

Legislation Details (With Text)

File #:	Details 2016- Version: 2 121	Name:		
Туре:	M - Miscellaneous	Status:	Agenda Ready	
File created:	6/21/2016	In control:	PUC Agenda Meeting	
On agenda:	7/14/2016	Final action:		
Title:	 ** G002/M-15-808 Northern States Power Company d/b/a Xcel Energy In the Matter of the Petition of Northern States Power Company, d/b/a Xcel Energy (Xcel or the Company), for Approval of a Gas Utility Infrastructure Cost Rider (GUIC) True-up Report for 2015, the Forecasted 2016 GUIC Revenue Requirement and Revised GUIC Adjustment Factors. Should the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (Commission) accept Xcel's Gas Utility Infrastructure Cost Rider (GUIC) True-up Report for 2015? Should the Commission change the GUIC tracker year to end on March 31, rather than December 31? Should the Commission cap the amount of cost recovery through the GUIC rider? Should the Commission approve or modify Xcel's proposed rate of return used for determining the GUIC Rider revenue requirements? If modified, what rate of return should be used? Should the Commission on its own motion, pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 216B.17, subd. 1, open an investigation into whether Xcel's rates are unreasonable and proceed, with notice, to make such investigation as the Commission may deem necessary? (PUC: Kaml, Morrissey, Brill) 			
Indexes:				

Code sections:

Attachments:

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
7/1//2016	1	PLIC Agenda Meeting		

7/14/2016 1 PUC Agenda Meeting

** G002/M-15-808 Northern States Power Company d/b/a Xcel Energy

In the Matter of the Petition of Northern States Power Company, d/b/a Xcel Energy (Xcel or the Company), for Approval of a Gas Utility Infrastructure Cost Rider (GUIC) True-up Report for 2015, the Forecasted 2016 GUIC Revenue Requirement and Revised GUIC Adjustment Factors.

Should the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (Commission) accept Xcel's Gas Utility Infrastructure Cost Rider (GUIC) True-up Report for 2015?

Should the Commission change the GUIC tracker year to end on March 31, rather than December 31?

Should the Commission cap the amount of cost recovery through the GUIC rider?

Should the Commission approve or modify Xcel's proposed rate of return used for determining the GUIC Rider revenue requirements? If modified, what rate of return should be used?

Should the Commission approve or modify Xcel's proposed 2016 GUIC Rider Revenue Requirements and Revised GUIC Adjustment Factor?

Should the Commission on its own motion, pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 216B.17, subd. 1, open an investigation into whether Xcel's rates are unreasonable and proceed, with notice, to make such investigation as the Commission may deem necessary? (PUC: **Kaml, Morrissey, Brill**)