



May 31, 2013

**ELECTRONIC FILING**

Dr. Burl W. Haar  
Executive Secretary  
Minnesota Public Utilities Commission  
350 Metro Square Building  
121 Seventh Place East  
St. Paul, MN 55101

**Re: *In the Matter of the Application for a Route Permit for the Fargo to St. Cloud  
345 kV Transmission Line Project***  
Alexandria to Border  
MPUC Docket No. E002, ET2/TL-09-1056

Dear Dr. Haar:

In response to a request from Department of Commerce Energy Facility Permitting Staff, Northern States Power Company, a Minnesota corporation ("Xcel Energy"), submits the enclosed tables for the minor alteration requests filed May 23, 2013. The tables provide impacts and a routing factors analysis under Rule 7850.4100 for each of the four requested minor alterations.

Please contact me at [thomas.hillstrom@xcelenergy.com](mailto:thomas.hillstrom@xcelenergy.com) or (612) 330-5835 if there are any questions regarding this filing.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Tom Hillstrom".

Tom Hillstrom  
Permit Project Lead  
Xcel Energy

Enclosures

cc: Bret Eknes, Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (w/enc.)  
David Birkholz, Minnesota Dept. of Commerce, Energy Facility Permitting (w/enc.)



## Route Comparison of Requested Minor Alteration 1

Environmental Consideration	Comments
Human settlement	Requested minor alteration will not have a greater impact on human settlement than the PUC Anticipated Alignment. There are no additional homes along the requested minor alteration.
Existence and density of populated areas	No populated areas are crossed by the requested minor alteration or the PUC Anticipated Alignment.
Existing and planned future land use	Potential land use impacts associated with both the requested minor alteration and the PUC Anticipated Alignment are the same.
Management plans	The same management plans that apply to the requested minor alteration also apply to the PUC Anticipated Alignment.
Natural environment	More wetlands have the potential to occur along the requested minor alteration (12% of ROW), in comparison to the PUC Anticipated Alignment (4% of ROW).
Public and designated lands (including but not limited to natural areas, wildlife habitat, water, recreational lands)	Neither the requested minor alteration nor the PUC Anticipated Alignment impact these types of land.
Known archaeological sites and historical structures	Neither the requested minor alteration nor the PUC Anticipated Alignment impact these types of resources.
Economies within the alternative, such as agricultural, commercial or industrial, forestry, recreational and mining operations	There would be no increase in potential for impact to any of these resources along the requested minor alteration.
Transmission line cost and accessibility	There would be no increase in cost and no decrease in accessibility along the requested minor alteration.
Use of existing rights-of-way and rights-of way sharing or paralleling	The requested minor alteration would move to the north side of the interstate and parallel the interstate for 47% of its length while the PUC Anticipated Alignment parallels the interstate for 80% of its length.
Natural resources and features	The requested minor alteration will not impact any additional natural resources or features.
Extent to which impacts are subject to mitigation through regulatory control and permit conditions	The same regulatory controls, mitigation measures and permit conditions will apply to both the requested minor alteration and the PUC Anticipated Alignment.
Cumulative potential effect of related or anticipated future transmission line construction	There would be no additional adverse effects or change as it relates to cumulative potential effects along the requested minor alteration, in comparison to the PUC Anticipated Alignment.

## Route Comparison of Requested Minor Alteration 2

Environmental Consideration	Comments
Human settlement	Requested minor alteration will not have a greater impact on human settlement than the PUC Anticipated Alignment. There are no additional homes along the requested minor alteration.
Existence and density of populated areas	No populated areas are crossed by the requested minor alteration or the PUC Anticipated Alignment.
Existing and planned future land use	Potential land use impacts associated with both the requested minor alteration and the PUC Anticipated Alignment are the same.
Management plans	The same management plans that apply to the requested minor alteration also apply to the PUC Anticipated Alignment.
Natural environment	The requested minor alteration will not have a greater impact on wetlands than the PUC Anticipated Alignment as no additional wetlands have the potential to occur along the requested minor alteration.
Public and designated lands (including but not limited to natural areas, wildlife habitat, water, recreational lands)	Neither the requested minor alteration nor the PUC Anticipated Alignment impact these types of land.
Known archaeological sites and historical structures	Neither the requested minor alteration nor the PUC Anticipated Alignment impact these types of resources.
Economies within the alternative, such as agricultural, commercial or industrial, forestry, recreational and mining operations	There would be no increase in potential for impact to any of these resources along the requested minor alteration.
Transmission line cost and accessibility	There would be no increase in cost and no decrease in accessibility along the requested minor alteration.
Use of existing rights-of-way and rights-of way sharing or paralleling	The requested minor alteration would parallel the interstate for 61% of its length while the PUC Anticipated Alignment parallels secondary roads for 50% of its length.
Natural resources and features	The requested minor alteration will not impact any additional natural resources or features.
Extent to which impacts are subject to mitigation through regulatory control and permit conditions	The same regulatory controls, mitigation measures and permit conditions will apply to both the requested minor alteration and the PUC Anticipated Alignment.
Cumulative potential effect of related or anticipated future transmission line construction	There would be no additional adverse effects or change as it relates to cumulative potential effects along the requested minor alteration, in comparison to the PUC Anticipated Alignment.

### Route Comparison of Requested Minor Alteration 3

Environmental Consideration	Comments
Human settlement	The requested minor alteration would have fewer homes within 500 feet (0) than the PUC Anticipated Alignment (2).
Existence and density of populated areas	No populated areas are crossed by the requested minor alteration or the PUC Anticipated Alignment.
Existing and planned future land use	Potential land use impacts associated with both the requested minor alteration and the PUC Anticipated Alignment are the same.
Management plans	The same management plans that apply to the requested minor alteration also apply to the PUC Anticipated Alignment.
Natural environment	The requested minor alteration will not have a greater impact on wetlands than the PUC Anticipated Alignment as no additional wetlands have the potential to occur along the requested minor alteration.
Public and designated lands (including but not limited to natural areas, wildlife habitat, water, recreational lands)	Neither the requested minor alteration nor the PUC Anticipated Alignment impact these types of land.
Known archaeological sites and historical structures	Neither the requested minor alteration nor the PUC Anticipated Alignment impact these types of resources.
Economies within the alternative, such as agricultural, commercial or industrial, forestry, recreational and mining operations	There would be no increase in potential for impact to any of these resources along the requested minor alteration.
Transmission line cost and accessibility	There would be no increase in cost and no decrease in accessibility along the requested minor alteration.
Use of existing rights-of-way and rights-of way sharing or paralleling	The requested minor alteration would not parallel any existing rights-of-way while the PUC Anticipated Alignment parallels secondary roads for 40% of its length.
Natural resources and features	The requested minor alteration will not impact any additional natural resources or features.
Extent to which impacts are subject to mitigation through regulatory control and permit conditions	The same regulatory controls, mitigation measures and permit conditions will apply to both the requested minor alteration and the PUC Anticipated Alignment.
Cumulative potential effect of related or anticipated future transmission line construction	There would be no additional adverse effects or change as it relates to cumulative potential effects along the requested minor alteration, in comparison to the PUC Anticipated Alignment.

## Route Comparison of Requested Minor Alteration 4

Environmental Consideration	Comments
Human settlement	The requested minor alteration would have fewer homes within 500 feet (0) than the PUC Anticipated Alignment (4).
Existence and density of populated areas	No populated areas are crossed by the requested minor alteration or the PUC Anticipated Alignment.
Existing and planned future land use	Potential land use impacts associated with both the requested minor alteration and the PUC Anticipated Alignment are the same.
Management plans	The same management plans that apply to the requested minor alteration also apply to the PUC Anticipated Alignment.
Natural environment	More wetlands have the potential to occur along the requested minor alteration (11% of ROW), in comparison to the PUC Anticipated Alignment (4% of ROW).
Public and designated lands (including but not limited to natural areas, wildlife habitat, water, recreational lands)	The requested minor alteration and the PUC Anticipated Alignment both cross a same water body. However, the crossing length would be shorter along the requested minor alteration.
Known archaeological sites and historical structures	Neither the requested minor alteration nor the PUC Anticipated Alignment impact these types of resources.
Economies within the alternative, such as agricultural, commercial or industrial, forestry, recreational and mining operations	There would be no increase in potential for impact to any of these resources along the requested minor alteration.
Transmission line cost and accessibility	There would be no substantial increase in cost and no substantial decrease in accessibility along the requested minor alteration.
Use of existing rights-of-way and rights-of way sharing or paralleling	The requested minor alteration would move to the north side of the interstate and parallel the interstate for 47% of its length while the PUC Anticipated Alignment parallels the interstate for 80% of its length.
Natural resources and features	One additional PWI water would be crossed by the requested minor alteration. However, the MnDNR has already issued a permit to cross this PWI water.
Extent to which impacts are subject to mitigation through regulatory control and permit conditions	The same regulatory controls, mitigation measures and permit conditions will apply to both the requested minor alteration and the PUC Anticipated Alignment.
Cumulative potential effect of related or anticipated future transmission line construction	There would be no additional adverse effects or change as it relates to cumulative potential effects along the requested

In the Matter of the Application for a  
Route Permit for the Fargo to St. Cloud  
345 kV Transmission Line Project

MPUC Docket No. E002, ET2/TL-09-1056

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Jill N. Yeaman certifies that on the 31st day of May, 2013, she filed true and correct copy of tables to Minor Alteration Requests filed May 23, 2013, by posting it on [www.edockets.state.mn.us](http://www.edockets.state.mn.us). Said document was also served via U.S. Mail and e-mail as designated on the Official Service List on file with the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission in the above-referenced docket.

*/s/ Jill N. Yeaman*\_\_\_\_\_

Jill N. Yeaman

## Service List Member Information

## Electronic Service Member(s)

Last Name	First Name	Email	Company Name	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret
Agrimonti	Lisa	lagrimonti@briggs.com	Briggs And Morgan, P.A.	Electronic Service	No
Anderson	Julia	Julia.Anderson@ag.state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-DOC	Electronic Service	Yes
Brama	Elizabeth	ebraa@briggs.com	Briggs and Morgan	Electronic Service	No
Church	Kodi	kchurch@briggs.com	Briggs & Morgan	Electronic Service	No
Felstul	Chad	c.felstul@pemlaw.com	Pemberton Sorlie Rufer and Kershner	Electronic Service	No
Ferguson	Sharon	sharon.ferguson@state.mn.us	Department of Commerce	Electronic Service	Yes
Haar	Burl W.	burl.haar@state.mn.us	Public Utilities Commission	Electronic Service	Yes
Kershner	H. Morrison	m.kershner@pemlaw.com	Pemberton Sorlie Rufer and Kershner	Electronic Service	No
Kjellberg	Cally	ckjellberg@quinlivan.com	Quinlivan & Hughes, PA	Electronic Service	No
Krikava	Michael	mkrikava@briggs.com	Briggs And Morgan, P.A.	Electronic Service	No
Lindell	John	agorud.ecf@ag.state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-RUD	Electronic Service	Yes
Overland	Carol A.	overland@legalelectric.org	Legalelectric - Overland Law Office	Electronic Service	No
Pemberton	Richard	r.pemberton@pemlaw.com	Pemberton Sorlie Rufer and Kershner	Electronic Service	No
Perry	Shawn	shawn.perry@ppplp.com	Perry & Perry	Electronic Service	No
Ross McCalib	Laureen	lrossmccalib@greenergy.com	Great River Energy	Electronic Service	No
Rufer	Stephen	s.rufer@pemlaw.com	Pemberton Sorlie Rufer and Kershner	Electronic Service	No
Schrenzel	Jamie	jamie.schrenzel@state.mn.us	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources	Electronic Service	No
Seykora	David	dave.seykora@state.mn.us	MN Department of Transportation	Electronic Service	No
Shaddix Elling	Janet	jshaddix@janetshaddix.com	Shaddix And Associates	Electronic Service	Yes
Smestad	Jennifer	jsmestad@ottertail.com	Otter Tail Corporation	Electronic Service	No
Stephenson	Donna	dstephenson@greenergy.com	Great River Energy	Electronic Service	No
Thompson	SaGonna	Regulatory.Records@xcelenergy.com	Xcel Energy	Electronic Service	No
Thulien Smith	Jennifer	jennifer.thulien-smith@xcelenergy.com	Xcel Energy Services, Inc.	Electronic Service	No
Undersander	Robert and Pauline	Rob.Undersander@gmail.com	N/A	Electronic Service	No
Von Korff	Gerald	jvonkorff@noon.com	N/A	Electronic Service	No

## Paper Service Member(s)

Last Name	First Name	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret
Eikmeier	Kenneth and Linda	N/A	8825 Old Highway Road, St. Cloud, MN-56301	Paper Service	No
Hylla	Scott	North Route Citizens Alliance	12385 Co Rd #5, Holdingford, MN-56340	Paper Service	No
Kaul	Will	Great River Energy	12300 Elm Creek Boulevard, Maple Grove, MN-553694718	Paper Service	No
Lahr	Darrin F.	Xcel Energy	8701 Monticello Lane, Maple Grove, MN-55369	Paper Service	No
Larson	Kent	Xcel Energy	414 Nicollet Mall, MP 800, Minneapolis, MN-55401	Paper Service	No
Maccabee	Paula	Just Change Law Offices	1961 Selby Avenue, St. Paul, MN-55104	Paper Service	No
O'Neil	Lyn Richert and Terra	N/A	2583 86th Avenue, St. Cloud, MN-56301	Paper Service	No
Osborn	Joyce H.	N/A	PO Box 1165, Burnsville, MN-55337	Paper Service	No
Scott	John	N/A	39522 115th Ave., St. Joseph, MN-56374	Paper Service	No
Undersander	Hal and Patricia	N/A	8705 Old Highway Road, St. Cloud, MN-56301	Paper Service	No

Assigned Service List Members

Weisbrich	Tim and Brenda	N/A	8601 Old Highway Road, St. Cloud, MN-56301	Paper Service	No
-----------	----------------	-----	--	---------------	----