

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission Decisions

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

PUC Agenda Meeting

Thursday, August 7, 2014 9:30 AM Large Hearing Room

Items 1-4: Audio only due to technical issue

INTRODUCTION

ORAL ARGUMENT ITEMS

DELIBERATION ITEMS

DECISION ITEMS

1. * P5207/RV-14-435 LDC Telecommunications Inc

In the Matter of the Revocation of a Certificate of Authority. (PUC: Oberlander; DOC: Lindscheid) **NOTE:** The Company did not file reply comments. Staff supports the Department's request to revoke the Company's authority.

Attachments: DOC Comments 6-30-14

Revoked certificate of authority

2. * P6522/RV-14-442 Infotelecom, LLC

In the Matter of the Revocation of the Certificate of Authority. (PUC: Oberlander; DOC: Linscheid) **NOTE:** The Company did not file reply comments. Staff supports the Department's request to revoke the Company's authority.

Attachments: DOC Commens 6-30-14

Revoked certificate of authority

3. ** G008/GR-13-316 CenterPoint Energy Resources Corp.

d/b/a

CenterPoint Energy Minnesota Gas

In the Matter of the Application of CenterPoint Energy Minnesota Gas for Authority to Increase Natural Gas Rates in Minnesota

Should the Commission reconsider and/or clarify its June 9, 2014 Findings of Fact, Conclusions, and Order (PUC:**Morrissey, Bahn**)

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. If you have questions about this particular docket, please contact Dorothy Morrissey at 651-201-2232 or Andy Bahn at 651-201-2249.

<u>Attachments:</u> <u>Briefing Papers</u>

Granted reconsideration to issue clarification; otherwise denied

4. **A E002/M-13-867 Xcel Energy

In the Matter of the Petition of Northern States Power Company, Doing Business as Xcel Energy, Requesting Approval of its Proposed Community Solar Gardens Program.

- What rate, Value or Solar (VOS) or Average Retail Rate (ARR), should the Commission approve for use in Xcel's Community Solar Garden tariff?
- 2. What is the appropriate methodology and calculation of Xcel's VOS rate? (PUC: **Bahn, Mackenzie**)

**B E002/M-13-867 Xcel Energy

In the Matter of the Petition of Northern States Power Company, Doing Business as Xcel Energy, for Approval of its Proposed Community Solar Gardens Program.

Should the Commission approve Xcel's Community Solar Garden (CSG) program compliance filing? (PUC: **Bahn, Mackenzie**)

Attachments: A Briefing Papers

A BP Attachment A-XLS Link

A Revised Decision Options

B Briefing Papers

B Revised Decision Options

Affirmed bill-credit rates set in prior order and solicited comments on using value-of-solar rate with an adder; approved Xcel's solar-garden plan with modifications.

THE FOLLOWING ITEM WILL NOT BE HEARD BEFORE 1:00 PM

5. ** PL6668/CN-13-474 North Dakota Pipeline Company LLC

In the Matter of the Application of North Dakota Pipeline Company LLC for a Pipeline Routing Permit for the Sandpiper Pipeline Project in Minnesota.

What additional pipeline routes or route segments should the Commission accept for consideration at the public hearings? Should the Commission take any additional actions at this time? (PUC: **Ek**)

Attachments: Briefing Papers

Revised Decision Alternatives

Second Revised Decision Alternatives

Accepted route alternatives recommended by EERA and system alternative SA-3; forwarded to ALJ; required NDPC to prepare pipeline safety report to be submitted as direct testimony and report; required submission of landowner mailing list; required NDPC to send landowners notice of alternative routes accepted; directed parties to submit additional comments w/l 14 days regarding consideration of additional system alternatives and whether and how to incorporate into certificate of need and route permit proceedings.

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