with gas, or carbon capture and storage.
- Further this should be done in a way that doesn't alienate fossil fuel workers and communities.

Please stay away from polluting solutions like burning wood or garbage. Don't rely on ideas that only work some of time like carbon capture and sequestration. These just provide incentives to pollute more.

Thanks for allowing input on this question of what “carbon-free” electric energy means in Minnesota.

Sincerely,
Peter Vachuska
Comfrey, MN 56019-4076
peter.vachuska@gmail.com

From: scottwmills@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [SCOTT MILLS](#)
To: [Staff, CAO \(PUC\)](#)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 2:13:20 PM

[You don't often get email from scottwmills@everyactioncustom.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

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,
SCOTT MILLS
Ely, MN 55731-1019
scottwmills@frontiernet.net

From: mm11@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Tom Mahoney](#)
To: [Staff, CAO \(PUC\)](#)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 2:01:55 PM

[You don't often get email from mm11@everyactioncustom.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

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,
Tom Mahoney
Hancock, MN 56244-1261
mm11@fedteldirect.net

From: verlaine@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Verlaine Halvorsen](#)
To: [Staff, CAO \(PUC\)](#)
Subject: Minnesotans need 100% Carbon Free Energy to be Clean & Renewable [Docket #: 24-352]
Date: Friday, September 12, 2025 2:01:56 PM

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

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. Verlaine Halvorsen
Minnetonka, MN 55345-1241
verlaineh@gmail.com