



STATE OF MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

NOTICE OF COMMISSION MEETING

Issued: December 6, 2013

The items listed on the attached agenda will be heard at the Commission's regularly scheduled meeting.

DATE: Thursday, December 19, 2013

TIME: 9:30am

LOCATION: Public Utilities Commission Large Hearing Room
121 7th Place East, Suite 350
St. Paul MN 55101-2147

DIRECTIONS: Visit www.puc.state.mn.us or
Call 651-296-0406 or 1-800-657-3782, Option 3

Occasionally items may need to be rescheduled. Commission staff will make all reasonable efforts to notify you if your item is rescheduled. However, if you wish to confirm this hearing date, please visit www.puc.state.mn.us or call 651-296-0406 or 1-800-657-3782.

Change your mailing preferences: E-mail consumer.puc@state.mn.us or call 651-296-0406.

The Commission hearing rooms have wheelchair access. If other reasonable accommodations are needed to enable you to fully participate in a Commission meeting (e.g., sign language or large print materials), please call 651-296-0406 or 1-800-657-3782 at least one week in advance of the meeting. Persons with hearing loss or speech disabilities may call us through their preferred Telecommunications Relay Service.

Public Utilities Commission

Agenda

Thursday, December 19, 2013

9:30 AM start time

Utilities represented: Energy Facilities, Natural Gas, Electricity

To view all documents related to the following Agenda items, visit [eDockets](#)

DELIBERATION ITEMS

No Items

DECISION ITEMS

***1 E002/TL-12-1151 Northern States Power Company d/b/a Xcel Energy**

In the Matter of the Application of Xcel Energy for a Route Permit for the Kohlman Lake to Goose Lake 115 kV Transmission Line Upgrade Project in Ramsey County, Minnesota.

Should the Commission find that the environmental assessment and the record created at the public hearing adequately address the issues identified in the scoping decision?
Should the Commission issue a route permit identifying a specific route and permit conditions for the Kohlman Lake to Goose Lake 115 kV Transmission Line Project in Ramsey County? (PUC: **Ek**)

***2 IP6646/WS-13-216 Stoneray Power Partners, LLC**

In the Matter of Stoneray Power Partners, LLC for a Large Wind Energy Conversion System Site Permit for the 105 MW Stoneray Wind Project in Pipestone and Murray Counties.

Should the Commission issue a draft site permit? (PUC: **DeBleeckere**)

***3 E015/CN-12-1163 Minnesota Power**

In the Matter of the Application of Minnesota Power for a Certificate of Need for the Great Northern High Voltage Transmission Line Project from the Manitoba, Canada – Minnesota Border to the Blackberry Substation near Grand Rapids, Minnesota.

Should the Commission accept the certificate of need application as substantially complete?

Should the Commission refer the Matter to the Office of Administrative Hearings for a contested case proceeding?

What action should the Commission take regarding other procedural items?

(PUC: **Kaluzniak**)

***4 E015/GP-13-978 Minnesota Power**

In the Matter of Minnesota Power's Partial Exemption Application for the Laskin Energy Center Natural Gas Pipeline Project.

Should the Commission find the application complete? (PUC: **DeBleekere**)

***5 E015/TL-12-1123 Minnesota Power**

In the Matter of the Application of Minnesota Power for a Route Permit for the Line 39 115 kV Transmission Line Project in St. Louis County, Minnesota.

Should the Commission find that the environmental assessment and the record created at the public hearing adequately address the issues identified in the scoping decision?

Should the Commission issue a route permit identifying a specific route and permit conditions for the Line 39 115 kV Transmission Line Project in St. Louis County? (PUC: **DeBleekere**)

***6 G004/D-12-565; G004/D-13-448 Great Plains Natural Gas Company, a division of MDU Resources Group, Inc.**

In the Matter of a request by Great Plains Natural Gas Company for Approval of its 2012 Five-Year Depreciation Study;

In the Matter of a Request by Great Plains Natural Gas Company for Approval of its 2013 Annual Depreciation Study.

Should the Commission approve the proposed depreciation parameters and the resulting depreciation rates for both studies?

Should the rates be effective January 1, 2013 and should the 2013 study rates supersede the 2012 study rates? (PUC: **Dasinger, Bender, Schwieger**)

***7 E002/PA-13-484 Northern States Power Company d/b/a Xcel Energy**

In the Matter of Xcel Energy's Petition for Approval of Transfer and Exchange of Transmission Assets with great River Energy.

Should the Commission grant approval of the proposed Asset Exchange Agreement under Minn. Stat. 216B.50?

Should the Commission grant a variance to Minn. Rule 7825.1800 Subp. B?
(PUC: **Dasinger, Alonzo**)

****8 E002/M-12-50 Northern States Power Company d/b/a Xcel Energy**

In the Matter of Xcel Energy's Petition for Approval of 2012 Transmission Cost Recovery (TCR), Project Eligibility, TCR Rate Factors, and 2011 True-up.

Should the Commission approve Xcel Energy's Petition for Approval of 2012 TCR Project Eligibility, TCR Rate Factors and True-Up for 2011? (PUC: **Dasinger, Schwieger**)

****9 E002/M-00-1583 Northern States Power Company d/b/a Xcel Energy**

In the Matter of the Request of Northern States Power Company d/b/a Xcel Energy for Approval of a Renewable Development Oversight Process.

Should the Commission require Xcel to return to Xcel's Renewable Development Fund (RDF) the amount of about \$1.1 million expended in 2003 on the Ecovation f/k/a AnAerobics, Inc. project? (PUC: **Mackenzie**)

****10 E999/CI-00-1636 All Electric Utilities**

In the Matter of the Investigation into Environmental and Socioeconomic Costs Under Minn. Stat. §216B.2422, subd. 3.

- 1) What is the scope of action requested by the petitioners?
- 2) Should the Commission reopen this matter, either by granting the Clean Energy Organization's Motion or on the Commission's own motion?
- 3) If the matter is reopened, what scope of issues should be examined and what procedures should be used? (PUC: **Rebholz, Kaml**)

* One star indicates agenda item is unusual but is not disputed.

** Two stars indicate a disputed item or significant legal or procedural issue to be resolved.

(Ex Parte Rules apply)