

From: David Steele [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 30, 2014 3:49:03 PM
To: PUC
Subject: RE: Xcel Energy Proposed Rate Hike
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Mr. Hanson,

I appreciate your continued contact on this matter and the documents you have thus far provided to me on this matter. I will read these documents as I have the others you have sent me. While South Dakota rate payers may not have paid for the jet directly, none the less, we are paying for partial expense as it pertains to its' operation. In my opinion, which, I feel would be mainstream amongst other South Dakota rate payers, \$58,000 would buy a plethora of commercial coach class airline tickets. When I travel for business, I travel coach. John Thune, one of the Senators of this great state, has coincidentally been aboard the same plane that I was on during a few of my numerous business trips and he too, was flying coach. If a United States Senator can fly coach, why can't the CEO and other management personnel of Excel Energy?

In the documents I have read thus far, it seems the industry standard is to blame these requested rate hikes on federal mandates and EPA changes. While these may be valid reasons for additional infrastructure costs, these should be handled by Excel directly; not the rate payers it services. You don't buy the bus company new busses and then pay to ride on the bus you just purchased. While this analogy may not be completely applicable, I think the message would resonate with many rate payers this proposed hike will effect.

Excel Energy should be held to the same standard we held our state government to during the "Great Recession". Prepare for and handle the unexpected. Our state government didn't raise taxes when the burst of the housing bubble caused state wide ramifications. Rather, we cut expenses, used "rainy day" funds and kept the state operational, and out of the red. The energy industry WILL ALWAYS be answerable to the federal government and the EPA. Policy changes that are both financially beneficial to the industry as well as those that increase costs for providers, are part of routine life in the industry. Rarely, if ever, do consumers get a check in the mail when a policy in Washington may reduce energy providers costs and theretofore, increase their profits. Rather, profits in years like those simply increase for the providers and the stock holders. Companies should and many do, plan accordingly for unexpected expenses. Simply raising rates every year and using federal mandates as justification for the increases becomes too easy and routine for energy providers. In turn, the rate payers are those who suffer most through higher rates and often, performance that is no better or negligible at best. Excel energy and other providers shouldn't be allowed to use mandates as a reason to increase rates unless they are also willing to send out checks to their customers when beneficial legislation occurs thereby increasing their profits. They can't have it both ways.

I still believe the 17% increase Excel would receive over 2 years (the one already granted and the one proposed) is egregious and I know the commission will have a broad range of documentation and opinions to evaluate before it renders its' verdict. It is my hope that emails and correspondence like mine (and hopefully other citizens privy of how this process works are contacting you as well) will keep the voice of the consumer in the view of the commission when they evaluate this request.

Regards,

David