



# Minnesota Public Utilities Commission

## PUC Agenda Meeting

---

Thursday, September 7, 2023

10:00 AM

---

### INTRODUCTION

### DECISION ITEMS

1. [Details 2016-131](#)

\*\* E002/M-13-867

**Northern States Power Company, d/b/a Xcel Energy**

In the Matter of a Petition for Approval of Northern States Power Company, dba Xcel Energy, for Approval of its Community Solar Garden Program.

Should the Commission take any action regarding Xcel's edit to the definition of the Standard Bill Credit as found in the Applicable Retail Rate (ARR) Tariff Sheet (Sec. 9; Sheet No. 69)? (PUC: **Strauss**)

**Attachments:**

[Briefing Papers](#)

2. [Details 2022-212](#)

\* ET2/TL-22-235

**Great River Energy**

In the Matter of the Application of Great River Energy for a Route Permit to Rebuild the Existing 69 kV ST-WW Transmission Line to 115 kV in Stearns County, Minnesota.

1. Should the Commission adopt the Administrative Law Judge's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Recommendation?
2. Should the Commission find that the Environmental Assessment and the record created at the public hearing adequately address the issues identified in the scoping decision?
3. Should the Commission require the use of an Independent Third-Party Monitor to assist DOC EERA and Commission staff in monitoring compliance of construction and restoration activities of the project?
4. Should the Commission issue a Route Permit identifying a specific route and permit conditions to rebuild the existing 69 kV ST-WW Transmission Line to 115 kV in Stearns County? (PUC: **Panait**)

**Attachments:**

[Briefing Papers with Attachment](#)

**3. [Details 2021-210](#)**

**\*\* ET2/TL-21-434 Nexus Line, LLC**

In the Matter of the Petition to Transfer a Portion of the Route Permit for the HVDC Transmission Line System and Associated Facilities in Minnesota.

1. Has Nexus met the requirements of Order point 9 in the Commission’s March 3 Order? If not, what requirements were not met?
2. Do the financial statements and other financial information provided by Nexus in its May 3, 2023 Petition demonstrate that the permittee has the ability to fund the decommissioning financial assurance? If not, what additional information should the Commission require Nexus to provide to demonstrate the permittee can fund the decommissioning financial assurance?
3. Do the proposed terms of the guaranty provide sufficient protections to ensure Minnesota ratepayers will not have to fund decommissioning of the high-voltage transmission line? If not, what changes should be made?
4. With the proposed guaranty, how will the public interest be protected in the event of the bankruptcy of the guarantor?
5. Is it in the public interest to switch from a letter of credit to a parental guaranty?
6. Are there other issues or concerns related to this matter the Commission should consider? (PUC: **Janezich**)

**Attachments:**                      [Briefing Papers](#)

**ADJOURNMENT**

**\* One star indicates that an agenda item is not disputed.**  
**\*\* Two stars indicate that an agenda item is disputed and there may be legal, procedural, or policy issues to be resolved.**  
**\*\*\* Three stars indicate a complex or lengthy disputed agenda item that may have significant legal, procedural, or policy issues to be resolved.**  
**Please note: For the complete record, please see eDockets.**