

**From:** Dennis Aanenson [REDACTED]  
**Date:** January 31, 2023 at 11:37:19 AM CST  
**To:** "Hanson, Gary (PUC)"  
**Subject:** [EXT] PUC Questions

Dear Gary,

We have sent a letter to all South Dakota legislators regarding your performance or lack thereof with protecting the Xcel Energy customers of South Dakota. I find it intriguing that your organization requires six months to perform a simple investigation and then can extend it six more months to make a decision on whether or not Xcel Energy can raise their rates. You claim that you don't have enough staff to cover everything, but how much extra staff do you need? I would like to have a breakdown of your budget in detail, WITHOUT sending me to a website that portrays vague information that raises even more questions.

Maybe someone can explain how "economic development" is a factor when making decisions in your organization – again, an extremely broad and vague topic that can be expanded with a long-winded answers that make no sense to serious questions from consumers. How can economic development possibly be done when raising the rates 18%? How does this benefit consumers? Let me answer that for you – it doesn't. How does the Governor's hunt create "economic development" for Xcel Energy? Again, it doesn't, it just places more money into the pockets of the shareholders. How are you looking out for the consumers by never declining a rate increase request?

With the size of your budget, why did you not publicize or even send a mailer regarding the public hearing? It seems that the public is allowed to give their feedback until we're blue in the face, yet to no avail. How many times have you turned down a rate increase from Xcel Energy? The PUC have been signing off on these "economic developments" aka "dark money" for over ten years. How can you possibly consider approving this? We don't see any signed off receipts on your spending, even though you spent well over what the commission approved - according to one of your websites the public is always directed to. Most of your spending has nothing to do with economic development, where is the explanation of exactly what part(s) of the economy is actually developed by all of this spending?

Why is the PUC not charging the shareholders for economic development, but charging consumers? The public deserves an explanation on why the PUC can approve and sign a ridiculous request when your job is to protect the rate payers, not the rate payees. Even if you were to reverse your approval decision on the increase and have Xcel give refunds to the public, plus interest (just like your website says), what interest? What is the interest rate? Again – vague.

I would like a response from you, in writing with all of these explanations that you owe us as we voted you in. I hope you keep in mind that there's an election coming real soon.

Regards,  
Dennis Aanenson  
[REDACTED]