

David R. Moeller Senior Attorney 218-723-3963 dmoeller@allete.com

December 1, 2016

Mr. Daniel P. Wolf, Executive Secretary MN Public Utilities Commission 121 7th Place East, Suite 350 St. Paul, MN 55101-2147

> RE: In the Matter of a Petition for Approval of an Amended and Restated Electric Service Agreement Between United States Steel Corporation and Minnesota Power Docket No. E015/M-16-836

Dear Mr. Wolf:

Please find attached for filing with the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission ("Commission") Minnesota Power's Reply Comments in the above Docket.

Yours truly,

David R. Moeller

Davis R. Molle

jmn Attachment

STATE OF MINNESOTA BEFORE THE MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

In the Matter of a Petition for Approval of an Amended and Restated Electric Service Agreement Between United States Steel Corporation and Minnesota Power Docket No. E015/M-16-836

REPLY COMMENTS MINNESOTA POWER

Minnesota Power has reviewed the Initial Comments filed by the Department of Commerce ("Department") on November 10, 2016 regarding a Petition for Approval of the Electric Service Agreement ("Agreement") with United States Steel Corporation ("US Steel") and offers these Reply Comments.

I. Review of Department's Conclusion and Recommendation

Minnesota Power notes and appreciates the Department timely conclusion that all but one of the provisions of the ESA is in the public interest (the "Provision"). Minnesota Power also notes that the Department does not recommend rejecting the Provision; rather, they acknowledge requiring additional information before drawing a conclusion at this time. While acknowledging the discussion points and the rationale brought forth in the Department's Initial Comments, Minnesota Power does not view the Provision as preventing the Commission from approving the Agreement at this time as written. Indeed, approval of the Agreement as filed with the Petition at this time will not necessarily lead to the Provision having an immediate impact to US Steel, Minnesota Power, or any other customer as the application of the Provision is [TRADE SECRET DATA EXCISED] leading Minnesota Power to expect that it will not be applied in 2017. Additionally, the Provision is exclusive of other terms and conditions of the Agreement, and as such approval of the Agreement as filed at this time will not result in other terms and conditions of the Agreement having an immediate impact to US Steel, Minnesota Power or any other ratepayer. Moreover, [TRADE SECRET DATA

_

¹ Minnesota Power and US Steel maintain the details of the Provision are competitive business information and should remain Trade Secret in accordance with the Commission's policies and procedures and Minnesota Power's initial trade secret justification that accompanied the Petition.

EXCISED] in the application of the Provision would create a broader response that in scope would naturally be deeper than the review of an electric service agreement. Finally, approval of the Agreement as filed at this time will not set a precedent as the Commission has supported similar contract provisions in other dockets, and Minnesota Power has agreed that similar terms and conditions are available to all Large Power ("LP") customers who make similar commitments to Minnesota Power.

To those points, as discussed further below, Minnesota Power respectfully requests that the Commission find the entire Agreement is in the Public Interest and approve the Agreement as filed in this Docket, thus allowing both US Steel and Minnesota Power to realize the other benefits negotiated in the Agreement as soon as possible following Commission approval. If and when the Provision takes effect, Minnesota Power will submit a compliance filing with additional information on the Agreement and US Steel's operations and any potential impacts and benefits for other customers in this Docket.

II. The Provision is conditional and is not anticipated to be applicable in 2017

As indicated in the Direct Testimony of Minnesota Power witness Michael Perala in Docket No. E015/GR-16-664, [TRADE SECRET DATA EXCISED]. The 2005 Agreement and the proposed Agreement similarly address the costs of facilities and infrastructure to serve the combined facilities under a single contract; a fact unchanged by operating level at one facility or the other. Thus, Commission approval of the entire Agreement at this time will provide all of the benefits contemplated by Minnesota Power and US Steel when entering into the Agreement, based on US Steel's current operating expectations, in such a way that other ratepayers shall not be negatively affected by a potential application of the Provision. Indeed, if and when the Provision applies, the [TRADE SECRET DATA EXCISED] would benefit all Minnesota Power customers. To the extent the Commission deems it necessary, Minnesota Power agrees with US Steel's recommendation to limit the application of the Provision consistent with other utility and customer rate limitations under Chapter 216B, recognizing that Minnesota Power sought approval of the Agreement under Minn. Stat. § 216B.05, subd. 2a.

III. The Provision is exclusive of other terms and conditions of the Agreement.

To the best of Minnesota Power's knowledge, and as presumably supported by the Department's Initial Comments, the Provision does not impact any other provision of the Agreement. Other features of the Agreement would be calculated and incorporated for US Steel essentially the same way they are now and the same way they are for all other similarly situated customers, and the application of the other terms of the Agreement would not be affected by a Commission decision to approve the Agreement.

IV. Sales Forecast Changes Would Create a Broader Response

One common acknowledgment of load forecasting, accepted by Minnesota Power as well as other utilities and stakeholders, is that conditions change. This evaluation that will take place in the Rate Case and the appropriateness of Minnesota Power's proposed test year will naturally include an analysis of this Agreement and any other potential customer changes that impact revenue requirements. While Minnesota Power currently assumes that [TRADE SECRET DATA EXCISED²].

Should Minnesota Power's sales forecast change significantly while the Rate Case is pending, [TRADE SECRET DATA EXCISED]. Minnesota Power would need to submit updated sales forecast information and revenue schedules reflecting greater MWh sales, as has happened when customer operations have significantly changed during prior rate cases,³ and the review of the changed landscape during the Rate Case process, [TRADE SECRET DATA EXCISED] could then be accomplished amid a corresponding broader update of proposed rates.

Similarly, should Minnesota Power's sales forecast change significantly after the Rate Case, [TRADE SECRET DATA EXCISED] it is conceived that Minnesota Power's proposed Annual Rate Review Mechanism, as described in the direct testimony of Minnesota Power witness Marcia Podratz, would capture the increase in revenue brought about by the increase in MWh sales and would then lead to a rate adjustment to

_

² [TRADE SECRET DATA EXCISED].

³ See, for example, Docket No. E015/GR-94-001, Order dated November 22, 1994 (Minnesota Power filed a Motion to Reopen the Record for the reopening of National Steel Pellet Company – the predecessor to Keetac) and Docket No. E015/GR-09-1151 (Minnesota Power increased its sales forecast for industrial and other customers due to improved economic conditions. See April 29, 2010 Rebuttal Testimony of Julie Pierce, Peter Seeling, and Marcia Podratz).

incorporate the changed circumstances brought about by the change in sales, [TRADE SECRET DATA EXCISED] resulting in significant benefits to Minnesota Power's customers and the utility alike.

If significant changes in customer operations and sales levels occur, Minnesota Power will provide the appropriate data and analysis in transparent fashion to allow the Department, the Commission, and other stakeholders to render judgment on the appropriateness of Minnesota Power's cost structure, including the Agreement, the sales forecast, and other relevant information and costs. A Commission decision to approve the Agreement now will not change or alter this process, and due to the exclusivity of the Provision in relation to other terms and conditions of the Agreement, as well as to Minnesota Power's agreement to submit a compliance filing with information on the Provision in this Docket, a Commission decision to approve the Agreement as written at this time should not impact the ability of the Commission to find that approving the entire Agreement is in the Public Interest. As noted in the Petition, the [TRADE SECRET DATA EXCISED] would benefit all Minnesota Power customers.

V. Past Commission Decisions

As stated in DOC IR 2, which was included as Attachment 2 in the DOC Reply Comments, several of Minnesota Power's current and past electric service agreements have contained combined billing features and provisions applicable to the customers' unique situations. The Provision is similar in intent with other concepts of combined contracts that have been approved by the Commission as being in the Public Interest. Some of these contract features include the common use of the Allowance for Scheduled Maintenance, complementary loads combined under a similar contract, joint facility usage of energy or curtailability provisions applied to multiple sites through a single contract. Overall these contract features provide benefits to these LP customers who have the greater degree of load variability and diversity in a combined contract than would be normally seen in single separate contract, while still having the structure of the combined contract supporting the cost of serving the customer load through the minimum billing demand structures of that contract and other rate design components that are unchanged with this Agreement. This is not, however, to say that US Steel could [TRADE SECRET DATA EXCISED]. Mr. Perala's testimony in the rate case that the

Agreement "optimizes the operating synergies between the two U.S. Steel facilities" refers to the Agreement as a whole. As Minnesota Power stated in its initial petition in this Docket "the Agreement further optimizes the operating synergies between the two US Steel facilities by continuing to combine electric service under a single contract as initially reflected in the 2005 Agreement with most of the 2005 Agreement provisions carried forward." As evidenced by other recent Commission decisions, unique contract features within an agreement have been adopted that are customized to the individual customer operation but when taken as part of an overall Agreement have been deemed to be consistent with the Public Interest. Minnesota Power firmly believes that the Provision, and the Agreement in its entirety, are consistent with the public interest.

VI. Conclusion

Minnesota Power appreciates the opportunity to address the comments brought forth by the Department, and respectfully requests that the Commission find approval of the Agreement to be in the Public Interest and thus approve the entire Agreement as filed.

Dated: December 1, 2016 Respectfully submitted,

David R. Moeller Senior Attorney Minnesota Power 30 West Superior Street Duluth, MN 55802 (218) 723-3963

Davis R. Malle

dmoeller@allete.com

⁴ In the Matter of the Application of Minnesota Power for Authority to Increase Rates for Electric Utility Service in Minnesota, Commission Docket No. E015/GR-16-664, DIRECT TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL A. PERALA, at 18:17-18.

_

⁵ *Petition*, pg. 6.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Jodi Nash, hereby certify that on the 1st day of December, 2016, on behalf of Minnesota Power, I electronically filed a true and correct copy of Minnesota Power's Reply Comments in Docket No. E015/M-16-836 to the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission ("MPUC") and the Minnesota Department of Commerce, Division of Energy Resources ("DoC"). The remaining parties on the attached service list were served as indicated.

Jodi Nash

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Christopher	Anderson	canderson@allete.com	Minnesota Power	30 W Superior St Duluth, MN 558022191	Electronic Service	Yes	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
Julia	Anderson	Julia.Anderson@ag.state.m n.us	Office of the Attorney General-DOC	1800 BRM Tower 445 Minnesota St St. Paul, MN 551012134	Electronic Service	Yes	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
William	Bond	william.bond@arcelormittal.com	ArcelorMittal USA - Minorca Mine Inc.	PO Box 1 5950 Old Highway 53 Virginia, MN 55792	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
Greg	Chandler	greg.chandler@upm.com	UPM Blandin Paper	115 SW First St Grand Rapids, MN 55744	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
David	Chura	dchura@mnpower.com	Minnesota Power	30 West Superior Street Duluth, MN 55802	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
Paul	Ciesielski	Paul.Ciesielski@arcelormitt al.com	ArcelorMittal	3300 Dickey Road East Chicago, IN 46312	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
Jack	Croswell	Jack.croswell@cliffsnr.com	Hibbing Taconite	P O Box 589 Hibbing, MN 55746	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
Emma	Fazio	emma.fazio@stoel.com	Stoel Rives LLP	33 South Sixth Street Suite 4200 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
Sharon	Ferguson	sharon.ferguson@state.mn .us	Department of Commerce	85 7th Place E Ste 500 Saint Paul, MN 551012198	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
Shane	Henriksen	shane.henriksen@enbridge .com	Enbridge Energy Company, Inc.	1409 Hammond Ave FL 2 Superior, WI 54880	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
Margaret	Hodnik	mhodnik@mnpower.com	Minnesota Power	30 West Superior Street Duluth, MN 55802	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Lori	Hoyum	lhoyum@mnpower.com	Minnesota Power	30 West Superior Street Duluth, MN 55802	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
James	Jarvi	N/A	Minnesota Ore Operations - U S Steel	P O Box 417 Mountain Iron, MN 55768	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
Michael	Krikava	mkrikava@briggs.com	Briggs And Morgan, P.A.	2200 IDS Center 80 S 8th St Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
Nathan N	LaCoursiere	nlacoursiere@duluthmn.go v	City of Duluth	411 W 1st St Rm 410 Duluth, MN 55802	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
David	Langmo	david.langmo@sappi.com	Sappi North America	P O Box 511 2201 Avenue B Cloquet, MN 55720	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
James D.	Larson	james.larson@avantenergy .com	Avant Energy Services	220 S 6th St Ste 1300 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
Douglas	Larson	dlarson@dakotaelectric.co m	Dakota Electric Association	4300 220th St W Farmington, MN 55024	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
John	Lindell	john.lindell@ag.state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-RUD	1400 BRM Tower 445 Minnesota St St. Paul, MN 551012130	Electronic Service	Yes	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
Patrick	Loupin	PatrickLoupin@Packaging Corp.com	Packaging Corporation of America	PO Box 990050 Boise, ID 83799-0050	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
Susan	Ludwig	sludwig@mnpower.com	Minnesota Power	30 West Superior Street Duluth, MN 55802	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Sarah	Manchester	sarah.manchester@sappi.c om	Sappi North American	255 State Street Floor 4 Boston, MA 02109-2617	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
Pam	Marshall	pam@energycents.org	Energy CENTS Coalition	823 7th St E St. Paul, MN 55106	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
Keith	Matzdorf	keith.matzdorf@sappi.com	Sappi Fine Paper North America	PO Box 511 2201 Avenue B Cloquet, MN 55720	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
Matthew	McClincy	MMcClincy@usg.com	USG	35 Arch Street Clouqet, MN 55720	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
Herbert	Minke	hminke@allete.com	Minnesota Power	30 W Superior St Duluth, MN 55802	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
David	Moeller	dmoeller@allete.com	Minnesota Power	30 W Superior St Duluth, MN 558022093	Electronic Service	Yes	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
Andrew	Moratzka	andrew.moratzka@stoel.co m	Stoel Rives LLP	33 South Sixth St Ste 4200 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
Jennifer	Peterson	jjpeterson@mnpower.com	Minnesota Power	30 West Superior Street Duluth, MN 55802	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
Ralph	Riberich	rriberich@uss.com	United States Steel Corp	600 Grant St Ste 2028 Pittsburgh, PA 15219	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
Santi	Romani	N/A	United Taconite	P O Box 180 Eveleth, MN 55734	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Susan	Romans	sromans@allete.com	Minnesota Power	30 West Superior Street Legal Dept Duulth, MN 55802	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
Thomas	Scharff	thomas.scharff@versoco.c om	Verso Corp	600 High Street Wisconsin Rapids, WI 54495	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
Ron	Spangler, Jr.	rlspangler@otpco.com	Otter Tail Power Company	215 So. Cascade St. PO Box 496 Fergus Falls, MN 565380496	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
Eric	Swanson	eswanson@winthrop.com	Winthrop Weinstine	225 S 6th St Ste 3500 Capella Tower Minneapolis, MN 554024629	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
Jim	Tieberg	jtieberg@polymetmining.co m	PolyMet Mining, Inc.	PO Box 475 County Highway 666 Hoyt Lakes, MN 55750	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
Karen	Turnboom	karen.turnboom@versoco.com	Verso Corporation	100 Central Avenue Duluth, MN 55807	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836
Daniel P	Wolf	dan.wolf@state.mn.us	Public Utilities Commission	121 7th Place East Suite 350 St. Paul, MN 551012147	Electronic Service	Yes	OFF_SL_16-836_M-16-836