

**State of Minnesota**  
**OFFICE OF ENERGY SECURITY**

**Utility Information Request**

Docket Number: ET02, E002/CN-06-1115

Date of Request: March 03, 2008

Requested From: James Alders  
Xcel Energy

Response Due: March 24, 2008

Analyst Requesting Information: Susan L. Peirce

Type of Inquiry:    .....Financial            .....Rate of Return            .....Rate Design  
                          .....Engineering            .....Forecasting            .....Conservation  
                          .....Cost of Service        .....CIP                        .....Other:

*If you feel your responses are trade secret or privileged, please indicate this on your response.*

Request No.	
49	RE: Dairyland Response to OES #34  According to Dairyland's response to OES #34, renewable generation is assigned to states based on each individual state's requirements. For 2006, identify the total amount of generation needed to meet green pricing programs for all states.

---

---

Response by: _____	List sources of information: _____
Title: _____	_____
Department: _____	_____
Telephone: _____	_____

**State of Minnesota**  
**OFFICE OF ENERGY SECURITY**

**Utility Information Request**

Docket Number: ET02, E002/CN-06-1115

Date of Request: March 03, 2008

Requested From: James Alders  
Xcel Energy

Response Due: March 24, 2008

Analyst Requesting Information: Susan L. Peirce

Type of Inquiry:    .....Financial            .....Rate of Return            .....Rate Design  
                          .....Engineering            .....Forecasting            .....Conservation  
                          .....Cost of Service        .....CIP                        .....Other:

*If you feel your responses are trade secret or privileged, please indicate this on your response.*

Request No.	
50	RE: Minnesota Power Response to OES #34  According to MP's response to OES #34, no renewable generation is assigned to green pricing programs. For 2006, please identify the total amount of renewable generation (in kWh) needed to meet green pricing programs.

---

---

Response by: \_\_\_\_\_ List sources of information: \_\_\_\_\_  
Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
Department: \_\_\_\_\_  
Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_

**State of Minnesota**  
**OFFICE OF ENERGY SECURITY**

**Utility Information Request**

Docket Number: ET02, E002/CN-06-1115

Date of Request: March 03, 2008

Requested From: James Alders  
Xcel Energy

Response Due: March 24, 2008

Analyst Requesting Information: Susan L. Peirce

Type of Inquiry:    .....Financial            .....Rate of Return            .....Rate Design  
                         .....Engineering            .....Forecasting            .....Conservation  
                         .....Cost of Service            .....CIP            .....Other:

*If you feel your responses are trade secret or privileged, please indicate this on your response.*

Request No.	
51	RE: Xcel Response to OES #34  Both the Hennepin Energy Resource Recovery facility and the Bayfront facility state that 16 percent of the generation is assigned to Wisconsin, and 0 percent to Minnesota. Where is the remaining generation assigned?

---

---

Response by: \_\_\_\_\_ List sources of information: \_\_\_\_\_  
Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
Department: \_\_\_\_\_  
Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_

**State of Minnesota**  
**OFFICE OF ENERGY SECURITY**

**Utility Information Request**

Docket Number: ET02, E002/CN-06-1115

Date of Request: March 03, 2008

Requested From: James Alders  
Xcel Energy

Response Due: March 24, 2008

Analyst Requesting Information: Susan L. Peirce

Type of Inquiry:    .....Financial            .....Rate of Return            .....Rate Design  
                          .....Engineering            .....Forecasting            .....Conservation  
                          .....Cost of Service            .....CIP                    .....Other:

*If you feel your responses are trade secret or privileged, please indicate this on your response.*

Request No.	
52	RE: Xcel Response to OES #34  With respect to the Tholen facilities, how much of the total generation of these facilities is allocated to Windsource, how much to Wisconsin programs, and how much to Minnesota.

---

---

Response by: \_\_\_\_\_ List sources of information: \_\_\_\_\_  
Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
Department: \_\_\_\_\_  
Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_

**State of Minnesota**  
**OFFICE OF ENERGY SECURITY**

**Utility Information Request**

Docket Number: ET02, E002/CN-06-1115

Date of Request: March 03, 2008

Requested From: James Alders  
Xcel Energy

Response Due: March 24, 2008

Analyst Requesting Information: Susan L. Peirce

Type of Inquiry:    .....Financial            .....Rate of Return            .....Rate Design  
                          .....Engineering            .....Forecasting            .....Conservation  
                          .....Cost of Service            .....CIP                    .....Other:

*If you feel your responses are trade secret or privileged, please indicate this on your response.*

Request No.	
53	RE: Xcel Response to OES #34  For each of the planned facilities listed, please provide an estimated year when those facilities will be in service.

---

---

Response by: \_\_\_\_\_ List sources of information: \_\_\_\_\_  
Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
Department: \_\_\_\_\_  
Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_

**State of Minnesota**  
**OFFICE OF ENERGY SECURITY**

**Utility Information Request**

Docket Number: ET02, E002/CN-06-1115

Date of Request: March 03, 2008

Requested From: James Alders  
Xcel Energy

Response Due: March 24, 2008

Analyst Requesting Information: Susan L. Peirce

Type of Inquiry:    .....Financial            .....Rate of Return            .....Rate Design  
                          .....Engineering            .....Forecasting            .....Conservation  
                          .....Cost of Service            .....CIP                    .....Other:

*If you feel your responses are trade secret or privileged, please indicate this on your response.*

Request No.	
54	RE: MRES Response to OES #34  In the 2007 REO Report to the Legislature, MRES reported generation from the following facilities: Zephyr 8, Freedom 9, and Elk River biomass. None of these facilities is reported in the Companies recent response to OES #34. Are these facilities still in use by MRES? If so, please provide the information requested in OES #34 for each facility.

Response by: \_\_\_\_\_

List sources of information:

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**State of Minnesota**  
**OFFICE OF ENERGY SECURITY**

**Utility Information Request**

Docket Number: ET02, E002/CN-06-1115

Date of Request: March 03, 2008

Requested From: James Alders  
Xcel Energy

Response Due: March 24, 2008

Analyst Requesting Information: Susan L. Peirce

Type of Inquiry:    .....Financial            .....Rate of Return            .....Rate Design  
                          .....Engineering            .....Forecasting            .....Conservation  
                          .....Cost of Service            .....CIP                    .....Other:

*If you feel your responses are trade secret or privileged, please indicate this on your response.*

Request No.	
55	RE: Dairyland Response to OES #34  In the 2007 REO Report to the Legislature, Dairyland reported generation from the following facilities: Tjaden Wind Farm and Chandler Wind Farm. None of these facilities is reported in the Companies recent response to OES #34. Are these facilities still in use by Dairyland? If so, please provide the information requested in OES #34 for each facility.

---

Response by: _____	List sources of information: _____
Title: _____	_____
Department: _____	_____
Telephone: _____	_____

**State of Minnesota**  
**OFFICE OF ENERGY SECURITY**

**Utility Information Request**

Docket Number: ET02, E002/CN-06-1115

Date of Request: March 03, 2008

Requested From: James Alders  
Xcel Energy

Response Due: March 24, 2008

Analyst Requesting Information: Susan L. Peirce

Type of Inquiry:    .....Financial            .....Rate of Return            .....Rate Design  
                          .....Engineering            .....Forecasting            .....Conservation  
                          .....Cost of Service            .....CIP                    .....Other:

*If you feel your responses are trade secret or privileged, please indicate this on your response.*

Request No.	
56	<p>RE: Response to OES #35</p> <p>According to the Wisconsin requirements, for the years 2006 – 2009, each utility may not decrease its renewable energy percentage of the electricity sold to customers below the utility’s average renewable-energy percentage for 2001, 2002 and 2003. Please provide the baseline percentage for each of the following utilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Dairyland Power Cooperative</li><li>b. Great River Energy</li><li>c. Xcel Energy</li></ul>

---

Response by: \_\_\_\_\_ List sources of information: \_\_\_\_\_  
Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
Department: \_\_\_\_\_  
Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_

**State of Minnesota**  
**OFFICE OF ENERGY SECURITY**

**Utility Information Request**

Docket Number: ET02, E002/CN-06-1115

Date of Request: March 03, 2008

Requested From: James Alders  
Xcel Energy

Response Due: March 24, 2008

Analyst Requesting Information: Susan L. Peirce

Type of Inquiry:    .....Financial            .....Rate of Return            .....Rate Design  
                          .....Engineering            .....Forecasting            .....Conservation  
                          .....Cost of Service            .....CIP                    .....Other:

*If you feel your responses are trade secret or privileged, please indicate this on your response.*

Request No.	
57	RE: Response to OES #35  With respect to Dairyland's renewable obligations in the State of Illinois, please clarify if Dairyland continues to be subject to the earlier renewable obligation (5% by 2010; 15% by 2020), or is no longer subject to a renewable obligation as a cooperative.

---

Response by: _____	List sources of information: _____
Title: _____	_____
Department: _____	_____
Telephone: _____	_____

**State of Minnesota**  
**OFFICE OF ENERGY SECURITY**

**Utility Information Request**

Docket Number: ET02, E002/CN-06-1115

Date of Request: March 03, 2008

Requested From: James Alders  
Xcel Energy

Response Due: March 24, 2008

Analyst Requesting Information: Susan L. Peirce

Type of Inquiry:    .....Financial            .....Rate of Return            .....Rate Design  
                          .....Engineering            .....Forecasting            .....Conservation  
                          .....Cost of Service            .....CIP                    .....Other:

*If you feel your responses are trade secret or privileged, please indicate this on your response.*

Request No.	
58	<p>Please explain how the accredited capacity for a facility is determined.</p> <p>a. If determined by other entities (i.e. MISO, MAPP), please provide information on the factors they consider and how they determine accredited capacity.</p> <p>b. Does accredited capacity change over the life of the facility? If so, please explain how those changes are made, and the frequency of any updates.</p> <p>c. A number of the hydro facilities listed in response to OES IR No. 34 show accredited capacity greater than the nameplate capacity. Please explain.</p> <p>d. Do the utilities use standard rates to estimate accredited capacity for planning purposes? If so, please provide those rates along with an explanation of how those rate(s) were determined.</p>

Response by: \_\_\_\_\_

List sources of information:

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_