

AN ALLETE COMPANY

# PUBLIC DOCUMENT TRADE SECRET DATA EXCISED

Susan Ludwig Policy Manager 218-355-3586 <u>sludwig@mnpower.com</u>

March 28, 2017

# VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

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

## RE: In the Matter of Minnesota Power's 2017 Capital Structure Petition Docket No. E015/S-17-142

Dear Mr. Wolf:

Minnesota Power (the "Company") hereby electronically submits the attached Reply Comments in the above-referenced Docket. These comments provide a response to comments submitted by the Minnesota Department of Commerce, Division of Energy Resources ("Department"), on March 17, 2017. Minnesota Power agrees with the Department's analysis and recommendations and has provided additional information.

Please contact me at (218) 355-3586 with any questions related to this matter.

Respectfully yours. 2 card

Susan Ludwig

## PUBLIC DOCUMENT TRADE SECRET DATA EXCISED

## STATE OF MINNESOTA BEFORE THE MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

### I. INTRODUCTION

On February 15, 2017, Minnesota Power ("the Company") filed a Petition with the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission ("Commission") seeking approval for ALLETE, Inc.'s ("ALLETE's") 2017 consolidated capital structure and authorization to issue securities. On March 20, 2017, the Department of Commerce – Division of Energy Resources ("Department") submitted comments in this Docket, recommending the Commission approve Minnesota Power's Petition and requesting additional information from the Company. Minnesota Power agrees with the Department's analysis and recommendations and provides these additional comments.

#### **II. ADITIONAL INFORMATION**

The Department noted that there were significant differences between ALLETE's 2016 projected capital expenditures and its 2016 actual capital expenditures and requested that the Company provide explanations for these differences. Exhibit L, Page 1 of the Initial Petition shows the 2016 projected and actual capital expenditures by category, including regulated and nonregulated expenditures. Pages 2 and 3 of Exhibit L provide a high level summary of the 2016 variances. A portion of Exhibit L is included in Table 1 below, which shows the most significant cost variances are to the Generation, Transmission, and Non-Regulated segments. An explanation of the most significant variances to these segments is included below.

## Table 1. ALLETE 2016 Capital Expenditures

LLETE, Inc.		
ected Capital Expenditu	res <sup>a</sup>	
illions rounded)		
	2016	
Projections <sup>B</sup>	Actuals	Variance
22	10	(12)
37	27	(10)
59	37	(22)
25	11	(14)
41	29	(12)
66	40	(26)
41	45	4
41 41	45 <b>45</b>	4 4
41	45	4 (44)
41 166	45	4 (44)
41       166       TRADE SECR       P's 2016 Capital Structure	45 122 ET DATA EX e (Docket No. E0	4 (44) CISED
41       166       TRADE SECR       P's 2016 Capital Structure       d repairs and ongoing gen	45 122 ET DATA EX e (Docket No. E0 eration upkeep	4 (44) CISED
41 166 TRADE SECR P's 2016 Capital Structure d repairs and ongoing gent e Great Northern Transmi	45 122 ET DATA EX e (Docket No. E0 heration upkeep ssion Line	4 (44) CISED 15/S-16-165)
41       166       TRADE SECR       P's 2016 Capital Structure       d repairs and ongoing gen	45 122 ET DATA EX ET DATA EX ET DATA EX ET DATA EX EX ET DATA EX EX ET DATA EX EX ET DATA EX EX EX EX DATA EX EX EX EX DATA EX EX EX DATA EX EX EX EX DATA EX EX EX EX DATA EX EX EX EX EX EX EX EX EX EX EX EX EX E	4 (44) CISED 15/S-16-165) ission upkeep
i	ected Capital Expenditu illions rounded) 2016 Projections <sup>b</sup> 22 37 59	ected Capital Expenditures <sup>a</sup> illions rounded)           2016           2016           Projections <sup>b</sup> Actuals           22           10           37           27           59           37           25           11           41

g Includes capital expenditures, acquisitions, and investments at ALLETE's affiliates

# A. <u>Generation</u>

As shown in Table 1, the 2016 actual expenditures for Generation were approximately \$22 million lower than projected. Of this amount, about \$12 million is related to the Boswell 4 Environmental project and is primarily due to project costs coming in lower than anticipated as contracts were finalized. Additionally, the budget amount included some contingency costs that

were not ultimately needed. Finally, the Company was able to benefit from sales tax credits in 2016, which offset some of the costs. As part of its normal business practices, Minnesota Power's Tax Department conducted a review of purchases and obtained a refund for eligible sales tax that had been paid by the Company. The sales tax credits were not included in the 2016 projections.

Other generation projects were about \$10 million lower than projected in 2016. This variance is primarily due to projects which were modified as the Company's 2015 Integrated Resource Plan ("IRP")<sup>1</sup> was underway. For example, when the 2016 budget was developed in the summer of 2015, it was assumed that the Company would perform an environmental upgrade and continue to operate Boswell Units 1 and 2 ("BEC1&2") as coal-fired units through 2024, consistent with its preferred plan in the IRP. Minnesota Power has since announced that it will retire BEC1&2 in 2018 and the environmental project will not be needed. Additionally, development costs related to a future gas resource were lower than budgeted. Finally, the Company received sales tax credits in 2016, as described above, which offset some expenditures and which had not been included in the projections.

## B. Transmission

Rider-eligible transmission projects were approximately \$14 million lower than budgeted in 2016. This was primarily due to a change in timing for expenditures related to the Company's Great Northern Transmission Line.

Other transmission projects were lower than projected, primarily due to reduced costs related to the Company's North American Electric Reliability Corporation ("NERC") reliability standards initiative. The Company was able to reduce costs by changing its contracts for external contractors (from "Time and Material" contracts to "Unit Price" contracts), by utilizing more internal crews (the budget assumed more work done by the contractor at a higher cost), by instituting changes to the construction process (such as assigning an inspector to accompany the contractor and help determine how much matting and clearing was required at each site), and by selling used matting materials and crediting the project costs accordingly. When the projections

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Docket No. E015/RP-15-690.

were developed in 2015, there was no procedure in place to credit the project for sales of material.

## C. <u>Non-Regulated</u>

As shown in Table 1, there is a substantial variance between projected and actual capital expenditures at ALLETE's non-regulated businesses. This variance is primarily due to a deferral of initiatives, including business acquisitions. The projected amount included potential business acquisitions that did not occur.

## **III. CONCLUSION**

Minnesota Power appreciates the Department's thorough review of the 2017 Capital Structure Petition and has provided the requested information. The Company looks forward to a Commission hearing on the issue.

Dated: March 28, 2017

Yours Truly,

En Ju

Susan Ludwig Policy Manager Minnesota Power 30 West Superior Street Duluth, MN 55802 (218) 355–3586 sludwig@mnpower.com