
From: Michael J. McGill

Sent: Monday, 02 January 2017 00:24:53 (UTC-06:00) Central Time (US & Canada)

To: PUC

Subject: NG16-014 Petition for a Declaratory Ruling Regarding Farm Tap Customers

January 1, 2017

To South Dakota Public Utilities Commission:

I am writing at the request of and on the behalf of Robert Lynch of Vermillion, South Dakota to comment on the hearing set for January 17, 2017 to address the three questions submitted to the Commission by the PUC staff relative to the matter of the regulation of farm tap customers created as the result of the grant of easements in favor of Northern Natural Gas (NNG). Mr. Lynch granted an easement to NNG in the early 1950s to permit and allow NNG to construct and install an interstate natural gas pipeline over and across his farm land in Clay County, South Dakota. In consideration for the grant of the easement, NNG agreed to create a tap and supply natural gas to Mr. Lynch for as long as the pipeline was maintained. I will order my comments in a series of numbered paragraphs.

1. Mr. Lynch is distressed at the prospect as stated in the response brief submitted by the Staff of the PUC that the PUC does not have jurisdiction over either of the major players in this dispute. Like all the other 197 farm tap customers interested in this case, Mr. Lynch has detrimentally relied upon the arrangement with NNG and invested a considerable sum of money on improvements on their infrastructure to facilitate the delivery of natural gas from NNG's interstate line to his farm residence and outbuildings, including dryer facilities for his grain bins. Mr. Lynch has complied with the obligations imposed upon him by the easement contract with NNG. I have reviewed several of the comments made by the other farm tap customers and Mr. Lynch's situation is similar to all the others. He has expended money to install and maintain his gas line and would have to incur significant expense to retrofit his appliances, furnace and grain dryer facilities to accommodate a switch to lp. If NNG would discontinue the service Mr. Lynch will incur economic damages as the result of the breach of the easement agreement by NNG or NNG successors in interest. In addition, if the terms of the easement are breached by NNG the next logical step would be a class action suit asking that the pipeline be capped at the South Dakota border at the request of the farm gas tap customers. In the event that the South Dakota PUC does not have jurisdiction over the transporter as NNG has argued or the merchant as NorthWestern Natural Gas (NWNG) has argued, the only remedy left to the farm tap customers would be to seek redress pursuant to state or federal law and seek to terminate the easement and to sue for damages for breach of contract. No one wants to go that level as it would be expensive and complicated. If the SD PUC has no jurisdiction in this case, that is the only remedy that would be available to the farm tap customers. Therefore, it is best if a settlement can be arranged. One would think that NNG would have the most interest in resolving this matter without an interruption of service to the farm tap customers by making arrangements for a new merchant to step in the shoes of NWNG and MERC prior to December 31, 2017. Mr. Lynch would like to see the PUC assert jurisdiction

000669

or the parties resolve this matter without forcing the farm tap customers to expend considerable legal fees to enforce their contractual rights to natural gas to attempt to terminate the easement

2. The regulatory framework that was in existence in 1952 when Mr. Lynch granted NNG the easement to install the pipeline has changed significantly. Today, as a result of the evolution of regulation of the natural gas industry and due to the volatile nature of the natural gas market, interstate pipelines are under Federal regulation and local merchants that provide the sale, distribution and bundled services to the end user consumer are subject to regulation by the South Dakota PUC. However, at the time that Mr. Lynch granted the easement in 1952 NNG was both the transporter and the merchant that served the lines and dealt with Mr. Lynch. As time went by, NNG created a subsidiary or affiliate named Peoples Natural Gas (PNG) to serve the merchant role in the transaction. Peoples provided the servicing of the transaction, all pursuant to the terms of the easement that stated that NNG would allow Mr. Lynch to tap into the line and NNG would supply Mr. Lynch natural gas for as long as the interstate line is maintained. The terms of the easement are binding on successors in interest and assigns of both parties to the agreement.
3. It is the height of presumption for me to comment to the staff, the PUC and the parties in this case regarding the evolution of state and federal regulation of natural gas. However, it appears to me that as a result of how that regulation has evolved we are left with a very anomalous situation where we have "orphan gas lines". NNG disclaims paternity due to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) orders 436, 636 and 637. NWNG disclaims paternity because it states that it did not acquire any infrastructure and is a mere contractor. FERC order 436 was adopted in 1985 and changed how interstate pipelines were regulated. This order established a voluntary framework under which interstate pipelines could act solely as a transporter of natural gas, rather than filling the role of a natural gas merchant. Prior to that time NNG and Peoples fulfilled both the transport function and the merchant function. On December 20, 1985 NNG either sold or spun off Peoples as an affiliated entity and sold the South Dakota farm tap customers to Utilicorp United, Inc. such that Utilicorp United Inc. would fulfill the necessary merchant role to the South Dakota farm tap customers. Pursuant to the terms of this agreement NNG assigned to Utilicorp the responsibility to service the farm tap customers that were People's responsibility. NNG therefore had complied with the regulatory framework and would avoid state regulation. For reasons not apparent in the documents that I have examined in the docket, NNG subsequently entered into a second contract in 1987 in which it agreed to a sunset of merchant status and responsibility to Utilicorp's subsidiary NWNG such that NWNG had the legal right to terminate its merchant status with respect to the farm tap customers after 2017.
4. NWNG now states that it seeks to be relieved of the farm tap lines because it lacks a grid map to locate and properly service the lines and that it is inequitable to assess the costs of servicing these lines on their network of customers. It appears as if this is a calculation that should have been built into the prior transactions that have occurred with respect to the farm tap lines in the several assignments that have taken place in this case and that it is a little late to play that card now. As Senator Rusch points out in his comments, the farm tap customers were not party to any of the transactions between the parade of entities that have been involved in this case. It is unusual that at some point between 1952 and 1985, when the farm tap customers were sold that a map would not have been created by Peoples or that Utilicorp United would not have demanded one be made as part of the 1985 agreement in which it purchased the customers.
5. It appears that we are confronted with a very unusual regulatory situation. NNG is not subject to South Dakota PUC jurisdiction. However, as the result of the 1987 contract that NNG signed that allowed NWNG to terminate its merchant status on the farm tap customer lines at the end of 2017, NNG will have 197 South Dakota farm tap customers on January 1, 2018. Due to federal regulation, NNG cannot fulfill the merchant role in the transaction with the farm tap customers on January, 2018. Accordingly, unless NNG can successfully shift legal ownership and responsibility of the lines to NWNG or MERC, NNG will have to contract with an alternative entity to act as merchant in this case prior to that date. It appears that if it fails to do this NNG will be in violation of the private contracts with the farm tap customers. The farm tap customers should not be made to suffer economically because of the unique set of facts in this case where NNG has agreed to certain things without consideration

of the legal obligation that they owe to the farm tap customers. NNG has to better explain why it agreed to the sunset provision in the 1987 agreement with NWNG or why the offending provision of the 1987 agreement with NWNG does not apply to the farm tap customers

6. If NNG can establish that the sunset provision does not apply to relieve NWNG of the merchant status on the farm tap customers, then it appears that pursuant to the 1985 agreement the assignees of Utilicorp United, Inc. (MERC and NWNG) would be contractually obligated to fulfill the merchant role in this case and as Kristin Edwards pointed out, NWNL retains the right to turn off the pipeline if farm tap customers fail to pay their account or otherwise fulfill their obligations under the contract. That right to operate or control the infrastructure would appear to subject NWNG to South Dakota PUC jurisdiction. Accordingly, if NNG can show that the sunset provision does not apply to the farm tap customers, pursuant to the applicable South Dakota statute NWNG cannot terminate service without the approval of the SD PUC.
7. In order to avoid a very complex and protracted legal proceeding it would be best for all concerned to reach a mediated settlement of this matter

Respectfully submitted this 1st day of January, 2017.

Michael J. McGill
Attorney at Law
P. O. Box 32
Beresford, SD 57004
605-763-2057
605-261-5635 cell
605-763-2201 fax
mjmc@bmtc.net

From: PUC
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 9:26 AM
To: 'mjmc@bmtc.net'
Subject: NG16-014

Mr. McGill:

Thank you for your message on behalf of Robert Lynch regarding the farm taps matter, docket NG16-014. I understand the concerns of Mr. Lynch with the possibility of losing his farm tap and natural gas supply. I encourage all affected by this to monitor the PUC's docket as it is reviewed and information is gathered by the commission.

The commission held a hearing with testimony provided by Northern Natural Gas and NorthWestern Energy officials as well as PUC staff members. As was evident during the hearing, my fellow commissioners and I are gravely concerned about these landowners and their natural gas supply. The recording of the Dec. 14 four-hour hearing is available on the PUC's website by clicking on the Recording link under the Hearing subhead in the docket:
<http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/NaturalGas/2016/ng16-014.aspx>.

This Informational Guide was designed to assist farm tap customers in understanding the filing of this docket and the PUC's process: <http://www.puc.sd.gov/commission/dockets/naturalgas/2016/ng16-014/informationguide.pdf>.

PUC staff filed an update on progress in resolving this matter that can be found at <http://puc.sd.gov/commission/dockets/naturalgas/2016/ng16-014/ltr122016b.pdf>. As relayed via this letter, the commission will likely discuss this docket again during our regularly scheduled meeting on Jan. 17 in Pierre. Since this is an open docket on which I will be voting, your message and my response are posted under Comments and Responses for all to read.

If you, Mr. Lynch, or others involved in this matter wish to communicate with a PUC staff member working on this docket, please contact the commission with this request by calling 1-800-332-1782 or 605-773-3201 or emailing PUC@state.sd.us.

Chris Nelson, Chairman
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
www.puc.sd.gov

000672

South Dakota Public Utilities Commission

ATTN:

Kristie Fiigen
Gary Hanson
Chris Nelson

RECEIVED

JAN 03 2016

SOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION

This letter is in regards to our disappointment with Northwestern Energys decision to discontinue serving farm taps in our area. We recently installed new gas line from our home to the meter which was a cost of \$1270.⁰⁰ to us thinking that we would continue to have natural gas to heat our home. We would hope that you as the PUC would take some action with Northwestern Energy as it affects a lot of our neighbors who heat their homes, heat their hog confinements, dry their corn, heat their shops or businesses.

We did attend a meeting that Northern Natural Gas Co. put on in Madison, S.D. on December 15, 2016 to talk about this issue and we felt like they, Northern Natural Gas Co, were not giving us the whole story. Northwestern Energy did state in a letter we received that we have a right to receive natural gas services pursuant to our easement.

The following questions are of concern:

- 1) Why would the PUC allow discontinuence of my utility service?

000673

- 2) Why would my farm tap be shut off while some of Northwestern Energy's other farm tap customers continue to receive service?
- 3) Why doesn't our original easement assure us of a farm tap usage?
- 4) If this is a disagreement between Northern Natural Gas and Northwestern Energy, can another supplier be found to replace Northwestern Energy?


The consideration of shutting off these farm taps is unprecedented.

Hopefully this issue can be resolved favorably for all parties involved and that you as the PUC would explore all options.

Thank-you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely

Kirk + Cheryl Rikonsrud



Missouri/Bikanstad
Carlton SD 57013


STIOUX FALLS SD 570

29 DEC 2016 PM 2 L



South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
500 E. Capitol Ave.
Pierre, S.D. 57501

57501\$5007 C012



000675



Chris Nelson, Chairperson
Kristie Fiegen, Vice Chairperson
Gary Hanson, Commissioner

South Dakota

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

500 East Capitol Avenue
Pierre, South Dakota 57501-5070
www.puc.sd.gov

Capitol Office
(605) 773-3201

Grain Warehouse
(605) 773-5280

Consumer Hotline
1-800-332-1782

Email
puc@state.sd.us

January 3, 2017

Kirk and Cheryl Rikansrud

[REDACTED]
Canton SD 57013

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Rikansrud:

Thank you for your letter regarding the farm taps matter, docket NG16-014. I understand your concern about the possibility of losing your farm tap and natural gas supply.

The commission held a hearing on this matter with testimony provided by Northern Natural Gas and NorthWestern Energy officials as well as PUC staff members.

Since that hearing, a letter was filed in the docket by PUC staff and here is an excerpt:

"Staff hereby informs the Commission and interested persons that Staff, Northern Natural Gas, and NorthWestern Energy have agreed to enter into discussions to negotiate for the benefit of the farm tap customers. In order to allow adequate time to have these discussions, we request that the Commission delay its decision until the regularly scheduled Commission meeting on January 17, 2017, rather than January 3, as previously intended. Staff, as the petitioner in this matter, hereby waives the 60-day requirement pursuant to ARSD 20:10:01:35. Staff has communicated with Northern, NorthWestern, and Montana-Dakota Utilities, and has received their consent to submit this request."

I encourage you to follow along as this matter is reviewed and information is gathered by the commission. You can find the public docket by going to the commission's home page at www.puc.sd.gov and clicking on Commission Actions, Commission Dockets, Natural Gas Dockets, 2016 Natural Gas Dockets, and scroll down to docket NG16-014.

Since this is an open docket before the commission on which I will be voting, your letter and my response will be posted under Comments and Responses for my fellow commissioners, the PUC staff analysts and attorney working on this docket, and others to read.

If you haven't already read it, the enclosed Informational Guide was prepared to assist farm tap customers in understanding the filing of this docket and the PUC's process and is posted on the commission's home page.

If you wish to communicate with a PUC staff member regarding this docket, please contact the commission by calling 1-800-332-1782 or 605-773-3201 or emailing PUC@state.sd.us.

Sincerely,

Chris Nelson

000676

From: Jim Jensen

Sent: Tuesday, 03 January 2017 15:19:19 (UTC-06:00) Central Time (US & Canada)

To: PUC

Subject: farm tap

{NG16-014}

Raymond Jensen

 Dell rapids SD 57022

In concern of our farm tap we have 2 out buildings 1 drying bin 1 grain dryer 1 shop and the house on natural gas. We where under the impression with the natural gas line easement that we would always have natural gas so on those terms we invested a sizable amount of money on our heating and drying. To convert everything to propane would be very expensive process to convert . We would appreciate your concern on this matter.

Thank you

000677