



**Minnesota Public Utilities  
Commission  
Decisions  
PUC Agenda Meeting**

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

---

Thursday, November 6, 2014

9:30 AM

Large Hearing Room

---

**INTRODUCTION**

**ORAL ARGUMENT ITEMS**

**DELIBERATION ITEMS**

**DECISION ITEMS**

1. \* **G008/GR-13-316** **CenterPoint Energy Resources Corp. d/b/a  
CenterPoint Energy Minnesota Gas**

In the Matter of the Application by CenterPoint Energy Resources Corp., d/b/a CenterPoint Energy Minnesota Gas for Authority to Increase Natural Gas Rates in Minnesota.

Should the Commission approve CenterPoint Energy's compliance filing? (PUC: **Bahn, Morrissey, Alonso**)

Attachments: [Briefing Papers](#)  
[Commission Decision Outline](#)

**Alternative revenue apportionment adopted; compliance filing accepted.**

2. \* **G008/MR-14-766** **CenterPoint Energy Minnesota Gas**  
In the Matter of a Petition for Approval by CenterPoint Energy Minnesota Gas to Establish a New Base Cost of Gas in Compliance with the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission's Order in CenterPoint's General Rate Filing in Docket No. G008/GR-13-316. (PUC: Morrissey; DOC: Heinen)

Attachments: [DOC Comments 10-8-14](#)

**Base Cost of Gas Approved.**

3. \*\* **E001,115,140,105,139,  
124,126,145,132,114,  
6521,142,135/PA-14-  
322** **Interstate Power and Light Company;  
Southern Minnesota Electrical Coop  
together (the "Joint Petitioners")**

In the Matter of a Request for the Approval of the Asset Purchase

and Sale Agreement Between Interstate Power and Light Company and Southern Minnesota Energy Cooperative.

Should there be public hearings on the Petition? (PUC: **Kaml, Dasinger, Alonso, Twite**)

Attachments: [Briefing Papers](#)

**Public hearings to be held.**

4.                   \*\* **G001,011/PA-14-107**           **Interstate Power and Light Company;  
Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation  
(together the “Petitioners”)**

In the Matter of a Request for Approval of the Asset Purchase and Sale Agreement Between Interstate Power and Light Company and Minnesota Energy Resource Corporation.

Is the proposed sale consistent with the public interest?

Should the Commission approve the proposed sale?

If so, should the approval be with conditions?

Should the Commission approve the proposed rate increase for IPL customers outside of a rate case? (PUC: **Kaml, Alonso, Bender, Twite**)

Attachments: [Briefing Papers](#)

[Commissin Decision Outline](#)

**Petition approved subject to conditions.**

## **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)

Please note: For the complete record, please see eDockets