

From: Chad Kurtenbach [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, December 18, 2015 5:58 PM
To: Nelson, Chris
Cc: Gregg, Deb; Sarah Kurtenbach
Subject: Re: Dispute Resolution with MidAmerican

Chris:

Good afternoon. Have you looked into your email from below?

As expected, we were denied the energy efficiency rebate offered by MidAmerican. This is another example and the most obvious indication that MidAmerican has no intention of incentivizing or encouraging renewable energy options. This is in direct contrast to their own claims to "promote green energy" and completely contradicts the current state and federal government's stance on the energy industry.

To your point that you still maintain that "it is wrong to shift costs from the cost causing consumer to other consumers". As I have tried to get clarification from MidAmerican and your office, what costs are you speaking of? MidAmerican has admitted that no additional costs were incurred for our gas line when compared to our next door neighbor. The ONLY difference is that we have a Geo unit. It didn't require extra line, special equipment or other costs.

Cost to MidAmerican for installing a gas line: \$855. Cost to consumer: \$0

Cost to MidAmerican for installing a gas line for consumers with Geothermal: \$855. Cost to consumer: \$855.

Does this make sense to you? Does this reflect the priorities and direction of the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission? Does the PUC promote green energy options? Where is the federal funding that MidAmerican has received specifically for renewable energy being allocated?

Thank you for your time.

Chad A. Kurtenbach