

From: Rose's [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, December 1, 2022 12:44 PM
To: PUC-PUC <PUC@state.sd.us>
Subject: [EXT] Xcel Proposed Increase - Notes from Meeting

Dear Sirs/Madams,

I attended the PUC forum for the rate increase and would like to reiterate my opposition based on the responses from Xcel.

I asked several questions that were based on Xcel's presentation, which stated that they were continuing their transition to renewable energy yet were paradoxically stating that they were also focused on customer service.

I asked a couple of questions that Xcel struggled to answer:

- 1) I asked why the North American Electric Reliability Corporation now considers our region at risk for blackouts, when the region was not at risk previously. The Xcel rep said that this was a regional issue due to reduced excess capacity. Why the region lost its excess capacity was not answered, but this is now a problem for South Dakota residents when it wasn't a problem before. Xcel needs to accept at least partial responsibility and come up with a solution, but they didn't do either.
- 2) I asked where Xcel's increasing reliance on renewables was currently and successfully, implemented and if Xcel had completed a Proof of Concept to show it will work at the increased scale Xcel is proposing. Xcel stated that there was no POC and that they were relying on some mythical future technology to make their plans workable. They were also going to rely on hopefully getting extensions on their nuclear power generation to keep the midwest grid reliable.

I hate to use hyperbole, but these answers were irresponsible.

We have proof that Xcel's reliability plans aren't working by the NAERC's repeated warnings. We seem to be now on the edge of our capacity and any further degradations will result in blackouts. Xcel's answer is to add even more unreliable energy to the mix, without testing its effectiveness in a real world system. Again, this is irresponsible. I would argue that this mix has already been tested, in Germany. It doesn't work. I also don't buy that coal and wind cost the same per GWH, as another questioner was noting that wind receives many subsidies. Even if they are the same, coal is more reliable and should be desired until a just-as-reliable renewable is available.

We have proof that Xcel's plans aren't reducing costs (or keeping them constant) since they are asking South Dakotans for more money.

There are technical solutions to reduce emissions that are safe, reliable and cost effective (and carbon free) e.g. Nuclear. I would have loved to hear Xcel talk about these solutions, but they did not. They talked about mainly wind replacing coal. Given our reduced capacity, we know it's not working TODAY, yet they are doubling down on this and asking South Dakotans to give more money in their failed energy policy. This is unacceptable. It's also irresponsible, as a policy of Xcel, for them to HOPE they can extend their existing nuclear facilities. Failed companies hope, successful companies plan and execute toward workable solutions.

Xcel is failing and South Dakotans should not be subsidizing their current energy generation plans. We should demand they come up with a solution they can prove will work before asking for more of our hard earned money.

Regards,

James Rose

Sioux Falls, SD