



# Minnesota Public Utilities Commission Meeting Agenda

121 7th Place East  
Suite 350  
Saint Paul, MN  
55101-2147

---

Thursday, September 11, 2014

9:30 AM

Large Hearing Room

---

## INTRODUCTION

## ORAL ARGUMENT ITEMS

## DELIBERATION ITEMS

## DECISION ITEMS

1. [Details 2014-233](#)

- \* **P430,521/PA-14-472**                      **Embarq Minnesota, Inc. dba CenturyLink;  
Emily Cooperative Telephone Company**

In the Matter of the Joint Petition of Embarq Minnesota, Inc. dba CenturyLink and Emily Cooperative Telephone Company for the Sale of a Portion of CenturyLink's Crosby Exchange to the Emily Cooperative Telephone Company. (PUC: Oberlander; DOC: Linscheid) **NOTE:** Staff supports the Department's recommendations in this matter.

*Attachments:*                      [DOC Comments 7-22-14 PUBLIC](#)

2. [Details 2014-234](#)

- \* **P6823/M-09-802;**                      **TracFone Wireless, Inc.**  
**P6823/CI-10-519**

In the Matter of a Petition of TracFone Wireless, Inc. for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier (ETC) for the Limited Purpose of Offering Lifeline Service to Qualified Households;

In the Matter of an Investigation into TracFone's Compliance with Remittance Responsibilities under Minn. Stat. §§403.11 and 237.52.

1. What action should the Commission take regarding TracFone's ETC application?
2. What action should the Commission take regarding the investigation into TracFone's compliance with remittance responsibilities under Minn. Stat. §§403.11 and 237.52?  
(PUC: **Brion**)

*Attachments:*                      [Briefing Papers](#)

3. [Details 2014-236](#)

- \*\* **E017/M-14-201**                      **Otter Tail Power**

In the Matter of Otter Tail Power Company's 2013 Demand Side Management Financial Incentives and Annual Filing to Update the CIP Rider.

1. Should the Commission approve Otter Tail's 2013 CIP tracker account?
2. Should the Commission approve an incentive of \$4,026,600 for Otter Tail's 2013 CIP achievements?

3. Should the Commission grant Otter Tail's variance to Minnesota Rules part 7820.3500 (K) and a variance to Minnesota Rules part 7825.2600 for one year after the issue date of the Commission's Order in the present docket?
4. Should the Commission eliminate the carrying charge or otherwise modify its application to Otter Tail's tracker balance for the CIP rider effective with the date of the Commission's Order?
5. Should the Commission approve OTP's request to book its 2013 financial incentive in the month following Commission approval as it has done in the past?
6. At what level should the Commission set Conservation Cost Recovery Adjustment (CCRA)? (PUC: **Fournier**)

Attachments:

[Briefing Papers](#)

### THE FOLLOWING ITEMS WILL NOT BE HEARD BEFORE 10:30 AM

#### 4. [Details 2014-231](#)

\* **IP6650/WS-07-1073**                      **Glacial Ridge Wind LLC**

In the Matter of the Large Wind Energy Conversion System Site Permit of Glacial Ridge Wind LLC.

Should the Commission revoke the site permit? (PUC: **Ek**)

Attachments:

[Briefing Papers](#)

#### 5. [Details 2014-151](#)

\*\* **E015/TL-14-21**                              **Minnesota Power**

In the Matter of the Application of Minnesota Power for a Route Permit for the Great Northern Transmission Line Project in Roseau, Lake of the Woods, Beltrami, Koochiching and Itasca Counties, Minnesota.

What action should the Commission take regarding its charge related to Advisory Task Forces? (PUC: **Kaluzniak**)

Attachments:

[Briefing Papers](#)

#### 6. [Details 2013-414](#)

\*\* **PL6668/CN-13-473;**                      **North Dakota Pipeline Company LLC**  
**PL6668/PPL-13-474**

In the Matter of the Applications of North Dakota Pipeline Company LLC for a Certificate of Need and a Pipeline Routing Permit for the Sandpiper Pipeline Project in Minnesota.

- Which, if any, of the eight system alternatives identified in the Department of Commerce Alternative Routes Summary Report should be accepted for further consideration in these proceedings?
- If accepted, should a system alternative be referred to the administrative law judge for consideration in the certificate of need docket, the routing docket, or both?
- What formal environmental review process, if any, would be appropriate for the certificate of need proceeding in this matter?
- Should the Commission separate the certificate of need and pipeline route permitting proceedings in this matter?
- What action should the Commission take regarding other procedural items, if any? (PUC:

Ek)

Attachments:

[Briefing Papers](#)

## ADJOURNMENT

\* 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)

Please note: For the complete record, please see eDockets