



202 South Main Street  
Le Sueur, Minnesota 56058  
Toll Free: (888) 931-3411  
Fax: (507) 934-6675

April 12, 2017

**VIA ELECTRONIC FILING**

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

Re: Petition for Approval of Firm Transportation Agreement  
Docket No. PL6580/M-16-1026

Dear Mr. Wolf:

Greater Minnesota Transmission, LLC (“GMT”) reviewed the Briefing Papers prepared by Commission staff in the above-referenced docket and received and reviewed the Revised Notice of Commission Meeting that was just issued in the docket. GMT submits this letter to clarify a mistake in materials and request consideration of the transportation agreement without regard to Docket No. G6960/M-16-214.

The Briefing Papers incorrectly stated that the City of Morton, Minnesota will be served by the underlying natural gas project, as well as the Lower Sioux Indian Community. Similarly, the Revised Notice of Commission Meeting identified the underlying project as serving Morton, Minnesota and other areas. However, the City of Morton, Minnesota is not part of the underlying project. Neither GMT nor United Natural Gas, LLC (“UNG”) have submitted any materials stating that the City of Morton, Minnesota will be served by the project. The intent of the project has always been that it was developed to serve the Lower Sioux Indian Community, which is a federally recognized Indian tribe and a sovereign nation. GMT did indicate that the Lower Sioux Community is located in the Morton, Minnesota area simply to provide a geographical reference. While UNG hopes to provide service to a small number of rural customers lying along the natural gas line running to the Lower Sioux Indian Community, those customers do not lie within the Morton, Minnesota city limits. There are significant geological obstacles that impact the ability to serve the city of Morton, Minnesota and GMT has not begun to investigate those obstacles. Hence, GMT wants to insure that the Commission is not mistaken about the location of the underlying project.

GMT also respectfully reasserts its position that the questions related to UNG’s small gas utility franchise exemption are not related to the narrow question before the Commission in this docket, which is whether the subject transportation agreement meets the requirements for approval pursuant to Minnesota Statutes Section 216B.045. The contract is not contingent upon UNG’s



April 12, 2017

Mr. D. Wolf

Page Two

small gas utility franchise exemption or any expansion thereof. Hence, consideration of any issues related to that exemption should be made in Docket No. G6960/M-16-214 and should not be considered in the instant docket. Moreover, since the record in the instant docket does not contain sufficient information on which the Commission could make determinations about matters related to UNG's small gas utility exemption, it would not be appropriate to make decisions about it at this time.

The Commission has, twice before, indicated that the status of the utility that was a party to a similar transportation agreement with GMT has not been relevant to the question of whether the transportation agreement itself can be approved. Most recently, as GMT has previously discussed in this docket, the Commission did so with regard to the GMT-UNG transportation agreement considered in Docket No. PL6580/M-15-104. Likewise, in Docket No. PL6580, G002/M-14-386 wherein it approved a transportation agreement between GMT and Xcel even though it had not considered Xcel's ultimate related request for cost recovery, the Commission considered only the narrow question of whether the contract could be approved under Minnesota Statutes Section 216B.045. GMT respectfully urges the Commission to maintain its policy of considering only the issue actually raised in the docket before it and refraining from considering questions that, while tangentially related to the parties, do not specifically impact the Commission's consideration of the contract within the scope of Minnesota Statutes Section 216B.045.

GMT maintains that Commission consideration can and should proceed without regard to comments and/or any comment period on the related UNG docket. Because there is no dispute that the transportation agreement between GMT and UNG satisfies the requirements of Minnesota Statutes Section 216B.045, GMT respectfully requests that the Commission approve the agreement at its April 18, 2017 Agenda Meeting.

Thank you for your consideration. Please do not hesitate to contact me should there be any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

GREATER MINNESOTA TRANSMISSION, LLC

/s/

Kristine A. Anderson  
Corporate Attorney

cc: Service Lists (16-1026 & 16-214)