



Minnesota Public Utilities Commission

Decisions

Thursday, July 19, 2018

9:30 AM

Large Hearing Room

INTRODUCTION

DECISION ITEMS

1. * **IP6985/TL-17-701 Blazing Star Wind Farm 2, LLC**
In the Matter of the Application of Blazing Star Wind Farm 2, LLC for a 115-Kilovolt High Voltage Transmission Line in Lincoln County.

What action should the Commission take regarding route alternatives to be evaluated in the environmental assessment? (PUC: **DeBleekere**)

No action taken.

2. * **E001,115,140,105,139, Southern Minnesota Energy Cooperative (SMEC)
124,126,145,132,114,
6521,142,135/PA-14-322**
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.

1. Does SMEC's filing comply with the Commission's June 8, 2015 Order?
2. Should the Commission approve the proposed rate changes? (PUC: **Alonso, Krishnan**)

Accepted filing and subsequent amendment; accepted SMEC's CCOS studies; and approved SMEC[s proposed rate increases for Years 1 and 2.

3. ** **E002/GR-92-1185; Northern States Power Company,
G002/GR-92-1186; doing business as Xcel Energy
E,G002/M-17-429**
In the Matter of the Application of Northern States Power Company for Authority to Increase its Rates for Electric Service in the State of Minnesota;
In the Matter of the Petition of Northern States Power Gas Utility for Authority to Change its Schedule of Gas Rates for Retail Customers within the State of Minnesota;
In the Matter of the Petition of Northern States Power Company, doing business as Xcel Energy (Xcel Energy), for Approval of its Annual Report of its 2016 Incentive Compensation Plan.

Should Xcel Energy's Annual Report of its 2016 Incentive Compensation Plan be accepted as originally filed?
How should Xcel Energy calculate whether a refund of incentive compensation is due?
(PUC: **Bender**)

Required Xcel to refund incentive compensation of \$1.2 million.

4. * E015/M-12-233 Minnesota Power

In the Matter of Minnesota Power's Compliance Filing for its Temporary Rider of Residential Time-of-Day (TOD) Rate for Participants of the Smart Grid Advanced Metering Infrastructure Pilot Project.

Should the Commission accept MP's compliance report as complete?
Should the Commission approve Option B: Removal of the critical peak pricing (CPP) component and increase to the on-peak adder, as described in MP's filing?
Should the Commission discontinue on-going formal evaluation of the current Rate and its participants, including annual review and compliance of the Rate?(PUC: **Stalpes**)

Accepted compliance report; required informational filings on time-of-day pilot; delayed rate-design compliance report due date and required additional information.

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