



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

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

Friday, October 28, 2016

9:30 AM

Large Hearing Room

INTRODUCTION

ORAL ARGUMENT ITEMS

DELIBERATION ITEMS

DECISION ITEMS

1. **E306,104/SA-16-647** **Saint Peter Municipal Utilities;
BENCO Electric Cooperative**

In the Matter of the Joint Request of Saint Peter Municipal Utilities and BENCO Electric Cooperative to Modify Electric Service Territory Boundaries. (PUC: Fournier; DOC: Lusti)

Approved service-territory boundary transfer.

2. **** PL6668/CN-13-473; North Dakota Pipeline Company LLC
PL6668/PPL-13-474**

In the Matter of the Application of North Dakota Pipeline Company LLC for a Certificate of Need for the Sandpiper Pipeline Project in Minnesota;
In the Matter of the Application of North Dakota Pipeline Company LLC for a Pipeline Routing Permit for the Sandpiper Pipeline Project in Minnesota.

Whether the Commission should consider imposing conditions on North Dakota Pipeline Company's request to withdraw its certificate of need and route permit applications for its proposed Sandpiper Pipeline Project. (PUC: Ek)

Directed Executive Secretary to grant withdrawal of petitions without conditions.

3. *** ET6/TL-14-665 Minnkota Power Cooperative, Inc.**

In the Matter of the Application of Minnkota Power Cooperative, Inc. for a Route Permit for the Clearbrook-Clearbrook West 115 kV Transmission Line Project in Clearwater County.

Whether the Commission should consider imposing conditions on

Minnkota Power Cooperative's request to withdraw its route permit application for its proposed Clearbrook-Clearbrook West 115 kV transmission line project. (PUC: **DeBleeckere**)

Directed Executive Secretary to grant withdrawal of permit application without conditions.

4. * **ET6/TL-16-327** **Minnkota Power Cooperative**
 In the Matter of the Application of Minnkota Power Cooperative, Inc. for a Route Permit for the MPL-Laporte 115 kV Transmission Line Project in Clearwater and Hubbard Counties, Minnesota.
- What action should the Commission take regarding route alternatives to be evaluated in the environmental assessment?
 Should the Commission direct the use of the Summary Report review process or refer the matter to the Office of Administrative Hearings for findings and a recommendation under the Summary Proceeding review process? (PUC: **Panait**)

Directed use of summary proceeding to develop the record.

5. ** **PL9/CN-14-916;** **Enbridge Energy, Limited Partnership**
PL9/PPL-15-137
 In the Matter of the Application of Enbridge Energy, Limited Partnership for a Certificate of Need for the Line 3 Pipeline Replacement Project in Minnesota from the North Dakota Border to the Wisconsin Border;
 In the Matter of the Application of Enbridge Energy, Limited Partnership for a Route Permit for the Line 3 Pipeline Replacement Project in Minnesota from the North Dakota Border to the Wisconsin Border.
- What action should the Commission take concerning the motions filed by Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy/Friends of the Headwaters and the Sierra Club?
 - In accordance with Minn. R. 7852.1400, what alternative pipeline routes and route segments should the Commission accept for consideration at the public hearings?
 - Should the Commission approve the proposed scope of the environmental impact statement? (PUC: **Ek**)

Motions denied. Proposed scoping decision approved with added notice. Route alternatives identified.

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