



Minnesota Public Utilities Commission

PUC Agenda Meeting

Thursday, September 27, 2018

10:00 AM

Rochester, MN

INTRODUCTION

DECISION ITEMS

1. [Details 2018-200](#)

P999/PR-18-20

All Telecommunications Carriers

In the Matter of 2017 Lifeline Recertification Results. (PUC: McCarthy; DOC: Linscheid)

Attachments:

[DOC Comments 5-31-18](#)

2. [Details 2018-199](#)

* **P999/PR-18-8**

Local Exchange Companies;

Eligible Telecommunications Carriers

In the Matter of Annual Certifications Related to Eligible Telecommunications Carriers' (ETCs) Use of the Federal Universal Service Support Required Pursuant to C.F.R. §54.313.

1. Should the Commission approve all petitioning ETCs' requests for high cost support certification?
2. Should the Commission order other action in this matter? (PUC: **McCarthy**)

Attachments:

[Briefing Papers](#)

3. [Details 2018-198](#)

* **ET9/RP-17-753**

Southern Minnesota Municipal Power Agency (SMMPA)

In the Matter of Southern Minnesota Municipal Power Agency's Submittal of Its 2018-2032 Integrated Resource Plan.

What action should the Commission take on SMMPA's filing? (PUC: **Bahn**)

Attachments:

[Briefing Papers](#)

4. [Details 2018-193](#)

** **IP6981/CN-17-306;**

Dodge County Wind, LLC

IP6981/WS-17-307;

IP6981/TL-17-308

In the Matter of the Application of Dodge County Wind, LLC for a Certificate of Need for

the Dodge County Wind Project and Associated Facilities in Dodge, Steele, and Olmsted Counties, Minnesota;

In the Matter of the Application of Dodge County Wind, LLC for a Site Permit for the Dodge County Wind Project and Associated Facilities in Dodge and Steele Counties, Minnesota;

In the Matter of the Application of Dodge County Wind, LLC for a Route Permit for the 345 kV High-Voltage Transmission Line Associated with the Dodge County Wind Project in Dodge and Olmsted Counties, Minnesota.

1. Should the Commission accept the combined large wind energy conversion system (LWECS) and high-voltage transmission line (HVTL) certificate of need application as substantially complete?
2. Should the Commission accept the LWECS site permit application as substantially complete?
3. Should the Commission accept the HVTL route permit as substantially complete?
4. Should the Commission direct that the combined LWECS and HVTL certificate of need application be evaluated using the Commission's informal process or referred to the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) for contested case proceedings?
5. Should the Commission direct that the LWECS site permit application be referred to the OAH for contested case proceedings?
6. Should the Commission direct that the LWECS site permit application and the HVTL route permit application be processed jointly with the certificate of need application (i.e., joint public information meetings, joint public/contested case hearings, and an environmental impact statement in lieu of an environmental report)?
7. Should the Commission appoint an advisory task force for the HVTL route permit application?
8. Should the Commission vary the time limits of certain rules related to the processing of the applications? (PUC: **Ek**)

Attachments:

[Briefing Papers](#)

[Attachment A - Sample LWECS Site Permit](#)

[Attachment B - Sample HVTL Route Permit](#)

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