

Discussion: Minnesota Power for a Competitive Rate for Energy-Intensive Trade-Exposed (EITE) Customers and an EITE Cost Recovery Rider | M-15-984

Closed Dec 31, 2015 · Discussion · 8 Participants · 5 Topics · 8 Answers · 0 Replies · 3 Votes

8

PARTICIPANTS

5

TOPICS

8

ANSWERS

0

REPLIES

3

VOTES

SUMMARY OF TOPICS

Topic: Does MP's proposed rate for EITE customers comply with Minn. Stat. §216B.1696, including the types of customers eligible for the rate, the criteria for qualification for the rate, the individual design elements of the rate, and the specific rate option proposed?

3 Responses

3 Responses

John Bray about 1 month ago

http://m.virginiamn.com/news/local/mp-arcelormittal-sign-year-power-deal/article_e61320b4-932f-11e5-bf4c-f7f8023a643f.html?mode=jgm

The important thing to note is that all Mn Power rate payers will be facing substantially increased power bills, since Mn Power is simply passing these special iron mining company rate reductions onto every Mn Power rate payer. To be clear, this kind of special treatment for any class of rate payer should be at the expense of Mn Power, not the rest of its rate payers. The huge rate increases expected because of this "deal" will especially hit hard rate payers who are living on fixed incomes. So while Mn Power takes credit for its generosity to the Mn mining companies, the real credit should go to the Mn Power rate payers who are really subsidizing this unfair business decision by MP.

0 Reads

Sonja Daniels about 1 month ago

please do not pass the pay ray hike to just residential users. The mining companies should have to pay their share since they are large users. Its not fair to smaller users to pay for the larger users.

0 Reads

Ellyn Wiens about 1 month ago

I am a senior citizen who recently moved to Duluth, MN. I am worried about an increase in my electric bill as I am on a fixed income. I am retired (for over 15 years) and plan to live a LONG time here in the Northwoods. So any increase will be devastating.

0 Reads

Topic: What criteria should the Commission use to evaluate whether MP's proposed EITE rate schedule provides net benefit to the utility or the state as required by Minn. Stat. §216B.1696, subd. 2(b)? Has MP demonstrated that its proposed EITE rate schedule provides such net benefit?

1 Responses

1 Responses

Rosemary Hampton 17 days ago

In this case, the net benefit for the state will not be there. The math does not prove a net profit. It won't preserve any mining jobs but will place a \$17M burden onto business, government, and resident, including senior citizens. The rate shift won't affect how much revenue or profit MN Power totally makes.

To remain competitive the mining corporations need to reduce the cost of production of iron ore by c. \$10/ton (Duluth News Tribune, June 21, 2015) , not \$.60/ton, which this rate adjustment will do. This math shows that the \$17M in savings to the mining corporations will not save mining jobs.

Thus, I advocate that the Commission vote against this rate increase.

I am a senior citizen and know that most senior citizens, especially those living on social security only, cannot afford an average electrical bill hike of \$11.46/month, which is \$137/month, although those people who signed up for a low-income discount with MN Power will not receive a hike, as I understand it. Please remember that for Year 2016 we did not receive any increase in our social security checks. Thus, for all of us I am trying to stop this rate increase.

0 Reads

Topic: Are there additional or alternative rate options for EITE customers that would better meet the policy goals of the statute?

0 Responses

Topic: Does MP's action on the deposit of \$10,000 for low-income funding comply with Minn. Stat. §216B.1696, subd. 3, and is it reasonable?

0 Responses

Topic: Under Minn. Stat. §216B.1696, subd. 2(d), the Commission shall allow recovery of costs in the next general rate case or through an EITE cost recovery rate rider between general rate cases. Should the Commission allow MP to implement a cost recovery rider prior to its next general rate case?

4 Responses

4 Responses

Paul Leslie about 1 month ago

I urge the commission to NOT approve the proposed rate increase on residential customers of Minnesota Power. It is not the responsibility of the residences of Northern Minnesota, including my 87 year-old mother, to subsidize the electricity needs of multi-national, multi-billion dollar companies. An \$11 or \$12 per month rate increase is much more burdensome for most people than the price of electricity for these businesses doing business in Minnesota. Our government should not intervene in free enterprise and they certainly should not transfer wealth from the people of the great State of Minnesota to corporations. When the commodity markets were booming, these companies paid their owners, shareholders and executives millions of dollars in the form of dividends, wages and bonuses. Now that the steel and paper businesses are in an economic trough, I am sure these same constituents can find a way to pay the going rate for electricity in Northern Minnesota.

1 Read

Judy Budisalovich about 1 month ago

I concur with Paul Leslie whole-heartedly. Those on fixed incomes cannot afford increases in their basic utilities. Four of the mining companies listed are currently not operating and who can say what the future will hold for them. Please reject this proposed rate increase.

1 Read

matt scorich 25 days ago

I do not wish to subsidise the iron mining companies. They are looking to take from their employees and retirees always. Also we just had a rate hike that amounted to \$20.00 a month just in the last few months. Please reject the rate hike.

1 Read

David Sather 15 days ago

I feel the whole problem with the mining companies could be solved if the legislators would put higher tariffs on incoming steel products to make it more competitive. Also, I feel the employees may have out priced themselves with the help of their unions. There's also the fact that if we help out the mining companies until they're back on their feet, we won't see any reduction in our rates. Please don't allow MP to collect from the residents to fund the mining companies. Plus if the mines are closed right now, they're not using as much electricity.

0 Reads