



February 15, 2025

Senator Nick Frentz, Chair
Senator Andrew Mathews, Ranking Member
Senate Energy and Utilities Finance and Policy Committee
2107 Minnesota Senate Building

Representative Chris Swedzinski, Chair
Representative Patty Acomb, Ranking Member
House Energy and Climate Finance and Policy Division
449 Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.

Dear Chairs and Ranking Members:

We submit this report pursuant to Laws of Minnesota 2017, Chapter 94, Article 10, Section 3, amended Minn. Stat. § 116C.779, subdivision 1, renewable development account. Among other changes, the Renewable Development Account (RDA) was established as a state special revenue fund administered by the commissioner of management and budget, with expenditures from the fund made by legislative appropriation. Previously, the Renewable Development Fund (RDF) was managed by Northern States Power Co. d/b/a Xcel Energy (Xcel Energy) in consultation with an advisory group. The overall functioning of, and most expenditures from, the fund were required to be approved by the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (Commission).

Xcel Energy reports \$22,763,502 was transferred to the RDA administered by the Minnesota Office of Management and Budget (MMB) on January 10, 2025. Xcel Energy previously transferred to the MMB for the RDA:

- \$8,817,885 for 2018
- \$12,566,510 for 2019
- \$14,852,115 for 2020
- \$19,259,667 for 2021
- \$20,159,757 for 2022 and
- \$28,468,278 for 2023.

Under the 2017 amended provisions, an RDA advisory group is to design requests for proposals, evaluate projects, and submit recommendations to Xcel Energy, which has sole authority to determine which expenditures are submitted to the Legislature. The Minnesota Public Utilities

Commission (Commission) is to approve, disapprove, or, if agreed to by Xcel Energy, modify those proposed expenditures. Then, the Commission is to present its recommendations to the Senate and House committees with jurisdiction over energy policy and finance annually by February 15.

However, the Commission received no funding recommendations from an advisory group or from Xcel Energy since the effective date of the amended statute in 2017. Just as in all previous years since then, therefore, the Commission has no recommended appropriations to present to the Legislature. To date, all new program expenditures from the RDA have been directly appropriated through legislation.

We do not expect this situation to change. On December 17, 2024, Xcel Energy filed a letter with the Commission stating that the amended statute does not indicate: who is to serve on the Advisory Group, how the third-party evaluator should be selected, or how the administrative costs should be paid. According to Xcel Energy, given the lack of detail in the statute the Company is not able to provide a recommendation of projects for funding at this time.

The Commission is neither endorsing nor rejecting the observations made by Xcel Energy in its December 17 letter. But based on law changes made in 2017, and that Xcel Energy does not plan to appoint an advisory group or making recommendations for RDA funding, the Commission has no role in RDA oversight and we believe that the annual report we provide under the statute does not provide meaningful information to the legislature. We recommend that this reporting requirement be repealed.

However, the Commission wants to be helpful in providing background information as to recent Commission activities with regards to the legacy appropriations from the RDF and its impact on the RDA to give you an effective frame of reference to work from in your important role of managing this initiative going forward. We continue to outline a few concerns in an attachment to this letter about some ambiguities and uncertainties we have encountered in implementing the 2017 statutory amendments, especially in regard to its responsibilities over the legacy RDF and the transition from the legacy RDF to the RDA.

Xcel Energy's 2024 Annual Report to the Minnesota State Legislature and Minnesota Public Utilities Commission was filed on January 30, 2025. To review that annual report, see www.edockets.state.mn.us and search for Docket No. E002/M-12-1278.

Sincerely,



Executive Secretary

cc: Legislative Reference Library

Attachment

To request this document in another format such as large print or audio, call 651.296.0406 (voice). Persons with a hearing or speech impairment may call using their preferred Telecommunications Relay Service or email consumer.puc@state.mn.us for assistance.

PHONE 651-296-0406 • TOLL FREE 1-800-657-3782 • FAX 651-297-7073 121
7TH PLACE EAST • SUITE 350 • SAINT PAUL, MINNESOTA 55101-2147
MN.GOV/PUC

Background on the Renewable Development Account¹

- **Overview of Renewable Development Legislation**

Funding for renewable development was mandated as part of the 1994 “Prairie Island legislation” codified in Minn. Stat. § 116C.779, that allowed the storage of spent nuclear fuel in dry casks at Northern States Power Company’s (hereinafter referred to as Xcel Energy) Prairie Island nuclear plant. The 1994 law required the company to transfer \$500,000 a year after 1999 to a Renewable Development Fund (RDF) for each dry cask at the Prairie Island plant containing fuel. The 1994 legislation did not provide for oversight of the RDF or specify a role for the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (Commission) or any other entity.

In 1999, the statute was amended to provide that expenditures from the RDF could be made only after approval by the Commission. In 2003, the statute was further amended, including changing the amount Xcel Energy was to transfer to the RDF to a flat \$16 million annually, and creating a Renewable Energy Production Incentive (REPI) to be funded from the RDF and overseen by the Department of Commerce. In 2007, that statute was again amended to require \$350,000 annually per cask at Xcel Energy’s Monticello nuclear plant also be transferred to the RDF. Changes were made in 2012 that further specified operational and administrative aspects of the RDF and the Commission’s authority.

In 2017, Minn. Stat. §116C.779 was substantially amended [Laws of Minnesota 2017, Chapter 94, Article 10, Section 3], replacing the RDF with a Renewable Development Account (RDA) that is a Special Revenue fund in the state treasury, administered by Minnesota Management and Budget (MMB). The RDA legislation includes a process for an advisory group to issue Requests for

¹ For more detailed information, the Legislature may wish to refer to the following:

- Commission Orders in Dockets 00-1583, 03-1883, 07-675, and 12-1278
- Annual Commission dockets reviewing RDF financial reports and establishing rate rider recovery factors. The most recent Commission decisions are in Dockets 17-712, 18-628, 19- 609, 20-766, and 23-434.
- Xcel Energy files annual RDF reports to the legislature. The February 15, 2024, report can be found on the Legislative Reference Library website and in e-dockets under the docket numbers in the first bullet point.

Proposals (RFPs) and make recommendations to Xcel Energy for the projects that should be funded; Xcel Energy determines which projects are brought forward to the Commission. The Commission is to make its funding recommendations to the Legislature by February 15 of each year. Expenditures from the RDA must be appropriated by law by the Legislature.

In 2023, this section was amended to reduce the total amount transferred annually by \$3,750,000, pursuant to a settlement agreement between Xcel Energy and the Prairie Island Indian Community.² Additional requirements were also added for project receiving funds from the account.

- **Overview of Commission Implementation of RDF Legislation**

The Commission has overseen four cycles of RDF grant processes, in Dockets 00-1583, 03-1883, 07-675, and 12-1278. The Commission issued its first RDF Order on April 20, 2001, in Docket 00-1583, which established the RDF administrative structure, governance process, operations guidelines, regulatory oversight procedures, fund accounting, and cost recovery. Subsequently, the Commission issued several Orders on these issues, to reflect changes in legislation, changes in technologies, and lessons learned.

Over the course of these four RDF grant cycles, 81 RDF projects were approved and moved forward. There is currently one active project, with the Minnesota Renewable Energy Society. In addition, Renewable Energy Production Incentive (REPI) programs are funded through the RDF and administered by the Department of Commerce, and various other legislatively mandated programs are being funded (e.g. Solar*Rewards, Solar*Rewards for Schools).

Uncertainties on Implementation of Transition from RDF to RDA

The Commission’s experience to date with the transition from the RDF to the RDA have identified some uncertainties about the general administration of the legacy RDF and new RDA that the Commission would like to bring to the Legislature’s attention.

- **Commission Responsibility for Legacy RDF Matters**

The 2017 amendments deleted language requiring Commission approval of expenditures from the account.

~~(e) Expenditures authorized by this subdivision from the account may be made only after approval by order of the Public Utilities Commission upon a petition by the public utility. The commission may approve proposed expenditures, may disapprove proposed expenditures that it finds to be not in~~

² Minn. Stat. § 216B.1645, subd. 4.

~~compliance with this subdivision or otherwise not in the public interest, and may, if agreed to by the public utility, modify proposed expenditures. The commission may approve reasonable and necessary expenditures for administering the account in an amount not to exceed five percent of expenditures. Commission approval is not required for expenditures required under subdivisions 2 and 3, section 116C.7791, or other law.~~

The Commission has continued to make decisions related to legacy RDF grant projects that were approved by the Commission prior to the 2017 amendments. For example, the Commission approved amendments to a grant contract with the University of Minnesota in orders issued in Docket 12-1278 on April 27 and November 23, 2021. In an October 15, 2018, Order in Docket 17-712, the Commission directed Xcel Energy to exercise its termination rights under the Crown Hydro grant contract. In an October 11, 2018, Order in Docket 12-1278, the Commission approved amendments to the grant contract with the Minnesota Renewable Energy Society (MRES). In 2024, Xcel proposed updates to the MRES contract which is the final grant under the former RDF.

- **Process for Project Recommendations under the RDA**

The 2017 amendments set out a framework for recommending to the Legislature projects to be funded through the RDA. It includes having an advisory group issue RFPs, evaluate projects, and recommend to Xcel Energy which projects should be funded. The utility has the sole authority to decide which projects shall be submitted by the advisory group to the Legislature.³ The Commission is to only approve, disapprove, or modify with Xcel Energy's permission, proposed expenditures. The statute then provides that the Commission is to (also) submit its recommended appropriations from the Account to the Legislature by February 15 of each year.

In each annual report since 2017, Xcel Energy has flagged a lack of legislative guidance on the creation of the RDA advisory group. The statute does not specify how these processes are implemented, including who determines the make-up of the advisory group, how the group is funded, who and how is it determined when an RFP should be issued, what types of projects should be eligible, and how much money should be set aside for projects to be bid into the RFP. The latter is particularly problematic, given the number of bills in the legislature which directly appropriate monies to specific projects outside of any RFP process. The statute also does not identify any other entity responsible for determining RDA guidance.

The statute also does not specify whether any entity other than the advisory group and Xcel Energy has any oversight role. The Commission assumes that its role is limited to overseeing the remainder of the legacy RDF processes and it does not have a role in RDA implementation or

³ The Commission assumes the intent is that Xcel Energy submit the projects to the Commission instead of, (or perhaps in addition to), the Legislature, since the statute goes on to require the Commission to recommend proposed expenditures to the Legislature.

oversight.

Xcel Energy and the advisory group did not issue RFPs in 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, or 2024 and consequently no further processes took place.

- **Recovery of RDA Amounts**

Minn. Stat. §216B.1645, provides in part that:

216B.1645 POWER PURCHASE CONTRACT OR INVESTMENT

Subdivision 1. **Commission authority.** Upon the petition of a public utility, the Public Utilities Commission shall approve or disapprove power purchase contracts, investments, or expenditures entered into or made by the utility to satisfy the wind and biomass mandates contained in sections 216B.169, 216B.2423, and 216B.2424, and to satisfy the renewable energy objectives and standards set forth in section 216B.1691, including reasonable investments and expenditures made to:

....

3. develop renewable energy sources from the account required in section 116C.779.

Subdivision 2. **Cost recovery.** (a) The following expenses are recoverable from utility ratepayers:

...

(2) expenses incurred by the utility over the duration of an approved contract or the useful life of an investment and expenditures made pursuant to section 116C.779, provided they are not offset by utility revenues attributable to the contracts, investments, or expenditures.

(b) Upon petition by a public utility, the commission shall approve or approve as modified a rate schedule providing for the automatic adjustment of charges to recover the expenses or costs approved by the commission under subdivision 1 . . .

The Commission approved a rate schedule allowing Xcel Energy to recover expenditures from the inception of the RDF. Xcel Energy files a fund accounting and proposed recovery factor annually which is reviewed by the Commission and results in a recovery factor that is included on customer bills. Minn. Stat. § 216B.1645 was not amended in conjunction with the 2017 RDA statutory amendments. Some ambiguity may exist with respect to how Xcel Energy's annual transfers into the RDA are covered under this rate rider language.

Under the Commission's prior and continuing practice for cost recovery for projects under the RDF, Xcel was allowed to recover only RDF costs related to actual or known and measurable expenditures, and that continues today. The payments into the RDA are not associated with specific projects. However, because the payments into the RDA are a statutory obligation for Xcel, the Commission has allowed the transfers into the RDA to be included in the annual rider recovery amounts, even though these funds are not tied to specific project and program

obligations. Xcel Energy transferred \$8,817,885 for 2018, \$12,566,510 for 2019, \$14,852,115 for 2020 and \$19,259,667 for 2021, \$20,159,757 for 2022, \$28,468,278 for 2023, and \$22,763,502 in 2024 to MMB for the RDA.

- **Recovery of RDF and RDA Administrative Costs**

The 2017 amendments deleted language allowing the Commission to approve recovery by Xcel Energy of expenditures for administering the RDF. In its review of the RDF/RDA annual recovery factor to be in effect for 2018, the Commission determined that the change in the statute did not provide for recovery of administrative expenses related to the legacy RDF or to the RDA. Xcel did not ask for recovery of administrative expenses through the annual rider recovery factor for 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, or 2023, and 2024 based on the Commission's earlier decision. Given that no further legislation has been passed, we conclude that our determination to deny administrative charges was the correct course of action.

- **Treatment of Changes in Legacy RDF Grant Amounts**

The 2017 amendments directed Xcel Energy to withhold from the transfer to the RDA amounts awarded in previous RDF grant cycles not yet expended. However, some legacy RDF grants subsequently were cancelled, such as Crown Hydro, or amounts changed, such as the Minnesota Renewable Energy Society projects. The statute does not specify how the related amounts that were withheld from transfer from the RDA should be treated. The Commission would welcome additional clarity or direction from the Legislature on this issue.

- **Xcel's RDF/RDA Transfer Obligation**

Under the 2017 amendments, Xcel was required to transfer on July 1, 2017, "all funds in the renewable development account previously established under the subdivision . . ." Xcel did not transfer any funds at that time, stating that there were no funds in the account collected from ratepayers. However, Xcel Energy did have unexpended and uncommitted per cask obligations of approximately \$25 million.

If the 2017 amendments had not been made, those monies would have been rolled forward and used for a future RFP or other mandate. The Commission designed the legacy RDF appropriation mechanism in such a fashion to protect ratepayers from being charged for the collection of money that would have remained unexpended in an account waiting for some possible future grant. Therefore, at the July 1, 2017, date when the new legislation mandated a transfer of unobligated RDF funds to the RDA, there were no monies sitting in a dedicated fund at Xcel Energy; rather, this approximately \$25 million amount represented potential future resources that might be expended for a new RFP funding cycle or other mandates. A future RDF cycle never occurred due to the 2017 amendments and, thus, no new RDF projects and grants were approved, and no monies were taken from ratepayers to be placed as "funds" into the legacy RDF.

The Commission determined that instituting a substantial one-time rate increase would be

contrary both to the objective for implementation of the statute and the ratepayers' interest. This has been raised in annual reports since the 2017 change. Given that no further legislation has been passed, we conclude that our determination to protect ratepayers was the correct course of action.