



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

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

Thursday, February 5, 2015

9:30 AM

Large Hearing Room

INTRODUCTION

ORAL ARGUMENT ITEMS

DELIBERATION ITEMS

DECISION ITEMS

1. * **E002/M-14-1043** **Northern States Power Company, dba
Xcel Energy**
In the Matter of a Petition for Approval of the First Amendment to the Interconnection Agreement with Best Power Intl, LLC(PUC: Stalpes; DOC:Ouanes) NOTE: The Commission agrees with the Department recommendation of Approval.

Approved.

2. ** **ET2/RP-14-813** **Great River Energy**
In the Matter of GRE's 2015-2029 Resource Plan

What action should the Commission take on AI-Corn's Petition to Intervene?(PUC: **Rebholz**)

Granted.

3. ** **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.

Should the Commission reconsider its December 8, 2014, Order Approving Sale Subject to Conditions?
If so, should the Commission change its decision allowing IPL customers to be transitioned to MERC's rates?
Should the Commission modify the Order's requirement that a 60-day notice of a change in rates be provided to IPL customers? (PUC: **Kaml, Alonso, Bender, Twite**)

The Commission has the authority to accept or decline a petition for reconsideration **with or without** a hearing or oral argument. (Minnesota Rules 7829.3000, Subpart 6) In other words, a decision on a petition for reconsideration can be made without taking oral comments at the Commission meeting.

Recon denied.

4. ** G011/PA-14-664 Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation (“MERC” or the “Company”)

In the Matter of a Request for Approval of the Merger Agreement between Integrys Energy Group, Inc. and Wisconsin Energy Corporation.

Does the proposed transaction require approval by the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission under §216B.50?

Is a contested case proceeding appropriate?

Should the Commission request additional information?

Is the proposed sale consistent with the public interest?

Should the Commission approve the proposed sale?

If so, should the approval be with conditions?(PUC: **Kaml, Alonso, Bender, Twite**)

Jurisdiction found, variance granted, procedural schedule established.

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