

Response:

A.

1. Planning engineers developed potential generation development nodes, independent of fuel type, which were then used in the modeling process. See Appendix A-1, p. 6. Planning engineers did, however, include a 600 MW generator at Forbes and a 600 MW generator at Big Stone, South Dakota, in the model based on what was known at that time about those projects.

2. As stated, no fuel types were assumed for this study.

3. See part A.1.

4. See part A.1.

B.

1. – 2. Planning engineers did not assume any particular generators that would meet the specific statutory definitions set forth in this information request. However, planning engineers did assume generators in areas where there are significant wind resources.

3. See parts B.1-B.2. Specific distributed generation units under 10 MW were not studied. Rather, all generation for the CapX2020 Vision Plan was assumed in large nodes on the high voltage system. These generation scenarios could accommodate these small projects. For example, where a 300 MW generation location was assumed, there could be multiple generators of varying sizes at that node, including projects of fewer than 10 MW.

4. See parts B.1-B.3. The Vision Study predated the statute referenced in this information request. Specific renewable energy generation, as that term is now statutorily defined, between 10 MW and 40 MW was not studied. Rather, as noted, all generation for the CapX2020 Vision Plan was assumed in larger nodes on the high voltage system. These generation scenarios could accommodate these small projects. For example, where a 300 MW generation location was assumed, there could be multiple generators of varying sizes at that node, including projects of between 10 MW and 40 MW.

Response By: Tim Rogelstad
Title: Manager
Department: Delivery Planning
Company: Otter Tail Power Company
Telephone: 218-739-8583
Date: May 16, 2008

2177673v1