

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

From: [Melissa Partin](#)
To: [Harsch, Trey \(PUC\)](#)
Cc: [Tony Mendoza](#); [Patty OKeefe](#); [Leigh Currie](#); [Caitlin Eichten](#); [Carolina Ortiz](#)
Subject: Re: PUC Ex Parte Communication: Docket No. 23-215
Date: Thursday, May 30, 2024 4:05:04 PM

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

Hello Trey -

Thank you for the clarifying question regarding the CEO's supplemental comments Docket No. 23-215 (CenterPoint's NGIA plan).

In response to your question:

- The CEOs support approval of the feasibility study phase of Pilot I.
- The CEOs recommend the Commission withhold approval of the implementation phase of Pilot I until the recommended additional information is provided. We support allowing the Company to provide this information as part of a compliance filing within this docket, which is why we included the estimated budget for it in the table included in our supplemental comments. The table is meant to show the impact on the Company's proposed budget of removing the pilots that the CEOs' recommend rejecting from the plan. As clarified in footnote 33, the table calculations don't account for changes in pilot budgets that may result from the CEOs' recommended modifications to the remaining pilots.

Please let me know if you have any questions about this response.

- Melissa

On Wed, May 29, 2024 at 4:20 PM Harsch, Trey (PUC) <trey.harsch@state.mn.us> wrote:

Hello Melissa,

I was hoping to receive some additional information regarding recommendations made in your supplemental comments for Docket No. 23-151 (CenterPoint's NGIA). Please note, Staff intends to file this discussion in the docket as an ex-parte communication.

Question:

- The CEOs stated that they support OAG's recommendation for the Commission to approve the feasibility study of Pilot I now, and re-evaluate the implementation of Pilot I once the feasibility study results are available. However, The CEOs listed the

full predicted cost of Pilot I in their table displaying their preferred plan while OAG only listed the costs required for the feasibility study. Could the CEOs explain this decision and elaborate on how they believe the Commission should treat Pilot I's budget? Can the CEOs confirm if their recommendation is the same as OAG's, or if it differs?

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