

September 2, 2014

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

Burl W. Haar
Executive Secretary
Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
121 7th Place East, Suite 350
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2147

RE: **PUBLIC Comments of the Minnesota Department of Commerce, Division of Energy Resources**
Docket No. G002/M-14-654

Dear Dr. Haar:

Attached are the **PUBLIC Comments** of the Minnesota Department of Commerce, Division of Energy Resources (Department) in the following matter:

Petition of Northern States Power Company (Xcel or Company) for Approval of Changes in Contract Demand Entitlements.

The petition was filed on August 1, 2014. The petitioner on behalf of Xcel is:

Paul J. Lehman
Manager, Regulatory Compliance and Filings
Xcel Energy
414 Nicollet Mall - 7th Floor
Minneapolis, MN 55401

The Department recommends that the Commission:

- approve Xcel's proposed level of demand entitlement, subject to possible adjustment in the Company's November 1, 2014 supplemental filing;
- allow Xcel to recover associated demand costs, subject to possible adjustment in the Company's November 1, 2014 supplemental filing, through the monthly Purchased Gas Adjustment effective November 1, 2014;
- approve changes in the jurisdictional allocation for demand costs.

The Department also recommends that the Company provide, in its November 1, 2014 supplemental filing, an update on any hedging transactions that are entered into for the 2014-2015 heating season.

The Department is available to answer any questions the Commission may have.

Sincerely,

/s/ MICHAEL N. ZAJICEK
Rates Analyst

MNZ/lt
Attachment

BEFORE THE MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

PUBLIC COMMENTS OF THE
MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
DIVISION OF ENERGY RESOURCES

DOCKET No. G002/M-14-654

I. SUMMARY OF XCEL'S REQUEST

Northern States Power Company (Xcel or the Company) filed a demand entitlement petition (*Petition*) on August 1, 2014, with the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (Commission). The Company requested Commission approval to place the Purchased Gas Adjustment (PGA) changes into effect on November 1, 2014. The Company stated that, in the event that the Commission does not act by November 1, 2014, the Company, pursuant to Minnesota Statute §216B.16, Subd. 7, Minnesota Rule 7825.2920, and Xcel's PGA tariffs, will provisionally place the PGA changes into effect on November 1, 2013, subject to later Commission approval.

In its *Petition*, Xcel requested approval from the Commission to implement its proposed interstate pipeline transportation, storage entitlement, and other demand-related contracts for 2014-2015 effective November 1, 2014. The Company requested that the adjustments be made through the PGA to reflect changes in its firm pipeline demand entitlement levels¹ as follows:

- increase its Minnesota jurisdictional design-day capacity by 9,010 dekatherms per day (Dth/day), about 1.27 percent (9,010 Dth/706,935 Dth);
- change the capacity resources used to meet the design-day requirements and increase the amount of capacity resources (total entitlements) for Minnesota by 12,029 Dth/day or 1.61 percent (12,029 Dth/749,325 Dth);

¹ The entitlement levels discussed in Xcel's filing are for the total Minnesota Company which encompasses the combined entitlements for Xcel's Minnesota and North Dakota jurisdictions. Minnesota's portion of the entitlements is the total combined entitlements times the Minnesota allocation factor discussed below. The Department has included Department Attachment 2, which shows the effect of the demand entitlement changes in the Minnesota jurisdiction.

- with these changes in Minnesota’s need and resources, the reserve margin increases slightly from 6.0 percent to 6.3 percent for Minnesota;
- slightly decrease the jurisdictional allocation to Minnesota (rather than North Dakota) to 88.42 percent from 88.95 percent to reflect usage patterns; and
- change its recovery of Supply Reservation fees.

Specifically, Xcel requested the following changes in demand volumes for the total Minnesota Company as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Proposed Changes in Entitlements for Xcel

Type of Entitlement	Proposed Dth Change	Rate	Months	Proposed Cost Change
NNG TFX (Nov-Mar)	1,100	\$15.1530	5	\$83,341.50
NNG TFX (Apr-Oct)	1,100	\$5.6830	7	\$43,759.10
NNG TFX (Nov-Mar)	1,050	\$15.1530	5	\$79,553.25
NNG TFX (Apr-Oct)	1,050	\$5.6830	7	\$41,770.05
NNG TFX (Nov-Mar)	431	\$8.6272	5	\$18,591.62
NNG TFX (Apr-Oct)	431	\$4.0000	7	\$12,068.00
NNG TFX (Nov-Mar)	4,036	\$15.1530	5	\$305,787.54
NNG TFX (Apr-Oct)	4,036	\$5.6830	7	\$160,556.12
VGT FT-A (Jan-Dec)	15,000	\$4.4954	12	\$809,172.00
VGT FT-A (Dec-Feb)	(10,542)	\$3.7671	3	\$(119,138.30)
VGT FT-A (Dec-Feb)	10,646	\$3.6918	3	\$117,908.71
VGT FT-A (Apr-Oct)	(5000)	\$3.4671	7	\$(121,348.50)
GLGT FT (Nov-Mar)	(6,706)	\$9.4560	5	\$(317,059.68)
GLGT FT (Nov-Mar)	9,248	\$14.6460	5	\$677,231.04
ANR FTS (Jan-Dec)	80	\$4.1600	7	\$2,329.60
ANR FSS (Jan-Dec)	84	\$2.0400	12	\$2,056.32
ANR FSS (Jan-Dec)	434	\$0.4000	12	\$2,083.20
ANRS FS (Jan-Dec)	(6,049)	\$1.0924	12	\$(79,295.13)
ANRS FS (Jan-Dec)	170,880	\$0.0133	12	27,169.92
Total for Change in Pipeline Entitlement				\$1,746,536.34

As indicated in the table above, Xcel proposed a number of changes in its demand entitlements that would increase costs from all source systems by approximately \$1,746,536.34. This amount is for Minnesota and North Dakota customers. As discussed further below, the increases are related to various reliability needs across the Xcel service territory.

The Company proposed to increase its net supply entitlements from Northern Natural Gas (NNG or Northern), Viking Gas Transmission Company (VGT), and Great Lakes Transmission Company (GLGT). The net change is an increase of 18,654 Dth/day in total, but only 12,029 Dth/day for Xcel’s Minnesota jurisdiction. Xcel noted that there is a small increase in the reserve margin – from 6.0 percent to 6.3 percent – due to an increase in entitlements in order to meet increased design-day consumption in the most economical manner.

Xcel also began treating storage-capacity demand charges as commodity costs instead of demand costs in the Company's July 2014 PGA as ordered in Xcel's grouped 2007-2013 Contract Demand Entitlement Filings.² Xcel also provided a summary of hedging transactions in place for the 2014-2015 heating season in response reporting requirements established in the Commission's May 27, 2008 *Order* in Docket No. G002/M-08-46.

II. DEPARTMENT'S ANALYSIS OF XCEL'S REQUEST

The Department's analysis of the Company's request includes a description and an evaluation of the Company's *Petition*. The Department discusses each part of the Company's request below.

A. XCEL'S PROPOSED DESIGN-DAY LEVELS

1. Xcel's Customer Base

Xcel expects an increase of 4,836 customers between the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 heating seasons in the Minnesota jurisdiction (from 441,573 to 446,409). This includes Xcel's addition of two Minnesota communities in the process of converting from propane to natural gas service.³

2. Xcel's Forecast

Consistent with its approach since its 2004-2005 demand-entitlement filing, the Company used two forecast methodologies in its estimate of its design-day requirement forecast for the 2013-2014 heating season: the Actual Peak Use per Customer Design Day (UPC DD) and the Average Monthly Design Day (Avg. Monthly DD). The Department assesses the foundations of the methodologies below.

a. Actual Peak Use per Customer Design Day (UPC DD)

The UPC DD method employs a use-per-customer number of 1.57393 Dth/day to estimate the design-day demand forecast, based on the actual use per customer on Thursday, January 29, 2004, the coldest day in recent years.⁴ Xcel multiplied the 1.57393 Dth/day value by estimates of total firm customers in all of Xcel's service areas and added the contracted billing demand for Small and Large Demand Billed Customers to arrive at the

² Docket Nos. G002/M-07-1395, G002/M-08-1315, G002/M-09-1287, G002/M-10-1163, G002/M-11-1076, G002/M-12-862, and G002/M-13-663, Order dated June 9, 2014.

³ In Docket No. G002/M-14-583 the Company requested New Area Surcharge riders for Barnesville, Holdingford, and Pillager.

⁴The Department notes that, while January 2014 was the coldest month in recent years, for design day purposes only the coldest single day is important. None of the days during January 2014 had temperatures as low as the January 29, 2004 low temperature.

total expected design-day demand for the Xcel system. Thus, the way customers are distributed among service areas does not affect the aggregate forecasts produced by the UPC DD method because the total number of customers and the resulting total volume is unchanged no matter where the customers are assigned.

If either cold temperatures or differences with the Avg. Monthly DD method indicate that the 1.57393 Dth/day peak-day use-per-customer volume is out of date, the Company stated that it will adjust the volume accordingly.

b. Average Monthly Design Day

The Avg. Monthly DD method is a statistical method that uses slope analysis to estimate design-day demand. Xcel performs a separate slope analysis on each demand area for both residential and commercial customers.⁵ These separate demand areas have their own specific usage characteristics based on the input data; as such, the coefficients used to estimate use per customer vary from service area to service area. Consequently, the shifting of customers among demand areas can affect the aggregate forecasts produced by the Avg. Monthly DD method. The Company's service areas were unchanged from the 2013-2014 heating season to the 2014-2015 heating season; therefore, any changes in the aggregate forecast numbers using the Avg. Monthly DD method are related to typical growth dynamics and data turnover (Xcel uses the 60 most recent months of data in its analysis), and to the usage characteristics of customers in a given demand area.

The Company summarizes its output statistics for each of its demand areas in Attachment 1, Schedule 1, of its *Petition*. The R-squared values for its various statistical models are generally greater than 0.90, which suggests that a high level of the predictive quality of the model is included in the input data for the specified variables. There are seven models that have R-squared values less than 0.90. These lower predictive models are generally associated with models that have a smaller number of customers. This result is not surprising, or even of a concern, because a smaller number of customers will inherently increase data variability because changes in consumption by a single customer, or group of customers will have a much greater impact on total consumption than an estimation group that has a larger number of customers.

The statistics presented by the Company in its *Petition* suggests that the Avg. Monthly DD method produces acceptable forecasts. In Docket No. G002/M-13-663, the Department noted that, while acceptable, the Avg. Monthly DD method might not represent the best option available for forecasting natural gas needs. The Department noted that there were potential issues related to the model assuming natural gas consumption is constant at all temperatures and that the average monthly design day estimates the average demand area

⁵ Xcel has 15 separate demand areas. The demand areas that the Company conducts separate analyses on are as follows: Metro, Brainerd, Mainline, Mainline—Welcome, Willmar, Paynesville, VGT-Chisago, Watkins, Tomah, Red Wing, Grand Forks MN, Fargo MN, Grand Forks ND, Fargo ND, and WBI ND.

consumption based on a given temperature, instead of for a peak day where consumption is likely to be above average. After conversations with the Company it was concluded that utilizing a regression model based on daily consumption data would be very difficult due the fact that it would require estimation of daily interruptible load. Further Xcel's dual method approach counteracts some of the issues inherent in the Avg. Monthly DD method as it generally resulted in higher forecasted requirements than those produced using the UPC DD method. Thus the Department believes that Xcel's forecast methodology is reasonable and the Department agrees with Xcel that the Company should continue to use the two methods to develop its design-day estimate, updating the UPC DD method when appropriate.

3. *Xcel's Forecasts*

Xcel projected that its (Minnesota and North Dakota) design-day requirements will increase by 14,899 Dth/day to 809,671 Dth/day in the 2014-2015 heating season, or a 1.8 percent increase. The Company's forecast of its Minnesota design-day requirements is 715,945 Dth/day, an increase of 9,010 Dth/day, or an increase of 1.3 percent. In addition, the forecasted North Dakota usage for 2014-2015 is 93,726 Dth/day, an increase of 5,889 Dth/day, or a 6.3% increase from the 2013-2014 heating season.

Xcel's customer forecast shows the number of Minnesota customers increasing by 4,836 from 441,573 in the 2013-2014 forecast to 446,409 in the 2014-2015 forecast, an increase of approximately 1.0 percent. The North Dakota customer count is forecasted to increase by approximately 4.0 percent to 52,067 in 2014-2015, up from 50,006 in 2013-2014.

The Department notes that the smaller rate of increase in forecasted Minnesota gas consumption indicates that the proportion of design-day responsibility on the Xcel system continues to shift from Minnesota to North Dakota. According to the *Petition*, the consumption allocator for Minnesota for the 2014-2015 heating season is 88.42 percent, down from 88.95 percent during the 2013-2014 heating season. The higher overall economic growth rates in North Dakota, relative to Minnesota, has been on-going and has led to incremental decreases in the allocator factor over the past few years. These small changes in apportionment year to year have not been significant.

The Department concludes from the Company's descriptions of its forecasting techniques that Xcel's forecasting of design-day levels are performed appropriately.

B. PROPOSED CHANGED IN XCEL ENERGY'S DESIGN-DAY RESOURCES

Xcel's filing proposed changes in the resources used to meet its design-day customer requirements. Overall, the Company's system firm supply entitlements, which include entitlements for Minnesota and North Dakota, rose slightly, from 842,411 Dth/day to 861,065 Dth/day, or 2.2 percent.

1. Northern Natural Gas

The majority of Xcel's firm pipeline transportation contracts are with Northern. Most of these contracts were put in place in 2007 and run through October 2017. The Company made four changes to its Northern entitlements for its 2014-2015 heating season that serve peak demand. According to the Company, the first change relates to the addition of 3,981 Dth/day of incremental capacity at Brainerd, MN in order to ensure adequate capacity to meet demand for firm customers and maintain a 5 percent reserve margin.⁶ The capacity at Brainerd, MN further increased by 55 Dth/day as capacity was scheduled to ratchet up for the 2014-2015 heating season. Combined, this amounted to a 4,036 Dth/Day increase.

Xcel indicated that the second change to its Northern entitlements relates to the addition of 1,100 Dth/day of incremental capacity for Red Wing, MN in order to provide sufficient incremental capacity and maintain a 5 percent reserve margin.⁷

The third change relates to an increase in capacity of 1,050 Dth/day at Kandiyohi, MN. Xcel stated that consistently higher than expected demand at Kandiyohi made additional capacity necessary in order for the Company to meet the updated design-day requirement, maintain a 5 percent reserve margin, and to serve expected propane conversions in the area.⁸

Finally, the fourth change relates to the addition of 431 Dth/day of incremental capacity for the St. Cloud and Becker, MN areas. Xcel indicated that additional capacity was needed to meet firm customer requirements at design-day temperatures.⁹

2. Viking Gas Transmission

The Company also made two adjustments to demand entitlements to serve peak demand on its VGT pipeline. First, Xcel allowed 10,542 Dth/day of capacity to expire and instead the Company plans to purchase 10,646 Dth/day of short-term capacity to meet design-day projections for the Grand Forks/East Grand Forks area, the Fargo/Moorhead area, and the Minneapolis/St. Paul metro area.¹⁰

⁶ *Petition Attachment 1*, pages 4 - 5.

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ *Id.*

⁹ *Id.*

¹⁰ *Petition Attachment 1*, pages 5-6.

Second, the Company added 15,000 Dth/day of year-round capacity with a Marshfield receipt point to serve new design-day needs identified this year. Xcel also proposed to decrease its contract delivery at [TRADE SECRET DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED] The Company did not provide an explanation for why they made this adjustment, but it appears that this delivery reduction would not jeopardize Xcel's ability to serve its design-day needs. Finally, the Company removed a [TRADE SECRET DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED].¹¹

When these entitlement changes are added together, they result in an increase in peak-day entitlements of 18,654 Dth/day, which corresponds to the entitlement figures presented in Xcel's *Petition*. The Department has analyzed the above changes in design-day entitlement resources and each change appears reasonable to serve firm customers on a peak day. The Department, therefore, concludes that Xcel's proposed changes for 2014-2015 demand entitlements are reasonable.

C. CHANGE IN XCEL'S RESERVE MARGIN

Xcel's proposed design-day reserve margin in Minnesota is 6.3 percent for 2014-2015, which is a slight increase from the 6.0 percent figure in 2013-2014 (DOC Attachment 1). Xcel stated that it bases its reserve margin on the firm resources necessary to meet projected firm customer demand plus the capability of either the largest pump at its Wescott facility used to vaporized liquefied natural gas (LNG) or either of its St. Paul Metro propane-air peak-shaving plants. The capacity decision reflects Xcel's assessment of the most economical method of adding capacity to meet demand beyond the forecasted design-day demand. The reserve margin balances protecting against the loss of a firm gas-supply source and actual consumer demand under design-day conditions, with the likelihood of experiencing design-day conditions. Xcel stated that its proposed reserve margin of 51,394 Dth/day, of which 45,409 Dth/day is for the Minnesota jurisdiction, is appropriate to meet its design-day needs. The Company further stated that the most economical method of adding capacity often involves adding increments that do not precisely match expected changes in demand. Xcel's proposed reserve margin is within the 5-7 percent range that serves as a rule of thumb in deciding whether a given margin is reasonable. The Department, therefore, concludes that the 2014-2015 reserve margin is reasonable.

D. CHANGES IN XCEL'S JURISDICTIONAL ALLOCATIONS

The previously noted faster economic growth in North Dakota versus Minnesota is reflected in the revised Minnesota jurisdictional allocation factor which is used to allocate new peak capacity to Minnesota and North Dakota. The allocation factor is calculated by dividing the design day forecasted demand for Minnesota (715,945 Dth/day) by the same demand for the Company's system (809,671 Dth/day). The Avg. Monthly DD results are used to update the allocation factor, which fell from 88.95 percent to 88.42 percent.¹²

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² *Petition* Attachment 1, page 8.

Small annual changes in the allocation factor are almost inevitable. A locational change of a handful of customers in one state or the other can change the total numbers upon which the allocation factor is based and therefore change the allocation between the states. Again, such changes are typically not significant. In addition, the Department is aware that the increased economic activity in North Dakota is increasing use of natural gas. Therefore, the Department concludes that Xcel's proposed jurisdictional allocation change is reasonable.

E. CHANGES IN XCEL'S SUPPLIER RESERVATION FEES

Xcel stated that its Supplier Reservation fees have changed. The proposed decrease is **[TRADE SECRET DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED]**. The new total expense level reflects these changes. Therefore, the Department concludes that Xcel's proposal is reasonable.¹³

F. XCEL'S PGA COST RECOVERY PROPOSAL

Xcel proposed to reflect the costs associated with the demand entitlements in the *Petition* in the PGA effective November 1, 2014. The demand entitlements in Xcel Trade Secret Attachment 2, Schedule 1, Page 1 of 2, represent the demand entitlements for which the Company's firm customers will pay. Department Attachment 2 compares the July 2014 PGA costs to the anticipated November 2014 PGA costs for several customer classes. The resulting per Dth cost changes related strictly to changes in demand costs have the following annual rate effects.

- Annual demand cost increase by \$0.0062/Dth, or approximately \$0.54 annually, for the average Residential customer consuming 87 Dth annually;
- Annual demand cost increase of \$0.0059/Dth, or approximately \$1.68 annually, for the average Small Commercial customer consuming 284 Dth annually;
- Annual demand cost increase of \$0.0110/Dth, or approximately \$16.09 annually, for the average Large Commercial customer consuming 1463 Dth annually; and
- No Change in annual demand costs for the average Small Interruptible, Medium Interruptible, and Large Interruptible customers. These customer classes are not allocated demand costs under the current cost allocation plan.

Based on its review, the Department concludes that the Company's proposal appears to be reasonable. The Department is aware that minor changes in cost and entitlement levels may occur between the filing of these *Comments* and November 1, 2014. As such, the Department recommends that the Company provide a supplemental filing on November 1, 2014 detailing final demand entitlement levels and costs.

¹³ *Id.*

III. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Department recommends that the Commission:

- approve Xcel's proposed level of demand entitlement, subject to possible adjustment in the Company's November 1, 2014 supplemental filing;
- allow Xcel to recover associated demand costs, subject to possible adjustment in the Company's November 1, 2014 supplemental filing, through the monthly Purchased Gas Adjustment effective November 1, 2014; and
- approve changes in the jurisdictional allocation for demand costs.

The Department also recommends that the Company provide, in its November 1, 2014 supplemental filing, an update on any hedging transactions that are entered into for the 2014-2015 heating season.

/lt

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Linda Chavez, hereby certify that I have this day served copies of the following document on the attached list of persons by electronic filing, e-mail, or by depositing a true and correct copy thereof properly enveloped with postage paid in the United States Mail at St. Paul, Minnesota.

MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE – COMMENTS

Docket Nos. **G002/M-14-654**

Dated this **2nd** day of **September, 2014**.

/s/Linda Chavez

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Tamie A.	Aberle	tamie.aberle@mdu.com	Great Plains Natural Gas Co.	400 North Fourth Street Bismarck, ND 585014092	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Julia	Anderson	Julia.Anderson@ag.state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-DOC	1800 BRM Tower 445 Minnesota St St. Paul, MN 551012134	Electronic Service	Yes	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Kristine	Anderson	kanderson@greatermngas.com	Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc.	202 S. Main Street Le Sueur, MN 56058	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Christopher	Anderson	canderson@allete.com	Minnesota Power	30 W Superior St Duluth, MN 558022191	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Alison C	Archer	alison.c.archer@xcelenergy.com	Xcel Energy	414 Nicollet Mall FL 5 Minneapolis, MN 55401	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Gail	Baranko	gail.baranko@xcelenergy.com	Xcel Energy	414 Nicollet Mall 7th Floor Minneapolis, MN 55401	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
William A.	Blazar	bblazar@mnchamber.com	Minnesota Chamber Of Commerce	Suite 1500 400 Robert Street North St. Paul, MN 55101	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Michael	Bradley	mike.bradley@lawmoss.com	Moss & Barnett	150 S. 5th Street, #1200 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Robert S.	Carney, Jr.			4232 Colfax Ave. S. Minneapolis, MN 55409	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
George	Crocker	gwillc@nawo.org	North American Water Office	PO Box 174 Lake Elmo, MN 55042	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Jeffrey A.	Daugherty	jeffrey.daugherty@centerpointenergy.com	CenterPoint Energy	800 LaSalle Ave Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Ian	Dobson	ian.dobson@ag.state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-RUD	Antitrust and Utilities Division 445 Minnesota Street, BRM Tower St. Paul, MN 55101	Electronic Service 1400	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Rebecca	Eilers	rebecca.d.eilers@xcelenergy.com	Xcel Energy	414 Nicollet Mall, 7th Floor Minneapolis, MN 55401	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Sharon	Ferguson	sharon.ferguson@state.mn.us	Department of Commerce	85 7th Place E Ste 500 Saint Paul, MN 551012198	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Edward	Garvey	garveyed@aol.com	Residence	32 Lawton St Saint Paul, MN 55102	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Benjamin	Gerber	bgerber@mnychamber.com	Minnesota Chamber of Commerce	400 Robert Street North Suite 1500 St. Paul, Minnesota 55101	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Elizabeth	Goodpaster	bgoodpaster@mncenter.org	MN Center for Environmental Advocacy	Suite 206 26 East Exchange Street St. Paul, MN 551011667	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Todd J.	Guerrero	todd.guerrero@kutakrock.com	Kutak Rock LLP	Suite 1750 220 South Sixth Street Minneapolis, MN 554021425	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Burl W.	Haar	burl.haar@state.mn.us	Public Utilities Commission	Suite 350 121 7th Place East St. Paul, MN 551012147	Electronic Service	Yes	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Annete	Henkel	mui@mnuilityinvestors.org	Minnesota Utility Investors	413 Wacouta Street #230 St. Paul, MN 55101	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Sandra	Hofstetter	N/A	MN Chamber of Commerce	7261 County Road H Fremont, WI 54940-9317	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Michael	Hoppe	il23@mtn.org	Local Union 23, I.B.E.W.	932 Payne Avenue St. Paul, MN 55130	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Eric	Jensen	ejensen@iwla.org	Izaak Walton League of America	Suite 202 1619 Dayton Avenue St. Paul, MN 55104	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Paula	Johnson	paulajohnson@alliantenergy.com	Alliant Energy-Interstate Power and Light Company	P.O. Box 351 200 First Street, SE Cedar Rapids, IA 524060351	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Richard	Johnson	Rick.Johnson@lawmoss.com	Moss & Barnett	150 S. 5th Street Suite 1200 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Michael	Krikava	mkrikava@briggs.com	Briggs And Morgan, P.A.	2200 IDS Center 80 S 8th St Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Nicolle	Kupser	nkupser@greatermngas.com	Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc.	202 South Main Street P.O. Box 68 Le Sueur, MN 56058	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
John	Lindell	agorud.ecf@ag.state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-RUD	1400 BRM Tower 445 Minnesota St St. Paul, MN 551012130	Electronic Service	Yes	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Eric	Lipman	eric.lipman@state.mn.us	Office of Administrative Hearings	PO Box 64620 St. Paul, MN 551640620	Paper Service	Yes	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Matthew P	Loftus	matthew.p.loftus@xcelenergy.com	Xcel Energy	414 Nicollet Mall FL 5 Minneapolis, MN 55401	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Pam	Marshall	pam@energycents.org	Energy CENTS Coalition	823 7th St E St. Paul, MN 55106	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Mary	Martinka	mary.a.martinka@xcelenergy.com	Xcel Energy Inc	414 Nicollet Mall 7th Floor Minneapolis, MN 55401	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
David	Moeller	dmoeller@allete.com	Minnesota Power	30 W Superior St Duluth, MN 558022093	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Andrew	Moratzka	apmoratzka@stoel.com	Stoel Rives LLP	33 South Sixth Street Suite 4200 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
David W.	Niles	david.niles@avantenergy.com	Minnesota Municipal Power Agency	Suite 300 200 South Sixth Street Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Greg	Palmer	gpalmer@greatermngas.com	Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc.	PO Box 68 202 South Main Street Le Sueur, MN 56058	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Richard	Savelkoul	rsavelkoul@martinsquires.com	Martin & Squires, P.A.	332 Minnesota Street Ste W2750 St. Paul, MN 55101	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Janet	Shaddix Elling	jshaddix@janetshaddix.com	Shaddix And Associates	Ste 122 9100 W Bloomington Frwy Bloomington, MN 55431	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
James M.	Strommen	jstrommen@kennedy-graven.com	Kennedy & Graven, Chartered	470 U.S. Bank Plaza 200 South Sixth Street Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
SaGonna	Thompson	Regulatory.Records@xcelenergy.com	Xcel Energy	414 Nicollet Mall FL 7 Minneapolis, MN 554011993	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654
Lisa	Veith	lisa.veith@ci.stpaul.mn.us	City of St. Paul	400 City Hall and Courthouse 15 West Kellogg Blvd. St. Paul, MN 55102	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_14-654_M-14-654