

MICHAEL J. AHERN
(612) 340-2881
FAX (612) 340-2643
ahern.michael@dorsey.com

September 17, 2009

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Burl W. Haar
Executive Secretary
Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
121 Seventh Place East, Suite 350
St. Paul, MN 55101

Re: In the Matter of the Petition of Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation-PNG for Approval of a Change in Demand Entitlement for its Great Lakes Gas Transmission System
Docket Nos. G011/M-08-1330; G007,011/MR-08-836

Dear Dr. Haar:

Enclosed please find the Response Comments of Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation ("MERC" or "Company") in the above-referenced docket. MERC submitted its initial Petition to the Commission on November 3, 2008 and filed revised spreadsheets shortly thereafter on November 5, 2008. The OES issued its initial Comments on March 4, 2009. MERC filed its Reply Comments on March 30, 2009 and a revised spreadsheet on August 12, 2009. On August 19, 2009, the OES issued Response Comments that noted areas in which the OES had continuing questions or concerns regarding the Company's proposal. The Company requests that the Commission accept these Response Comments, which address the issues raised by the OES in their August 19, 2009 Response Comments.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Michael J. Ahern

Michael J. Ahern

cc: Service List

**STATE OF MINNESOTA
BEFORE THE MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

David C. Boyd
J. Dennis O'Brien
Thomas Pugh
Phyllis A. Reha
Betsy Wergin

Chair
Commissioner
Commissioner
Commissioner
Commissioner

In the Matter of the Petition of Minnesota
Energy Resources Corporation-PNG for
Approval of a Change in Demand Entitlement
for its Great Lakes Gas Transmission System

Docket No. G011/M-08-1330
Docket No. G007,011/MR-08-836

**RESPONSE COMMENTS OF
MINNESOTA ENERGY RESOURCES CORPORATION**

Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation-PNG (“MERC” or “Company”) submits to the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (“Commission”) these Response Comments in response to the August 19, 2009 Response Comments of the Minnesota Office of Energy Security (“OES”) in the above referenced matter.

MERC submitted its initial Petition to the Commission on November 3, 2008 and filed revised spreadsheets shortly thereafter on November 5, 2008. The OES issued its initial Comments on March 4, 2009. MERC filed its Reply Comments on March 30, 2009, and a revised spreadsheet on August 12, 2009. On August 19, 2009, the OES issued Response Comments that noted areas in which the OES had continuing questions or concerns regarding the Company’s proposal. The Company requests that the Commission accept these Response Comments, which address the issues raised by the OES in their August 19, 2009 Response Comments.

A. Design-Day Study

The OES recommended that the Commission approve MERC-PNG's Great Lakes system demand entitlement level without endorsing its design-day study analysis, noting that:

- 1) MERC-PNG's method has merit in terms of providing a more realistic estimate of use by interruptible customers on peak days;
- 2) MERC-PNG's system performed well in the past year; and
- 3) OES agrees with MERC-PNG that it would be helpful to continue to talk about the Company's method.

The OES stated that although it believes that MERC-PNG's current design-day methodology has advantages over its previous estimation technique, the OES concluded that there is not complete support for the Company's analysis in this docket.

Response

As the OES stated, MERC-PNG's system performed well in the past year, and MERC-PNG had sufficient firm capacity to meet its need during the 2008-2009 heating season. MERC also agrees with the OES that its new methodology provides a more realistic estimate of use by interruptible customers on peak days. In the Company's rate case in Docket No. G007,011/GR-08-835, the Commission approved MERC's proposal that all interruptible and transportation customers be required to install telemetry equipment. The use of telemetry equipment by all interruptible and transportation customers will provide the daily data to make the design day calculation more realistic. In particular, telemetry will provide MERC with daily interruptible and transportation volumes that can be deducted from the total daily throughput to ascertain actual firm consumption. MERC agrees that it would be helpful to meet with the OES to further discuss the Company's design-day methodology.

B. System Performance During the 2008-2009 Heating Season

In its initial Comments, the OES noted that MERC-PNG's Great Lakes service territory has no peak shaving ability or available storage, and recommended that the Company provide information on whether it had sufficient capacity available for firm customers during the cold spells experienced in December 2008 and January 2009. MERC discussed this issue in the Company's Reply Comments, and the OES noted in its Response Comments that it has additional questions regarding MERC's response. The OES noted that it was unable to fully substantiate the Company's system performance discussion but that it appeared that the Company has sufficient firm demand volumes to meet the needs of its firm customers. The OES noted, however, that the Company used significantly more than anticipated on days during the past heating season that had temperatures warmer than the Commission's peak-day standard. The OES also noted its concern that the Company did not provide usage data that was specific to each of its PGA systems. Without the PGA system specific data, or at a minimum estimates, the OES stated it is unable to determine whether the Company's PGA system would have adequate firm entitlements on a Commission prescribed peak-day.

The OES also noted that in Docket No. G011/M-08-1328 (relating to the petition for a change in demand entitlement on MERC-PNG's NNG system) the Company was able to offer several options to serve firm load if needed next year. The OES stated it was not clear, however, whether such options would be available to serve MERC-PNG's Great Lakes firm customers and recommended that the Company be prepared to indicate to the Commission whether these tools could be used to serve MERC-PNG's Great Lakes customers. Finally, the OES noted that MERC-PNG's change in its method to estimate peak use by interruptible customers implies that

MERC-PNG would be able to make greater use of interruptions of such customers if needed for reliability purposes.

The OES stated that although it believes that MERC-PNG's current design-day methodology has advantages over its previous estimate technique, the OES still has concerns about the design-day study's ability to estimate peak-day sendout and recommended that the Commission require the Company to provide additional evidence supporting the estimative power of its design-day study in its next demand entitlement filing. The OES also recommended that the Company be prepared to indicate to the Commission all of the tools that could be used to serve firm customers on MERC-PNG's Great Lakes PGA system.

Response

As on the MERC-PNG NNG system, the Company does have the capability to call transportation customers to their Maximum Daily Quantity (MDQ) on the Great Lakes system as MERC deems necessary or to curtail interruptible customers for operational integrity. MERC also has the capability to purchase a delivered service at MERC citygate(s). Contract number 111866, referenced in MERC's Reply Comments in Docket No. G011/M-08-1328, is part of the Northern Natural Gas Northern Lights project and does not provide additional capacity on MERC-PNG's Great Lakes system.

MERC-PNG is willing to discuss making reasonable changes to its design day forecasting process, including preparing and providing appropriate documentation related to the "estimative power of its design day study" as requested by the OES. MERC-PNG requests clarification of the specific metrics or measures that would best describe "estimative power" including the preferred method of calculation and preferred format for the results (e.g. memo,

table, graph, set of graphs). To that end, MERC agrees that it would be helpful to meet with the OES to further discuss the Company's design-day methodology.

C. Daily Firm Capacity Selections

The OES noted that MERC has previously explained that it does not secure firm volumes specifically for joint-rate customers and that historically volumes associated with joint-rate customers have been so low that the capacity needed to serve these customers is historically low, the capacity needed to serve these customers has come out of the reserve margin. MERC has also noted that if it does not have the capability to provide a joint customer with both firm supply service and firm distribution service, then the customer's request for contracted demand capacity would be denied. The OES recommended that the Commission require the Company to provide in its future demand entitlement filings, the individual PGA system specific number of joint customers (sales versus transportation) who elect to take firm service, and to identify the associated interstate pipeline contracts and units of contracted demand from the Company for each month during the 12-month period between filings.

Response

MERC agrees to provide the requested information starting with the Company's November 2009 demand entitlement filings.

D. FT0011 Contract

The OES recommended that the Commission require MERC to remove all costs and volumes related to the FT0011 contract from its latest update, and any future updates, to the base

cost of gas dated January 27, 2009, and to submit the revised base cost of gas calculation as part of its rate case compliance filing.

Response

MERC agreed in its Reply Comments to remove all costs and volumes related to the FT0011 contract from its latest update to the base cost of gas dated January 27, 2009, and to submit the revised base cost of gas calculation as part of its rate case compliance filing.¹

DATED this 17th day of September, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

/s/ Michael J. Ahern

Michael J. Ahern
50 South Sixth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 340-2600

Attorney for MERC

¹ On September 14, 2009, the Commission issued its *Order After Reconsideration* in MERC's rate case, Docket No. G007,011/GRE-08-835, which requires MERC to remove the costs of the FT0011 agreement from its base cost of gas calculations.

Burl W. Haar
MN Public Utilities Commission
350 Metro Square Building
121 Seventh Place East
St. Paul, MN 55101-5147

Robert S. Lee
Mackall Crouse & Moore PLC
1400 AT&T Tower
901 Marquette Avenue
Minneapolis, MN 55402-2859

James D. Larson
Dahlen Berg & Co.
200 South Sixth Street
Suite 300
Minneapolis, MN 55402

Sharon Ferguson
MN Department of Commerce
85 Seventh Place East
Suite 500
St. Paul, MN 55101-2198

Michael Ahern
Dorsey & Whitney LLP
50 South Sixth Street, Suite 1500
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1498

Pam Marshall
Energy CENTS Coalition
823 East Seventh Street
St. Paul, MN 55106

Julia Anderson
Attorney General's Office
1400 Bremer Tower
445 Minnesota Street
St. Paul, MN 55101-2131

Ann Seha
Dorsey & Whitney LLP
50 South Sixth Street, Suite 1500
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1498

Brian Meloy
Leonard, Street & Deinard
150 South Fifth Street
Suite 2300
Minneapolis, MN 55402

Ronald M. Giteck
Attorney General's Office-RUD
900 Bremer Tower
445 Minnesota Street
St. Paul, MN 55101

Michael J. Bradley
Moss & Barnett
4800 Wells Fargo Center
90 South Seventh Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402-4129

Eric F. Swanson
Winthrop & Weinstine
225 South Sixth Street
Suite 350
Minneapolis, MN 55402-4629

Karen Finstad Hammel
Attorney General's Office
1400 Bremer Tower
445 Minnesota Street
St. Paul, MN 55101-2131

Marie Doyle
CenterPoint Energy
800 LaSalle Avenue – Fl. 11
P.O. Box 59038
Minneapolis, MN 55459-0038

James R. Talcott
Northern Natural Gas Company
1111 South 103rd Street
Omaha, NE 68124

John Lindell
Attorney General's Office-RUD
900 Bremer Tower
445 Minnesota Street
St. Paul, MN 55101-2130

Jack Kegel
MN Municipal Utilities Assn.
3025 Harbor Lane N.
Suite 400
Plymouth, MN 55447-5142

Greg Walters
Minnesota Energy Resources
3460 Technology Drive NW
Rochester, MN 55901