☐ **Not-Public Document – Not For Public Disclosure**
☐ **Public Document – Not-Public Data Has Been Excised**
☒ **Public Document**

Information Request No. 5

Docket No.:	E002/CN-25-117
Response To:	North Route Group and NO765MN
Requestor:	Carol Overland
Date Received:	July 7, 2026

Question:

Regarding cost increases:

Please see MISO "Multi-Value Project Dashboard" at link:

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

22	Big Stone South - Brookings County - Lakefield Junction	MN; SD	2034	2034	◐		$1,459	$1739*	
23	Lakefield Junction - East Adair	IA; MN	2034	2034	◐		$1,375	$1398*	
24	Lakefield Junction - Pleasant Valley - North Rochester	MN	2034	2034	◐		$1,195	$1955*	Cost change under review.
25	Pleasant Valley - North Rochester - Hampton Corner	MN	2032	2032	◐		$222	$241*	

See also cost, from PowerOn Midwest application, Chapter 2, p. 37:

Table 2.4-1 **Project Cost Estimate by Project Component**		
Project Component	**Base ($2024)**	**High-Range (Base Plus Contingency) ($2024)**
765 KV TRANSMISSION LINES		
MN/SD State Line to Lakefield Junction	$582 million	$756 million
Lakefield Junction to MN/IA State Line	$115 million	$150 million
Lakefield Junction to Pleasant Valley	$813 million	$1.056 billion
Pleasant Valley to North Rochester	$196 million	$255 million
345 KV TRANSMISSION LINES		
Pleasant Valley to North Rochester	$160 million	$207 million
North Rochester to Hampton	$74 million	$96 million
SUBSTATIONS		
Lakefield Junction Substation	$434 million	$564 million
Pleasant Valley Substation	$393 million	$512 million
North Rochester Substation	$553 million	$718 million
Hampton Substation	$7 million	$9 million
PROJECT TOTAL	**$3.327 billion**	**$4.323 billion**

Table 2.4-1 lists a base cost – separated out by transmission voltage and substations.

- Is it correct that these are Minnesota only numbers?
    - Response: Yes, that is correct.

- How were these numbers calculated? MISO cost estimator? Provide link to source of methodology and cost assumptions.
    - Objection: The Applicants object to this request as vague and ambiguous in its phrasing. Subject to and without waiving this objection, the Applicants provide the following response.

Response: Section 2.4.1 includes the description of how the costs in Table 2.4-1 were calculated.

LRPT24 cost increase

Per MISO's Multi-Value Project Dashboard, the cost of LRPT 24, Lakefield Junction-Pleasant Valley-North Rochester, the cost has risen from the MISO approved $1,195 to $1,955.

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

- Provide itemized documentation of cost increases.
    - Objection: The Applicants object to this request because "itemized documentation" is vague and ambiguous.

- MISO requires a Variance Analysis where cost increases over 25%, and the Multi-Value Project Dashboard notes "cost change under review." Provide documentation of this "review" and the MISO Variance Analysis as required by the MISO Tariff.
    - Objection: The Applicants object to this request to the extent it seeks information outside of the Applicants' custody and control. Subject to and without waiving this objection, the Applicants provide the following response.
    - Response: The Applicants have provided the Project costs in Table 2.4-1 of the Application to MISO and understand that MISO is reviewing those costs. As of the date of this response, the Applicants are not aware that MISO has commenced variance analysis regarding the Project.

Contingency

Application Table 2.4-1 has a "High-Range (Base Plus Contingency)" set at 30%. What is the justification for such a high contingency, double the customary 15%?

Objection: The Applicants object to this request's assumption/assertion of "such a high contingency" and the request's assertion that a contingency of 15 percent is "customary." Subject to and without waiving this objection, the Applicants provide the following response.

Response: As stated in the Application, "[a] 30 percent contingency is consistent with industry practices, Applicants' experiences, and MISO guidelines for this stage of project development."

Tariffs assessed to PowerOn Midwest project?

- What project components are affected by tariffs?
  - Objection: The Applicants object to this request because "affected by" is vague and ambiguous. Subject to and without waiving this objection, the Applicants provide the following response.
  - Response: Refer to Application section 2.4.1.
- Are tariffs fluctuating? If so, by country? Product?
  - Objection: The Applicants object to this request because it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, and ambiguous, and seeks information not in the Applicants' custody or control. Subject to and without waiving this objection, the Applicants provide the following response.
  - Response: The Applicants do not have a real-time analysis of tariff fluctuations by country and/or product.
- At this point in time what is dollar amount of tariffs for the PowerOn Midwest transmission project, knowing tariffs may increase, declared unconstitutional, be dropped, etc., going forward?
  - Objection: The Applicants object to this request because it is vague and ambiguous.
  - Response: Refer to Application section 2.4.1. Uncertainty related to tariffs is a component of the contingency in the current cost estimates.

Preparers:	Matt Ellis	Derrick Johnson
Title:	Director, Transmission Planning & Compliance	Regional Transmission Project Manager
Department:	Great River Energy	Great River Energy
Date:	July 21, 2026	July 21, 2026