## A Guide to Comments to the MN Public Utilities Commission

about Great River Energy's proposed permit change for the Cambridge Station power plant

## Submit your comment directly to the PUC in docket 22-122 by Friday, May 27, 2022

There are two ways to do this, you can set up an account in the PUC portal or you can email them directly.

- 1) <a href="https://mn.gov/puc/consumers/public-comments/">https://mn.gov/puc/consumers/public-comments/</a> and follow the instructions,
- 2) or send comment via email directly to <a href="mailto:consumer.puc@state.mn.us">consumer.puc@state.mn.us</a> (indicate comment is for docket 22-122)

## **TEMPLATE FOR YOUR EMAIL:**

**Subject Line:** Comments for Docket 22-122

In your comments the two points we are trying to communicate are:

- 1) You want the PUC to conduct an Environmental Review of the proposal
- 2) You want to emphasize your concern for public and environmental health impacts.

**Wrap up** your comments by telling them what you want them to do: insist that the PUC do an environmental review and/or tell them that you do not want them to approve this request.

**Please follow your comments by your full name and your address.** If you are from out of state, you can comment if you own property in Minnesota. Please indicate the address of that property as well.

**Below are some sample comments** – These are meant to provide talking points for your comments. Please feel free to use them or personalize them as you see fit.

- As a member-owner distribution cooperative in Minnesota, GRE claims that they are making energy decisions that will power our future. As a rural electric cooperative member-owner, I believe GRE should invest in renewable energy that does not impact our human health and the environment. The "minor alteration" that GRE is seeking—changing their gas-fired plant to a "dual fuel" plant that will burn both oil and gas—is a step in the wrong direction. A new Environmental Impact Statement is necessary and should not even be optional or questioned.
- Certainly, any proposal that comes in front of the PUC that asks for a permit to burn anything much less diesel fuel deserves an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to ensure that the air the people of Cambridge and surrounding communities breathe is not going to cause harm to their health or the environment. The PUC needs to factor in not only the increased air pollution due to the "dual fuel" status change but the additional pollution that will come from the semi-trucks delivering the diesel to the plant. This is not good for the community or the environment.



- Rural communities in Minnesota are consistently on the front lines of exposure to pollutants in our air, soil, and water. The proposal by Great River Energy is another attempt to skirt environmental review while taking us backward on our commitment as a state to lead on clean energy and healthy places to live and play. Say no to GRE and keep diesel fuel fumes out of our community!
- At what point does the PUC take a role in supporting our state climate goals? When any project comes before you as a regulatory board you should be holding industry accountable for the pollution they are emitting into the air we breathe. This is a prime example of a project that takes us backward. We should be asking GRE to detail how their request supports our climate goals. Where does the buck stop? Any proposed project should have to detail how the changes impact the quality of the air, water, or soil.
- My vote is no on the request from GRE to amend their permits from the PUC, MPCA and the DNR. Any project that pollutes to this level is a huge step backwards on our benchmarks to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and address our contribution to the current climate crises. If the PUC approves this request, you are saying that the quality of life for people in rural communities is not important.
- As a person with respiratory problems, the last thing I, my children, or my grandchildren need is more
  arsenic, mercury, and sulfur dioxide in the air. We should ask utilities how their proposals move us to
  our zero-emissions climate goals. This seems like a step in the wrong direction. Please do not approve
  this request.
- As a Minnesotan, I want the Public Utilities Commission to be protecting our human health and the
  environment. Environmental Review should be part of every proposal that contributes to the climate
  crisis. Companies like GRE need to be moving away from burning fuel and moving to renewable energy
  sources. While diesel may be cheaper in the short term, the impacts on the environment and human
  health become a burden for the rest of us now and in the future. Please do not approve this proposal!

Learn more about PEER's climate work here https://peer.org/areas-of-work/climate-and-energy/

Learn more about CURE's energy democracy work here <a href="https://www.cureriver.org/energy-democracy/">https://www.cureriver.org/energy-democracy/</a>

Learn more about the North Star Chapter's Beyond Oil Campaign here https://www.sierraclub.org/minnesota/beyond-oil

