



Energy Facility Permitting
85 7th Place East, Suite 500
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2198
ph 651.539.1500 | fx 651.539.1549
www.energyfacilities.puc.state.mn.us

July 17, 2013

TO: William Grant, Deputy Commissioner

THROUGH: Deborah Pile, Director, Energy Facility Permitting

FROM: Suzanne Steinhauer, Environmental Review Manager, Energy Facility Permitting

RE: Recommendation on the Scope of the Environmental Report for the Xcel Energy Competitive Bidding Process

Action Required

The signature of the deputy commissioner is requested on the attached environmental report (ER) scoping decision. Once signed, Department of Commerce, Energy Facility Permitting (EFP) staff will provide notice of the scoping decision to those persons on the project mailing list.

Background

The Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (Commission) has initiated a Competitive Resource Acquisition Process through which it will select resources to meet the need identified in Xcel Energy's 2010 Integrated Resource Plan (IRP). Because Xcel Energy submitted a bid, the Commission has determined that the proposals will be evaluated through a Certificate of Need-like proceeding.

In its order of June 21, 2013, the Commission accepted proposals from Xcel Energy, Calpine, Corporation, Invenergy, Geronimo Energy, and Great River Energy.¹

In its review the Commission will consider the following alternatives:

- Xcel Energy's proposed three 215 MW combustion turbine gas generators with a total capacity of 645 MW. One of the proposed locations would be at Xcel Energy's existing Black Dog plant in Burnsville. The two additional turbines would be built near Hankinson, North Dakota;
- Calpine Corporation's proposed natural gas combustion turbine and a heat recovery steam generator with a total capacity of 345 MW in Mankato;
- Invenergy's proposed three 178.5 MW natural gas combustion turbines, one in Cannon Falls and two in Dakota County or Scott County, for a combined capacity of 535.5 MW;

¹ eDockets Document ID: [20136-88404-01](https://www.puc.state.mn.us/eDockets/2013/20136-88404-01) (herein after, *Commission's Notice and Order for Hearing*)

- Geronimo Energy's up to 100 MW of solar generation distributed at up to 31 sites across Minnesota; and
- Great River Energy's (GRE) proposed MISO Zone 1 Resource Credits for capacity only.

The proposals will be weighed against each other in a formal evidentiary proceeding based on the certificate of need statute and rules. The Commission has referred this matter to an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) for contested case proceedings. At the conclusion of the process, the Commission is expected to select one or some combination of the proposed alternatives to meet Xcel Energy's identified need. This proceeding is the only proceeding in which the no-build alternative and the size, type, timing, and system configuration will be considered.

Environmental Review

As part of the review process the Commission has requested the Department of Commerce to prepare an ER evaluating the proposals under consideration. An ER examines the potential human and environmental impacts of a proposed project, alternatives to the project, and potential mitigating measures for anticipated adverse impacts.

The resource acquisition process required the solicitation of actual proposed alternatives to Xcel Energy's proposed project. The Commission has determined that due to the nature of the bidding process, combined with the analysis completed in the IRP docket, the proposed alternatives and a no-build alternative for each should comprise the scope of alternatives to be evaluated in the ER for this docket.

On June 24, 2013, EFP staff issued a notice requesting comments on issues to be evaluated in the ER prepared for Xcel Energy's Competitive Resource Acquisition Process. Pursuant to the Commission's directive, there was no public meeting held. The public was given until July 10, 2013, to submit comments on the scope of the ER. Four written comments were received on issues to be evaluated in the ER during the comment period.

- Dakota County commented on issues related to potential power plant sites in Dakota County in the Xcel Energy and Invenergy proposals. Comments identified existing and potential soil contamination, waste disposal, and groundwater contamination at the existing Black Dog site identified in Xcel Energy's proposal. The comments also indicated that there is insufficient environmental information on the proposal for the Hampton Energy Center contained in Invenergy's proposal. Dakota County also requested that the ER provide "a complete traffic analysis and assessment that is consistent with Environmental Assessment Worksheet documentation requirements."
- The Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy, Fresh Energy, Izaak Walton League of America – Midwest Office, and Sierra Club (collectively "Environmental Intervenors"), a party to the proceeding, requested that the environmental report address emissions resulting from GRE's proposal.

- The Minnesota Chamber of Commerce (Chamber) questioned the need for the acquisition process in the timeframe anticipated.
- Mr. Bob Messerich indicated a preference for a more distributed solar option than the one proposed by Geronimo Energy. Mr. Messerich also expressed a preference for solar development in the “built environment,” rather than on agricultural or other commercially viable land.

EFP Staff Response to Comments

EFP staff appreciates Dakota County’s identification of issues related to the Black Dog site and anticipates exploring these issues in greater depth in the ER. Staff notes that Invenergy did file a public version of an environmental supplement on June 27, 2013, that provides some additional environmental information. With respect to traffic impacts, EFP staff notes that, although traffic will be discussed in the ER, the detailed traffic analysis to which Dakota County refers is the type of analysis that would be included in the environmental review (EA or EIS) required as part of the siting decision.

Environmental Intervenors’ comments reflect its earlier comments to the Commission recommending that the ER should identify environmental impacts, specifically emissions, of GRE’s proposal based on the resource mix identified by GRE.² The Commission considered this argument at the time of application acceptance and concluded that the GRE proposal was for capacity only, not energy, and is not tied to specific generators. The Commission’s order requested that the Department design its environmental review with the proceeding conclusion in mind.³

The Chamber’s comments do not address the impacts to be evaluated in the ER, but rather address the need for Xcel Energy to add additional generation in the specified timeframe. The Commission has already determined the need for generation. The manner and timing through which this need is met is the subject of the proceeding.

Mr. Messerich’s comments indicate a preference for an alternative that is outside the range of alternatives the Commission will consider.

Schedule

The scoping decision is due in a timely manner following the close of the public comment period on July 10, 2013. Please review and provide a signature by Friday, July 19, 2013. If you require any changes or have any questions, please contact staff as soon as possible. The environmental report is scheduled to be completed by mid-October 2013.

² eDocket Document ID: [20135-86900-01](#)

³ Commission’s Notice and Order for Hearing
E002/CN-12-1240

-BLANK PAGE-



In the Matter of the Petition of Northern States Power Company d/b/a Xcel Energy for Approval of Competitive Resources Acquisition Proposal and Certificate of Need Docket

**ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT
SCOPING DECISION
PUC DOCKET NO. E002/CN-12-1240**

The above matter has come before the deputy commissioner of the Department of Commerce (Department) for a decision on the scope of the environmental report (ER) to be prepared for the Xcel Energy's Competitive Resource Acquisition Process.

Project Description

The Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (Commission) has initiated a Competitive Resource Acquisition Process through which it will select resources to meet the need identified in Xcel Energy's 2010 Integrated Resource Plan (IRP). Because Xcel Energy submitted a bid, the Commission has determined that the proposals will be evaluated through a Certificate of Need-like proceeding.

In its order of June 21, 2013, the Commission accepted proposals from Xcel Energy, Calpine, Corporation, Invenergy, Geronimo Energy, and Great River Energy (GRE).

In its review the Commission will consider the following alternatives:

- Xcel Energy's proposed three 215 MW combustion turbine gas generators with a total capacity of 645 MW. One of the proposed locations would be located at Xcel Energy's existing Black Dog plant in Burnsville. The two additional turbines would be built near Hankinson, North Dakota;
- Calpine Corporation's proposed natural gas combustion turbine and a heat recovery steam generator with a total capacity of 345 MW in Mankato;
- Invenergy's proposed three 178.5 MW natural gas combustion turbines, one in Cannon Falls and two in Dakota County or Scott County, for a combined capacity of 535.5 MW;
- Geronimo Energy's proposed up to 100 MW of solar generation distributed at up to 31 sites across Minnesota; and
- GRE's proposed MISO Zone 1 Resource Credits for capacity only.

The proposals will be weighed against each other in a formal evidentiary proceeding based on the certificate of need statute and rules. The Commission has referred this matter to an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) for contested case proceedings. At the conclusion of the process, the Commission is expected to select one or some combination of the proposed

alternatives to meet Xcel Energy's identified need. This proceeding is the only proceeding in which the no-build alternative and the size, type, timing, and system configuration will be considered.

Environmental Review

As part of the review process the Commission has requested the Department of Commerce to prepare an ER evaluating the proposals under consideration. An ER examines the potential human and environmental impacts of a proposed project, alternatives to the project, and potential mitigating measures for anticipated adverse impacts.

ER Scoping Process

The resource acquisition process required the solicitation of actual proposed alternatives to Xcel Energy's proposed project. The Commission has determined that due to the nature of the bidding process, combined with the analysis completed in the IRP docket, the proposed alternatives and a no-build alternative for each should comprise the scope of alternatives to be evaluated in the ER for this docket.

A comment period, ending on July 10, 2013, provided the public an opportunity to submit comments to Department staff on issues for consideration in the scope of the ER. Four comment letters were received by the close of the comment period.

- Dakota County commented on issues related to existing and potential soil contamination, waste disposal, and groundwater contamination at the existing Black Dog site identified in Xcel Energy's proposal. The comments also indicated that there is insufficient environmental information on the proposal for the Hampton Energy Center contained in Invenergy's proposal.
- The Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy, Fresh Energy, Izaak Walton League of America – Midwest Office, and Sierra Club (collectively "Environmental Intervenors"), a party to the proceeding, requested that the environmental report address emissions resulting from GRE's proposal.
- The Minnesota Chamber of Commerce questioned the need for the acquisition process in the timeframe anticipated.
- Mr. Bob Messrich indicated a preference for a more distributed solar than the one proposed by Geronimo Energy. Mr. Messerich also expressed a preference for solar development in the "built environment," rather than on agricultural or other commercially viable land.

Scoping comments are available for viewing on the Department's energy facilities permitting website at: <http://mn.gov/commerce/energyfacilities/Docket.html?Id=33228> and on the eDockets website at: <https://edockets.state.mn.us/EFiling/search.jsp> (enter "12" for year and "1240" for number).

HAVING REVIEWED THE MATTER, consulted with Department staff, and in accordance with Minnesota Rule 7849.1400 and 7849.1500, I hereby make the following scoping decision:

MATTERS TO BE ADDRESSED

1.0 Project Description - Xcel Energy Competitive Resource Acquisition Process

- 1.1 Description of process
- 1.2 Sources of information

2.0 Alternatives to be Evaluated

- 2.1 Xcel Energy's proposed three 215 MW combustion turbine gas generators and the no-build alternative to Xcel Energy's proposal
 - 2.1.1 Description of proposed project including proposed facilities and general construction and reclamation processes.
 - 2.1.2 Description of no-build alternative to Xcel Energy's proposal.
- 2.2 Calpine Corporation's proposed 345 MW natural gas combustion turbine and a heat recovery steam generator and the no-build alternative to Calpine's proposal
 - 2.2.1 Description of proposed project including proposed facilities and general construction and reclamation processes.
 - 2.2.2 Description of no-build alternative to Calpine's proposal.
- 2.3 Invenergy's proposed three 178.5 MW natural gas combustion turbines and the no-build alternative to Invenergy's proposal
 - 2.3.1 Description of proposed project including proposed facilities and general construction and reclamation processes.
 - 2.3.2 Description of no-build alternative to Invenergy's proposal.
- 2.4 Geronimo Energy's proposed up to 100 MW of solar generation and the no-build alternative to Geronimo's proposal
 - 2.4.1 Description of proposed project including proposed facilities and general construction and reclamation processes.
 - 2.4.2 Description of no-build alternative to Geronimo Energy's proposal.
- 2.5 GRE's proposed MISO Zone 1 Resource Credits for capacity only and the no-build alternative to GRE's proposal
 - 2.5.1 Description of proposed project.
 - 2.5.2 Description of no-build alternative to GRE's proposal.

3.0 Human and Environmental Impacts and Mitigation of Project and Evaluated Alternatives

- 3.1 Land Requirements
- 3.2 Land Use and Displacement
- 3.3 Biological Resources – flora, fauna, and sensitive natural resources
- 3.4 Water Resource
- 3.5 Geology and Soils
- 3.6 Health and Safety
- 3.7 Economic Impacts – Jobs, local tax revenues

- 3.8 Traffic
- 3.9 Emissions
- 3.10 Hazardous air pollutants and Volatile Organic Compounds
- 3.11 Visibility impairment
- 3.12 Ozone formation
- 3.13 Fuel availability and delivery
- 3.14 Associated transmission facilities
- 3.15 Water appropriations
- 3.16 Wastewater
- 3.17 Solid and hazardous wastes
- 3.18 Noise

4.0 Feasibility and availability of alternatives

- 4.1 Xcel Energy's proposal for three 215 MW combustion turbine gas generators
- 4.2 Calpine Corporation proposal for a 345 MW natural gas combustion turbine and heat recovery steam generator
- 4.3 Invenergy's proposal for three 178.5 MW natural gas combustion turbines
- 4.4 Geronimo Energy's proposal for up to 100 MW of solar generation
- 4.5 GRE's proposal for MISO Zone 1 Resource Credits for capacity only

5.0 Required permits

ISSUES OUTSIDE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT

The environmental report will not consider the following matters:

1. Impacts or mitigative measures associated with specific sites.
2. The negotiation and content of easement agreements by which land owners are paid for property rights.
3. Any alternatives not specifically described in this scoping decision

SCHEDULE

The environmental report is anticipated to be completed and available in October 2013. A public hearing will be held after the report has been issued and notice served.

Signed this 17th day of July, 2013

STATE OF MINNESOTA
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE



William Grant, Deputy Commissioner