

Thursday, December 17, 2015

1.

2.

3.

9:30 AM

Large Hearing Room

# INTRODUCTION

## **ORAL ARGUMENT ITEMS**

# **DELIBERATION ITEMS**

## **DECISION ITEMS**

G6956/M-15-856 Community Co-ops of Lake Park (CCLP or the Co-op) In the Matter of Community Co-ops of Lake Park's Petition for an Exemption for a Small Gas Utility Franchise. Does Community Co-ops of Lake Park meet the statutory requirements to qualify for a small gas utility franchise exemption under Minn. Stat. § 216B.16, subd. 12? Should the Commission require the Co-op to update its tariff language to reflect the suggested changes recommended by the Department of Commerce and the Public Utilities Commission's Consumer Affairs Office? (PUC: Schwieger, Brill) Approved exemption request; required compliance filing. \*\* G011/GR-13-617 **Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation** In the Matter of a Petition by Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation (MERC) for Authority to Increase Natural Gas Rates in Minnesota, the Interim Rate Period Refund. What should Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation (MERC) be directed to do with un-refunded amounts from the interim rate refund? (PUC: Brill) Authorized donation of refunds less than \$2 with conditions; set requirements for future interim rate refund proposals. ET2/TL-15-423 **Great River Energy** In the Matter of the Application of Great River Energy for a Route Permit under the Alternative Permitting Process for the Palisade 115 kV Project in Aitkin County.

What action should the Commission take regarding route alternatives to be evaluated in the environmental assessment? (PUC: **Kaluzniak**)

Took no action on route alternatives; delegated administrative authority to Executive Secretary.

### The following items will not be heard before 10:00 AM.

4.

5.

#### \*\* PL6668/CN-13-473; North Dakota Pipeline Company LLC PL6668/PPL-13-474

In the Matter of the Application of North Dakota Pipeline Company LLC for a Certificate of Need for the Sandpiper Pipeline Project in Minnesota;

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 action should the Commission take concerning the Sierra Club Petition to Intervene?
- What procedural actions should the Commission take concerning the certificate of need matter?
- What procedural actions should the Commission take concerning the route permit matter? (PUC: **Ek**)

Granted petition to intervene; referred both dockets for joint contested-case proceedings; authorized Department to prepare EIS, to be finalized before intervenor direct testimony is due; requested that Department seek approval of alternative routes or route segments; rescinded 11/16/15 and 11/23/15 notices.

\*\* PL9/CN-14-916; Enbridge Energy, Limited Partnership PL9/PPL-15-137

In the Matter of the Application of Enbridge Energy, Limited Partnership for a Certificate of Need for the Line 3 Pipeline Replacement Project in Minnesota from the North Dakota Border to the Wisconsin Border.

In the Matter of the Application of Enbridge Energy, Limited Partnership for a Route Permit for the Line 3 Pipeline Replacement Project in Minnesota from the North Dakota Border to the Wisconsin Border.

- What action should the Commission take concerning the Sierra Club Motion to Suspend or Extend or Reopen the Scoping Comment Period?
- What procedural actions should the Commission take concerning the certificate matter and route permit matter?
- What action should the Commission take concerning

environmental review requirements in the certificate of need and route permit matters?

 What action should the Commission take concerning combined environmental review of the Line 3 Replacement Project applications and the Sandpiper Pipeline Project applications? (PUC: Ek)

Referred both dockets for joint contested-case proceedings; authorized Department to prepare EIS, to be finalized before intervenor direct testimony is due, that addresses cumulative impact of Sandpiper/Route 3 projects; rescinded 12/8/15 notice.

# 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