

BEFORE THE MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

LeRoy Koppendrayner	Chair
Marshall Johnson	Commissioner
Ken Nickolai	Commissioner
Thomas Pugh	Commissioner
Phyllis A. Reha	Commissioner

In the Matter of the Application of Northern
States Power Company for Authority to
Increase Minnesota Retail Electric Rates

ISSUE DATE: March 13, 2006

DOCKET NO. E-002/GR-05-1428

ORDER DENYING RECONSIDERATION

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On November 2, 2005, Xcel filed an application for a proposed rate increase, in Docket No. E-002/GR-05-1428. Several parties, including Myer Shark, challenged Xcel's petition as premature given the terms and provisions in Xcel's merger stipulation agreements, and in the Commission's *Order Approving Merger, As Conditioned*, issued June 12, 2000, in Docket No. E,G-002/PA-99-1031.

At the Commission meeting on December 15, 2005, the Commission took up the issue of whether to accept the rate case filing.

On December 27, 2005, prior to the issuance of Commission's Orders in this matter, Myer Shark filed a petition for reconsideration and a request to stay the interim rates approved by the Commission at its meeting on December 15, 2005.

On December 29, 2005, Xcel filed an objection to the request for a stay.

On December 30, 2005, the Commission issued three Orders in this docket, as follows: 1) *Order Accepting Filing and Suspending Rates*; 2) *Notice and Order For Hearing*; and 3) *Order Setting Interim Rates*. Among other things, the Commission's *Order Accepting Filing and Suspending Rates* found the rate case filing to be substantially complete as of the date of its filing (November 2, 2005) and decided that the Commission's *Merger Order* and the stipulations adopted in that Order did not preclude Xcel filing a petition for a general rate increase prior to January 1, 2006.

On January 30, 2006, Rebecca S. Winegarden and Myer Shark filed petitions asking for reconsideration of the Commission's *Order Accepting Filing and Suspending Rates*.

On February 6, 2006, Xcel filed a reply to these petitions.

On March 7, 2006, this matter came before the Commission.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The Commission has carefully reviewed the entire record and concludes that the requests for reconsideration do not raise new issues requiring development, do not point to new and relevant evidence, do not expose errors or ambiguities in the original Order, and do not otherwise persuade the Commission that it should rethink its original decision.

The Commission concludes that the original decision is the one most consistent with the facts, the law, and the public interest and will deny the requests for reconsideration.

The Commission will so order.

ORDER

1. The motion for reconsideration filed in this case is hereby denied.
2. This Order shall become effective immediately.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION

Burl W. Haar
Executive Secretary

(S E A L)

This document can be made available in alternative formats (i.e., large print or audio tape) by calling (651) 201-2202 (voice) or 1-800-627-3529 (MN relay service).