

State of Minnesota

PowerOn Midwest 765 kV Transmission Project Information Request

Docket Number: E002, ET2, ET6675/CN-25-117 Date of Request: July 10, 2026
CAH 28-2500-41617

Requested From: Lisa A. Crum, Max Meyer Response Due: July 24, 2026
Attorneys for Midcontinent
Independent System Operator, Inc.

Analyst Requesting Information: Carol A. Overland, Counsel for North Route Group
and NO765MN

Type of Inquiry: ☒ Financial ☐ Rate of Return ☐ Rate Design
 ☒ Engineering ☐ Forecasting ☐ Conservation
 ☐ Cost of Service ☐ CIP ☒ Other:

Responses that are trade secret or privileged are indicated.

Request No.	
5	Please provide information below, and link(s) if responsive: From MISO's "Multi-Value Project Dashboard, Tranche 2.1 Portfolio"¹ updated 3/31/2026, LRTP 24, Lakefield Junction-Pleasant Valley-North Rochester has increased in estimated cost from \$1,195 million to \$1,955 million, an increase of \$760 million, over 60%. (a) Provide line item documentation of this cost increase. (b) Provide all documentation of Variance Analysis as required by tariff. (c) Provide updated cost/benefit analysis for each category of benefit for LRTP 24: a. Congestion and Fuel Savings b. Reduced Losses c. Decarbonization d. Reduced Transmission Outage Costs e. Reduced Extreme Weather Risks f. Avoided Tax Investment g. Avoided Capacity Costs h. Mitigation of Reliability Issues (d) Provided updated cost apportionment for LRTP 24

¹ Online: cdn.misoenergy.org/Tranche%202.1%20Dashboard732078.pdf?v=20251215144025

- (e) Provide minutes and/or videos of meetings with Minnesota PUC staff and/or Commissioners regarding Tranche 2.1 cost increases.

Conversely, the estimated cost of LRPT 26, the eastern Minnesota portion of the 765 kV transmission line, has dropped from \$1,924 million to \$,873 million, and Lakefield Junction to East Adair rose by only \$23 million, in the same timeframe.

- (f) Why has one segment of the 765 kV line risen so sharply, while these others decreased sharply. Provide documentation.
- (g) Provide itemized cost comparison of LRTP 24 765 kV with comparable direct current (DC) above ground and buried.

Responses:

- (a) Objection. MISO objects to this request to the extent it improperly seeks or purports to require MISO to provide documents and information not in MISO's possession, custody, or control or could be more easily obtained through third parties or other sources.

Subject to, and without waiving these objections, MISO states as follows:

MISO does not possess line-item documentation of the referenced cost increase.

- (b) MISO has not initiated a Variance Analysis for LRTP 24.

- (c) Objection. MISO objects to this request to the extent it improperly seeks or purports to require MISO to provide documents and information not in MISO's possession, custody, or control.

Subject to, and without waiving these objections, MISO states as follows:

MISO does not perform cost/benefit analyses for specific projects within an LRTP portfolio. Information on the cost/benefit analyses for the Tranche 2.1 portfolio on a zonal and Midwest Subregion basis are included in the MTEP24 Report.

- (d) The costs of the LRTP Tranche 2.1 portfolio will be recovered from MISO load and exports associated with the MISO Midwest Subregion through the energy-based MVP Usage Rate (\$/MWh) according to Attachment MM of the MISO Open Access Transmission, Energy and Operating Reserve Markets Tariff.

- (e) MISO has not had any meetings with Minnesota PUC staff and/or Commissioners regarding LRTP Tranche 2.1 cost increases.
- (f) MISO objects to this request to the extent it improperly seeks or purports to require MISO to provide documents and information not in MISO's possession, custody, or control or could be more easily obtained through third parties or other sources. MISO objects to this request to the extent that it improperly seeks or purports to require the production of documents or information, which is not relevant to the subject matter of the proceeding nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Subject to, and without waiving these objections, MISO states as follows:

After projects are included in an approved MTEP, the transmission developer must perform further engineering and construction work to bring the projects online, which may lead to project costs increasing or decreasing. Generally speaking, costs can increase or decrease relative to MISO's original estimate for a variety of reasons including materials used, route distance, labor costs, state regulatory requirements, etc.

- (g) Objection. MISO objects to this request to the extent it improperly seeks or purports to require MISO to provide documents and information not in MISO's possession, custody, or control or could be more easily obtained through third parties or other sources.

Subject to, and without waiving these objections, MISO states as follows:

The cost and other disadvantages of HVDC facilities are known, making the calculation of an itemized cost comparison unnecessary for the specific facilities. Therefore, MISO does not possess an itemized cost comparison of LRTP 24 765 kV with comparable direct current (DC) above ground and buried.

Objections prepared by: MISO Counsel

Response by: Jeanna Furnish

Title: Senior Director of Expansion Planning

Department: Transmission Planning

Telephone: 317.249.5400

Sources of information:

MTEP24 Report Chapter 2, Appendix E.1 to the Application.