

Ex Parte Communication Report

Date:

To: Public Ex Parte Communication File

Docket No:

Case Name:

From: PUC Staff:

RE: Permissible Ex Parte Communications Pursuant to Minn. Rules, Part 7845.7400.

1. Type of communication: (Oral or Written)

If written, attach the document.

If oral, Date:

Time:

NOTE: In both instances, please notify the Maker the communication has been submitted for inclusion in the record.

2. Maker of the Communication:

3. Recipient of the Communication:

4. For communications involving the setting of interim rates or the review of compliance filings, the topic was:

5. For all other permissible communications that are prohibited for the Commissioners under Minn. Rules, part 7845.7200, the substance of the communication was:

6. For oral permissible ex parte communications, has a copy of this memo been sent to the assigned Administrative Law Judge? Yes No N/A

(Name and Date)

From: [Zajicek, Michael \(COMM\)](#)
To: [Harsch, Trey \(PUC\)](#)
Cc: [Teigland, Peter \(He/Him/His\) \(COMM\)](#); [De, Adway \(COMM\)](#); [Zwick, Ari \(COMM\)](#)
Subject: RE: PUC Ex-Parte: Questions on Docket 23-215
Date: Friday, May 31, 2024 2:51:31 PM
Attachments: [Zajicek-M-23-215 ltr- 5.31.24.pdf](#)

Hi Trey,

Please see the attached letter responding to your questions. As the responses to your questions change the Department's recommendations slightly, we will be filing the attached letter in eDockets. Please let us know if you have any questions.

Thanks!

Michael Zajicek

From: Harsch, Trey (PUC) <trey.harsch@state.mn.us>
Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2024 10:46 AM
To: Teigland, Peter (He/Him/His) (COMM) <Peter.Teigland@state.mn.us>; Zwick, Ari (COMM) <Ari.Zwick@state.mn.us>
Cc: MacAlister, Jamie (COMM) <jamie.macalister@state.mn.us>; Nikitas, Sophie (She/Her/Hers) (PUC) <sophie.nikitas@state.mn.us>; Nissen, Will (PUC) <will.nissen@state.mn.us>
Subject: PUC Ex-Parte: Questions on Docket 23-215

Hello Department Staff!

In reviewing the Department's supplemental comments, I came across several items that I believe require additional information and clarification. Please note, Staff is treating this email as ex-parte communication, and will be forwarding filing this email exchange in the record. I'd be happy to answer any clarifying questions you may have about this request. Do not hesitate to contact me with questions.

1. In reviewing CenterPoint's initial petition, it is Staff's understanding that Pilot O is intended to fulfill the requirement under Subd. 6 of the NGIA. Both of the Department's alternative portfolios exclude Pilot O. Is the Department's position that its proposed modifications fulfill the requirements of Subd. 6 through another pilot? Please elaborate as necessary.
2. The Department's first alternative budget allocates more than 10% of the Plan's budget toward R&D projects. It is Staff's understanding that Subd. 3.(g) of the NGIA prevents R&D spending from exceeding 10% of the proposed total incremental costs of the Innovation Plan. Please explain the Department's interpretation of Subd. 3.(g). Is the Department's position that its first alternative portfolio meets the requirements of Subd. 3.(g)?

Best,

Trey Harsch

Rates Analyst III | Economic Analysis Unit

Pronouns: He/Him

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission

121 7th Place E, Suite 350

Saint Paul, MN 55101-2147

O: 651-201-2232