
From: John Mills

Sent: Tuesday, 03 January 2017 21:19:02 (UTC-06:00) Central Time (US & Canada)

To: PUC

Subject: Submission for Docket Number NG16-014

PUC Commissioners,

I have done more research since my first inquiry about the "farm tap" issue and thought I would offer additional comment.

I read through several of the items on the docket. Of most interest were the Dec. 7 filings of the 2 parties 1) Northern Natural Gas (NNG) [12/07/16 - Initial Brief of Northern Natural Gas and Certificate of Service](#) and 2) Northwestern Energy (NWE) [12/07/16 - NorthWestern Energy's Brief in Response to Commission Staff's Petition for Declaratory Ruling](#) NNG's Brief is a bit hard to follow. NWE's Brief is much clearer. From my experience, clarity usually follows truth.

After reading both of these, my opinion is that Northern Natural Gas (NNG) is the one who has the on-going obligation to provide natural gas to farm tap customers. They are the ones who acquired the easement that included a provision to provide gas service - either directly or through their assigns. I received a copy of an easement from a constituent to verify that. It has pretty clear language and an on-going obligation from both parties to the easement for *"so long as such pipe lines, and appurtenances thereto, shall be maintained . . ."*

I think it should be NNG's responsibility to negotiate a continuation of service through NWE OR find a replacement for NWE. It's too bad these two companies are dragging end use customers into the fray when the issue seems to rest only with them.

I do not know what jurisdiction the PUC has in this matter, but to the extent you are able to do so, please insist on the continuation of the farm taps and needed gas service to those customers who were promised access to the pipeline and gas service for their farms as an inducement for agreeing to pipeline easements across their land.

Thanks,
Representative Elect, John Mills, District 4