



# Minnesota Public Utilities Commission Meeting Agenda

121 7th Place East  
Suite 350  
Saint Paul, MN  
55101-2147

---

Thursday, December 19, 2013

9:30 AM

Large Hearing Room

---

## INTRODUCTION

## DELIBERATION ITEMS

## DECISION ITEMS

1. [Details 2013-369](#) \* **E002/TL-12-1151**      **Northern States Power Company d/b/a Xcel Energy**  
In the Matter of the Application of Xcel Energy for a Route Permit for the Kohlman Lake to Goose Lake 115 kV Transmission Line Upgrade Project in Ramsey County, Minnesota.  
  
Should the Commission find that the environmental assessment and the record created at the public hearing adequately address the issues identified in the scoping decision? Should the Commission issue a route permit identifying a specific route and permit conditions for the Kohlman Lake to Goose Lake 115 kV Transmission Line Project in Ramsey County?  
(PUC: **Ek**)  
**Attachments:**      [PUC Briefing Papers 12-10-13](#)  
                                 [PUC Briefing Papers Supplemental \(12-1151\) 12-17-13.pdf](#)
  
2. [Details 2013-370](#) \* **IP6646/WS-13-216**      **Stoneray Power Partners, LLC**  
In the Matter of the Application of Stoneray Power Partners, LLC for a Large Wind Energy Conversion System Site Permit for the 105 MW Stoneray Wind Project in Pipestone and Murray Counties.  
  
Should the Commission make a preliminary determination whether a site permit should be issued or denied? (PUC: **DeBleeckere**)  
**Attachments:**      [PUC Briefing Papers 12-12-13](#)
  
3. [Details 2013-377](#) \* **E015/CN-12-1163**      **Minnesota Power**  
In the Matter of the Application of Minnesota Power for a Certificate of Need for the Great Northern High Voltage Transmission Line Project from the Manitoba, Canada - Minnesota Border to the Blackberry Substation near Grand Rapids, Minnesota.  
  
Should the Commission accept the certificate of need application as substantially complete?  
Should the Commission refer the Matter to the Office of Administrative Hearings for a contested case proceeding?  
What action should the Commission take regarding other procedural items?

(PUC: **Kaluzniak**)

Attachments: [PUC Briefing Papers 12-12-13](#)

4. [Details 2013-371](#)

\* **E015/GP-13-978** **Minnesota Power**

In the Matter of the Application of Minnesota Power for a Gas Pipeline Routing Permit for the Laskin Energy Center Natural Gas Pipeline Project.

Should the Public Utilities Commission accept, conditionally accept, or reject the application filed by Minnesota Power for a partial exemption from pipeline route selection procedures and for a pipeline routing permit to provide natural gas for the Laskin Energy Center in Hoyt Lakes, Minnesota?

(PUC: **DeBleekere**)

Attachments: [PUC Briefing Papers 12-12-13](#)

5. [Details 2013-372](#)

\* **E015/TL-12-1123** **Minnesota Power**

In the Matter of the Application of Minnesota Power for a Route Permit for the 39 Line 115 kV Transmission Line Project in St. Louis County, Minnesota.

Should the Commission find that the environmental assessment and the record created at the public hearing adequately address the issues identified in the scoping decision? Should the Commission issue a route permit identifying a specific route and permit conditions for the 39 Line 115 kV High Voltage Transmission Line Project in St. Louis County? (PUC:

**DeBleekere**)

Attachments: [PUC Briefing Papers 12-12-13](#)

[PUC Briefing Papers Supplemental 12-17-13.pdf](#)

6. [Details 2013-375](#)

\* **G004/D-12-565;** **Great Plains Natural Gas Company, a**  
**G004/D-13-448** **Division of MDU Resources Group, Inc.**

In the Matter of a request by Great Plains Natural Gas Company for Approval of its 2012 Five-Year Depreciation Study;  
In the Matter of a Request by Great Plains Natural Gas Company for Approval of its 2013 Annual Depreciation Study.

Should the Commission approve the proposed depreciation parameters and the resulting depreciation rates for both studies?

Should the rates be effective January 1, 2013 and should the 2013 study rates supersede the 2012 study rates? (PUC: **Dasinger, Bender,**

**Schwieger**)

Attachments: [PUC Briefing Papers 12-12-13](#)

7. [Details 2013-382](#)

\* **E002/PA-13-484** **Northern States Power Company d/b/a**  
**Xcel Energy**

In the Matter of Xcel Energy's Petition for Approval of Transfer and Exchange of Transmission Assets with great River Energy.

1. Should the Commission grant approval of the proposed Asset Exchange Agreement under Minn. Stat. 216B.50?

2. Should the Commission grant a variance to Minn. Rule 7825.1800 Subp. B? (PUC: **Dasinger, Alonso**)

Attachments: [PUC Briefing Papers 12-12-13](#)

8. [Details 2013-376](#)

**\*\* E002/M-12-50 Northern States Power Company d/b/a Xcel Energy**

In the Matter of Xcel Energy's Petition for Approval of 2012 Transmission Cost Recovery (TCR), Project Eligibility, TCR Rate Factors, and 2011 True-up.

Should the Commission approve Xcel Energy's Petition for Approval of 2012 TCR Project Eligibility, TCR Rate Factors and True-Up for 2011? (PUC: **Dasinger, Schwieger**)

Attachments: [PUC Briefing Papers 12-12-13](#)

9. [Details 2013-367](#)

**\*\* E002/M-00-1583 Northern States Power Company d/b/a Xcel Energy**

In the Matter of the Request of Northern States Power Company d/b/a Xcel Energy for Approval of a Renewable Development Oversight Process.

Should the Commission require Xcel to return to Xcel's Renewable Development Fund (RDF) the amount of about \$1.1 million expended in 2003 on the Ecovation f/k/a AnAerobics, Inc. project? (PUC: **Mackenzie**)

Attachments: [PUC Briefing Papers 12-11-13](#)

[PUC Revised Decision Options 12-18-13](#)

10. [Details 2013-368](#)

**\*\* E999/CI-00-1636 All Electric Utilities**

In the Matter of the Investigation into Environmental and Socioeconomic Costs Under Minn. Stat. §216B.2422, subd. 3.

- 1) What is the scope of action requested by the petitioners?
- 2) Should the Commission reopen this matter, either by granting the Clean Energy Organization's Motion or on the Commission's own motion?
- 3) If the matter is reopened, what scope of issues should be examined and what procedures should be used? (PUC: **Rebholz, Kaml**)

Attachments: [PUC Briefing Papers 12-11-13](#)

## ADJOURNMENT

\* One star indicates agenda item is unusual but is not disputed.

\*\* Two stars indicate a disputed item or significant legal or procedural issue to be resolved. (Ex Parte Rules apply)