Speak Up!

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission

Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation (MERC) for Evaluation and Approval of Rider Recovery for its Rochester Natural Gas Extension Project | M-15-895

Closed Jul 28, 2016 · Discussion · 17 Participants · 4 Topics · 19 Answers · 0 Replies · 10 Votes

17	4	19	0	10
PARTICIPANTS	TOPICS	ANSWERS	REPLIES	VOTES

SUMMARY OF TOPICS

IS OTHER FUNDING AVAILABLE TO COVER THE ROCHESTER PROJECT COSTS?

2 Answers · 0 Replies

Gilbert Peters · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jul 01, 2016 3:40 pm

0 Votes

I agree. No Dept. should go to the customers asking for funds when a zero base budget has not been done to determine if revenues might be available from other areas, other than additional funding. First prove you are using the money you have, prudently.

larry pahl · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jul 02, 2016 6:45 pm

0 Votes

Operational cost should be paid for by the people that benefit fanatically from it. That would be the share holders. Pay out smaller dividends and use that money to pay for the pipe line.

ARE MERC'S PROPOSED INVESTMENTS IN THE ROCHESTER NATURAL GAS EXTENSION PROJECT PRUDENT, REASONABLE, AND NECESSARY FOR MERC TO BE ABLE TO PROVIDE SERVICE TO MERC'S ROCHESTER SERVICE AREA NOW AND IN THE FUTURE?

2 Answers · 0 Replies

Judy Sundby · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jun 30, 2016 4:11 pm
0 Votes

With the cost of running a business in Minnesota anymore increases in utilities will put many businesses out of business.

Justin Lee · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jun 30, 2016 4:40 pm
0 Votes

What type of business do you run?

IS IT REASONABLE FOR MERC TO RECOVER THE ROCHESTER PROJECT COSTS AS PROPOSED OR SHOULD ALL PROJECT COSTS BE RECOVERED FROM ALL OF MERC'S MINNESOTA CUSTOMERS OR ONLY FROM ITS ROCHESTER AREA CUSTOMERS? IF NOT, WHAT ALTERNATIVE WOULD BE MORE REASONABLE?

14 Answers · 0 Replies

Randy-Colleen Tscheu · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jun 25, 2016 12:14 pm
5 Votes

cost should not come from all res. coustomers only those that will directly benefit

Dave Stevens · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jun 25, 2016 4:19 pm
4 Votes

I'm against all of Mn. paying for the Rochester expansion.Mayo has blackmailed Minn. out of over Half a Billion dollars.I was just refused access to their services.I will not pay one cent to subsidize some entity I can't even use.When will this corporate welfare stop? Dave

Dave Stevens · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jun 25, 2016 4:23 pm
2 Votes

I might add that I live in Park Rapids,am 73 years old,and refuse to pay for something Inever wanted or never received

.

Tina Brady · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jun 27, 2016 11:08 am
2 Votes

Given the ability for MN Energy to recover and profit on the expansion of service to new customers, this should not be funded by the whole of their customers. We are all fully aware that an increase will never be dropped in the future once costs are recovered by MERC.

Mary Kay Riendeau · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jun 28, 2016 10:35 pm
1 Votes

If future revenue is expected to be collected by Minnesota Energy Resources, why should the consumer pay for their project. That's like me asking for the city I live in to pay for my riding lawnmower if I mow my neighbors grass. I do not understand why the consumer is being asked to pay for a "For Profit" companies expenses. I don't think any consumer, including Rochester customers should pay this expense. If they want to expand their company, they should pay for it. Are they planning on sharing their revenue with the consumer as well?

James Borgschatz · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jun 29, 2016 12:14 pm
1 Votes

Two issues arise with the proposed funding. 1) When will the special monthly rate expire? No mention is made of that once the bills have been paid. 2) While infrastructure benefits everyone generally, the proposal does not benefit the state wide customers. The Rochester area customers ought to pay at least 80% of the cost since they are the direct beneficiaries. When the city I live in wishes to do a significant improvement to the road in front of my house (not just maintenance) they ask the residents to pay a fair share of that cost since we are the ones that primarily use it. Since others in the community can use the road as well, there is money from the general transportation funds that participate as well. That same principle ought to be pursued in all public funding. Get an expiry date on this proposal AND limit the primary costs to the primary beneficiaries.

Mike Mm · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jun 29, 2016 8:40 pm
1 Votes

I agree with James comments. The city and/or company should incur the costs not me that lives 4 hours away. If this happens I switch service. I don't use your service for 7 to 8 months a year yet you would charge me 17 dollars a month extra. What do I get again? How does this help me to heat my garage for 4 months and 220 more dollars?

Denise Zeitz · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jun 30, 2016 9:23 am
1 Votes

I do not feel it is right to charge all MN customers for the added pipeline in Rochester. Case closed

todd os · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jun 30, 2016 10:59 am
1 Votes

I too generally agree with James. I want to add that when a local business needs added infrastructure they are expected to pay for all of it. It is reasonable to me that the area benefiting should pay the lions share.

MarkNhan DW · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jun 30, 2016 2:16 pm
1 Votes

When my city decided the road near my house needs repair, I had to pay assessment fee just like my neighbors, since I use that road I couldn't complain. I don't live in Rochester so why should I pay for their customers' benefit? The price keeps on increasing now they want all of us to pay for all this new construction project when they're a profit company? Have anyone been to Rochester lately? They've expanded so much in the last 10 years that Mayo Clinic alone could easily pay for all the cost instead of making all of us working people pay for their benefits. I don't agree with paying for Rochester pipeline.

Guy HH · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jun 30, 2016 7:40 pm
0 Votes

comment...I live 4 hours west of the area that will benefit from this project. I will never use this pipeline, nor will it improve my service in any way. The City of Rochester and/or the company should bear the entire cost of this project. This is the same as the Vikings stadium (which I will never visit), the light rail (which I will never use), and all the other nonsense that the outstate population is supposed to pay for, for no tangible benefit to their region. If the company is unable to fund it themselves, the end users in Rochester should pay. Of course, they could always apply for some of the budget surplus that the Capital stole from us taxpayers I suppose.

Paul Deeming · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jul 08, 2016 9:34 pm
0 Votes

I agree that any cost recoup should be from the area that will benefit: Rochester. Furthermore, I think the Mayo Corporation, which will probably use a huge chunk of the gas benefits (not to mention benefitting in other ways from it), should pay a significant share. And even on a broader scale than that, correct me if I'm wrong, but MERC is a FOR-PROFIT corporation who will pocket the profits from this venture. Let THEM pay for it themselves!!

James Nelson · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jul 12, 2016 10:44 am
0 Votes

I think this profitable mother business that consists of multiple energy companies can foot the majority of the bill to expand. It's like any other company that wants to expand, They need to do it just so that they can see how they will recover the expense in years down the line. Leverage the debt to profit not make everyone else pay for it so that they can profit 10 fold. I strongly disagree with my rates increasing for a project that is 4 hours away from me. What sacrifices has the CEO or stock holders made for this project? Private homeowners are getting rate increases on everything these days. Please help us keep our bills down in this wage stagnant economy.

Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation (MERC) for Evaluation and Approval of Rider Recovery for its Rochester Natural Gas Extension Project | M-15-895

Closed Jul 28, 2016 · Discussion · 17 Participants · 4 Topics · 19 Answers · 0 Replies · 10 Votes

MarkNhan DW · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jun 30, 2016 2:16 pm
1 Votes

When my city decided the road near my house needs repair, I had to pay assessment fee just like my neighbors, since I use that road I couldn't complain. I don't live in Rochester so why should I pay for their customers' benefit? The price keeps on increasing now they want all of us to pay for all this new construction project when they're a profit company? Have anyone been to Rochester lately? They've expanded so much in the last 10 years that Mayo Clinic alone could easily pay for all the cost instead of making all of us working people pay for their benefits. I don't agree with paying for Rochester pipeline.

Guy HH · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jun 30, 2016 7:40 pm
0 Votes

comment...I live 4 hours west of the area that will benefit from this project. I will never use this pipeline, nor will it improve my service in any way. The City of Rochester and/or the company should bear the entire cost of this project. This is the same as the Vikings stadium (which I will never visit), the light rail (which I will never use), and all the other nonsense that the outstate population is supposed to pay for, for no tangible benefit to their region. If the company is unable to fund it themselves, the end users in Rochester should pay. Of course, they could always apply for some of the budget surplus that the Capital stole from us taxpayers I suppose.

Paul Deeming · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jul 08, 2016 9:34 pm
0 Votes

I agree that any cost recoup should be from the area that will benefit: Rochester. Furthermore, I think the Mayo Corporation, which will probably use a huge chunk of the gas benefits (not to mention benefitting in other ways from it), should pay a significant share. And even on a broader scale than that, correct me if I'm wrong, but MERC is a FOR-PROFIT corporation who will pocket the profits from this venture. Let THEM pay for it themselves!!

James Nelson · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Jul 12, 2016 10:44 am
0 Votes
I think this profitable mother business that consists of multiple energy companies can foot the majority of the bill to expand. It's like any other company that wants to expand, They need to do it just so that they can see how they will recover the expense in years down the line. Leverage the debt to profit not make everyone else pay for it so that they can profit 10 fold. I strongly disagree with my rates increasing for a project that is 4 hours away from me. What sacrifices has the CEO or stock holders made for this project? Private homeowners are getting rate increases on everything these days. Please help us keep our bills down in this wage stagnant economy.