

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20426

VIA FERC Service

In Reply Refer To:

OEP/DPC/CB-1

Northern Natural Gas Company

Docket No. CP20-503-000

§ 375.308(x)(3)

January 5, 2021

Michael T. Loeffler
Senior Director of Certificates and External Affairs
Northern Natural Gas Company
1111 South 103rd Street
Omaha, Nebraska 68103-3330

Re: Data Request

Dear Mr. Loeffler:

Please provide the information described in the enclosure to assist in our analysis of Northern Natural Gas Company's (Northern) proposal in the above application. File your response in accordance with the provisions of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. In particular, 18 C.F.R. § 385.2010 (Rule 2010) requires that you serve a copy of the response on each person whose name appears on the official service list for this proceeding.

Please file a complete response within five (5) days of the date of this letter. If certain information cannot be provided within this time frame, please indicate which items will be delayed and provide a projected filing date. File all responses under oath (18 C.F.R. § 385.2005) by an authorized representative of Northern and include the name, position, and telephone number of the respondent to each item.

Sincerely,

Darya Khanin
Project Engineer
Division of Pipeline Certificates
Office of Energy Projects

Engineering:

1. The hydraulic models representing the St Cloud – Elk River – Willmar branch line system have eight unexpected receipt nodes that show an increased amount of inlet gas in the proposed model. It appears that the nodes bring in additional gas that accounts for the 120 percent and 150 percent proration. Explain why additional gas comes in at these specific nodes and not from the interconnections with the Northern's mainline. Otherwise, provide updated hydraulic models and corresponding flow diagrams if applicable.
2. The difference in gas flow between the existing and the proposed models was calculated at the three points of interconnection between the Ventura North models and the St Cloud – Elk River – Willmar branch line system models. These calculations show inconsistencies between the two sets of models. Explain or correct.
3. In its December 12, 2018 Data Reply filed in Docket No. CP18-534-000, Northern explained that net consequence of the Carlton Adjustment is that mainline flow is higher in the corridor between the Ventura and North Branch compressor stations when the adjustment volume is applied; therefore, Northern utilizes the Carlton Resolution models to calculate mainline capacity in the Ventura to North Branch segment. Furthermore, Northern stated that the full contract volume is utilized to calculate capacity on all other mainline segments and branch lines. However, the greatest difference between the Northern Lights 2021 Project hydraulic models and the corresponding hydraulic models featuring the Carlton Adjustment is outside of the Ventura to North Branch segment. Provide an updated discussion on how the Carlton Resolution impacts the design of the hydraulic models for the existing and the proposed operations for the Northern Lights 2021 Project.
4. Exhibit G contains Horsepower Data table for two compressor stations. Provide a Horsepower Data table for each compressor station represented in the hydraulic models. For each compressor unit, identify the type of unit and fuel usage, if applicable.
5. In a public document, identify end use of the gas for the volumes to be delivered to each shipper.