

**EXHIBIT NO. \_\_\_\_\_ (TLO-13)**

**Minnesota Power's Response to  
Excelsior Energy Information Request No. 106  
Oct. 27, 2006**

# EXCELSIOR ENERGY

## Information Request

MPUC Docket Number: E-6472/M-05-1993  
OAH Docket Number: 12-2500-17260-2

Date of Request: October 13, 2006

Requested From: Minnesota Power

Response Due: October 27, 2006

Party Requesting Information: Excelsior Energy

Type of Inquiry:    .....Financial                    .....Rate of Return            .....Rate Design  
                         .....Engineering                    .....Forecasting                .....Conservation  
                         .....Cost of Service                    .....CIP                                .....Other

*If you feel your responses are trade secret or privileged, please indicate this on your response.*

Request No.	
106.	<p>In Ms. Hodnick's [sic] testimony at page 7, lines 5-8, she states that MP believes it is "unlikely" that the Mesaba Project has the potential to be a reliable energy resource, and that the "Mesaba Project plans to use IGCC technology, which, as indicated in our testimony. . .is not commercialized for power production." As page 22, of Xcel's Base Load Process Study and Options filed November 2005, Xcel states that "MP led the site suitability assessments, provided the fuel transportation estimates and <i>provide an IGCC comparison estimate . . .</i>" as part of a partnership to develop a coal-fired plant on the Eastern Iron Range (Emphasis added.) Please provide all correspondence between the utilities and within MP with respect to the analysis you conducted with respect to IGCC technology, and all reports prepared by MP, Xcel, Great River or their respective consultants, reflecting the basis for your conclusions about the IGCC technology.</p>

### Response:

The information learned from the IGCC investigation that took place "as part of a partnership to develop a coal-fired plant on the Eastern Iron Range" was not part of the basis for MP's testimony regarding our conclusions about the IGCC technology. In addition, the requested information is subject to confidentiality agreements with Xcel and GRE. As stated in my testimony, the basis for my statements is that IGCC is not commercialized for power production, especially with the plan to rely on lower rank sub-bituminous coal.

Response by: Margaret Hodnik

List sources of information:

Title: Director

Department: Regulatory & Public Affairs

Telephone: 218-723-3966