State of Minnesota

PowerOn Midwest 765 kV Transmission Project Information Request

Docket Number: E002, ET2, ET6675/CN-25-117
CAH 28-2500-41617

Date of Request:July 10, 2026

Requested From: Lisa A. Crum, Max Meyer
Attorneys for Midcontinent
Independent System Operator, Inc.

Response Due: July 24, 2026

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

Type of Inquiry:			
	[x] Financial	[ ] Rate of Return	[ ] Rate Design
	[x] Engineering	[ ] Forecasting	[ ] Conservation
	[ ] Cost of Service	[ ] CIP	[x] Other:

Responses that are trade secret or privileged are indicated.

Request No.	
4	(a) Please provide all iterations of MISO's "assumed proxy route" for LRPT's 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26 for both 765kV and 345 kV transmission. (b) Please provide each iteration of development and selection of MISO's "endpoints" for each of the segments of LRPT 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26. (c) Please provide basis for segmentation of the 765 kV transmission line into LRPT 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26, and what point in development segmentation occurred. (d) Explain role of planned ownership of transmission line played in segmentation and endpoint development provide documentation of coordination with potential planned owners in segmentation and endpoint development. (e) Explain role of potential planned applicant for transmission line segment played in segmentation and endpoint development and provide documentation of coordination with potential planned applicants in segmentation and endpoint development. (f) In Wisconsin, MISO selected transmission developer from RFP. Was there RFP or competition for development of Minnesota Portion of MISO LRPT 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26? Provide documentation of competition and provide contracts for development and application to Public Utilities Commission.
Responses:	(a) Objection. MISO objects to the request to the extent is vague, ambiguous, uses terms that are subject to multiple interpretations, but are not properly

defined for purposes of these discovery requests, or otherwise provides no basis from which MISO can determine what information is sought ("assumed proxy route" is placed in quotation marks, but is not explained/defined).

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

MISO's transmission planning is done on a substation-to-substation basis and MISO does not plan a specific route or route alternatives between substations. MISO develops a proxy route for new transmission lines, that is a generic route connecting substations based on a desktop study, solely for the purpose of developing a cost estimate for a specific project. The proxy route used for cost estimation is not an endorsement of a particular route by MISO, and route and route alternatives are ultimately determined by the transmission developer(s) and state regulators. For those reasons, MISO does not develop iterations of the proxy route for a project.

(b) Objection. MISO objects to the request to the extent is vague, ambiguous, uses terms that are subject to multiple interpretations, but are not properly defined for purposes of these discovery requests, or otherwise provides no basis from which MISO can determine what information is sought (the term "endpoints" is placed in quotation marks, but is not explained/defined).

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

MISO's transmission planning is done on a substation-to-substation basis with each substation included in a project being a necessary part of that project. To the extent the Information Request relates to the term "endpoint" as used in Minn. Stat. Sec. 216B.243, subd. 3(6), the endpoints are the substations identified in MTEP projects that have been approved by the MISO Board of Directors. For information regarding the development of the LRTP Tranche 2.1 projects and their endpoints, please see the MTEP24 Report.

(c) Objection. MISO objects to the request to the extent it is vague, ambiguous, uses terms that are subject to multiple interpretations, but are not properly defined for purposes of these discovery requests, or otherwise provides no basis from which MISO can determine what information is sought ("segmentation" is not a term used in MISO transmission planning, and is not explained/defined in the Information Request).

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

The transmission solutions identified for inclusion in the LRTP Tranche 2.1 portfolio were organized into projects for construction and management during the detailed facility scoping process after finalization of the portfolio to develop costs for the MTEP24 Report, Appendix A. The portfolio was divided into individual projects by considering various factors including existing facility ownership, project size, state boundaries, etc. While stakeholders were highly engaged in developing LRTP Tranche 2.1, MISO was solely responsible for dividing the portfolio into individual projects.

(d) MISO objects to the request to the extent is vague, ambiguous, uses terms that are subject to multiple interpretations, but are not properly defined for purposes of these discovery requests, or otherwise provides no basis from which MISO can determine what information is sought (the terms "role" and "endpoint" are not explained/defined; "segmentation" is not a term used in MISO transmission planning, and is not explained/defined in the Information Request).

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

See response to Sections 4(b)-(c).

(e) MISO objects to the request to the extent is vague, ambiguous, uses terms that are subject to multiple interpretations, but are not properly defined for purposes of these discovery requests, or otherwise provides no basis from which MISO can determine what information is sought (the terms "role," "potential planned applicant," and "endpoint" are not explained/defined; "segment" and "segmentation" are not terms used in MISO transmission planning, and are not explained/defined in the Information Request).

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

See response to Sections 4(b)-(c).

(f) No. Competitive bidding did not take place for LRTP Tranche 2.1 projects in Minnesota. Minnesota has a right-of-first-refusal statute which provides incumbent electric transmission owners in the state with the right to construct new transmission facilities that connect to facilities owned by the incumbent electric transmission owner.

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