

-----Original Message-----

From: Johnson, Dustin (PUC)
Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2009 12:18 PM
To: [REDACTED]; Van Gerpen, Patty
Subject: Re: Xcel Energy Rates

Roger,

Xcel was required to include notice of this filing with your bill. I have cc:ed the PUC executive director on this email so that her staff can verify that was done. I know that the Argus Leader has included some info in their paper and other media outlets may have covered this, as well. That being said, I would agree with out that this has been very quiet. I expected more media attention, to be honest.

I undertand your comments on executive compensation. This will certainly be an issue we will examine. In the past, it has not been unusual for the Commission to disallow some costs associated with compensation. The executives can be paid more than we allow, but those dollars can't come from ratepayers.

Thanks for your comments,
Dusty

Dustin "Dusty" Johnson
Public Utilities Commission

From: Roger Schroeder
To: Johnson, Dustin (PUC)
Sent: Wed Nov 11 12:09:21 2009
Subject: RE: Xcel Energy Rates

Mr. Johnson

Thank you for your response to my e-mail, and you are correct that I had no idea as to the actions that have already unfolded in this matter. As one of the 81,000 SD customers that Xcel identified, I had no idea as to this filing with the commission. I do not know if any kind of notice shows up on my utility bill (as I get my bills from them and pay them electronically), but I would bet that at least 80,000 of their customers does not know of this.

I understand that Companies operating in South Dakota need to make a fair return on their investments, but making money to waste on high level employees is another thing.

I have faith in you and the commission to do the right thing for the 81,000 people that are and will be affected by this request from Xcel. I do understand that it is a balancing act on your and the commissions part to weigh the needs of a utility company and those of the residence of the State of South Dakota in making your decisions, and I do respect your jobs and decisions, good luck with this one, and please take into account the article that I previously e-mailed to you in that decision process.

Thank You
Roger Schroeder

From: Dustin.Johnson@state.sd.us <Dustin.Johnson@state.sd.us>
Subject: RE: Xcel Energy Rates
To: rds0123@yahoo.com
Date: Wednesday, November 11, 2009, 11:31 AM
Roger,

Sorry for the slow response. When I travel a lot (as I have been lately) emails have a tendency to get buried. My apologies.

Thanks for sending along the article -- it is helpful to know what is going on in other jurisdictions. Yes, I, too, would hope that the SD PUC would be thorough in their review of Xcel's rates, and absolutely expect that we will be during their pending rate case. Your email suggests that perhaps you aren't aware that Xcel has filed in South Dakota. Information on the filing can be found here:
<http://puc.sd.gov/Dockets/Electric/2009/el09-009.aspx>

Thanks again for taking the time to write, Roger. I do appreciate it.

Thanks,
Dusty

Dustin "Dusty" Johnson
Public Utilities Commission
605-773-3201

-----Original Message-----

From: Roger Schroeder
Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2009 9:34 AM
To: Johnson, Dustin (PUC)
Subject: Xcel Energy Rates

Mr. Johnson

I am sure that you are keep informed of such developments (please see attachment), but as a South Dakota Xcel Energy customer, I wanted you and the Commission to be aware of what is happening with Xcel Energy, even in there own state of Minnesota. I would hope that you would take similar actions if Xcel would come before you with rate increase requests here in South Dakota.

Thank You

Roger Schroeder
[REDACTED]
Valley Springs, SD 57068