BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE MA	TTER OF	THE FIL	ING BY XCEL	.)	ORDER APPROVING 2001
ENERGY F	OR APP	PROVAL (OF ITS 2001)	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
ECONOMIC	DEV	ELOPMEN'	T ANNUAL)	ANNUAL REPORT AND 2002
REPORT	AND	2002	ECONOMIC)	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
DEVELOPMENT PLAN)	PLAN
				j	EL02-019

On September 30, 2002, the Public Utilities Commission (Commission) received Xcel Energy's (Xcel) 2001 Economic Development Annual Report and proposed Economic Development Plan for 2002. The proposed plan was filed in accordance with the settlement agreements reached between NSP and Commission Staff, and approved by the Commission, in the company's most recent rate case filings, Dockets EL91-004 and EL92-016.

For 2002, Xcel's proposed economic development investment budget is \$100,000. The actual expenditures for the 2001 Economic Development Plan were \$100,000. Fifty percent of the 2002 budget would be recovered through rates, with the remaining 50% funded by shareholders.

At its regularly scheduled November 20, 2002, meeting, the Commission reviewed Xcel's 2001 Economic Development Annual Report and Economic Development Plan for 2002. The Commission has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to SDCL Chapter 49-34A, specifically, SDCL 49-34A-4 and 49-34A-6. After review of the report and plan, the Commission found that they are just and reasonable and voted to approve them (Commissioner Nelson, dissenting). It is therefore

ORDERED, that Xcel's 2001 Economic Development Annual Report and Economic Development Plan for 2002 are approved as filed.

Dated at Pierre, South Dakota, this and day of December, 2002.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
The undersigned hereby certifies that this document has been served today upon all parties of record in this docket, as listed on the docket service list, by facsimile or by first class mail, in properly addressed envelopes, with charges prepaid thereon. By:
Date: 12/2/02
(OFFICIAL SEAL)

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION:	
semo a/Zurg	
JAMES A. BURG, Chairman	_

PAM NELSON, Commissioner, dissenting

ROBERT K. SAHR, Commissioner

Courk fah

DISSENT OF COMMISSIONER NELSON

Xcel Energy (Xcel) first filed these economic development plans five years before I took office. I understand the economic development plan blueprint was developed during settlement between our staff and employees of Northern States Power Company, Xcel's predecessor. Ratepayers and utility would each contribute \$50,000 annually; the utility would develop a plan to spend the money; and this Commission would get its say through an approval process. The idea was that economic development would be a benefit for both customer and company. The Commission subsequently approved the settlement, and annual filings have been made.

I have approved past filings of these plans. I believe these plans can be a beneficial tool. The trick is to transform the money into an economic development tool. We have seen Xcel offer a variety of programs designed to do just that. I understand some may have yielded more immediate returns than others, and I understand how some projects require a longer-term view as benefits may be difficult to measure. One must keep an open, imaginative mind and one must exhibit a degree of patience with results.

Last year we approved a plan that gave Xcel wide spending latitude for the bulk of the money. Over 60% was in a "pot" dubbed the "Economic Assistance" Program. We relied on Xcel's discretion to appropriately ladle the cash out of the pot and into the hands of worthy economic causes.

My dissent arises because I think at least some of the cash was "ladled" to programs that have little, if any hope of economic development return. Specifically, I believe donating \$5,000 to the SD Tech Summit is more appropriately labeled as a political contribution than an economic development contribution. Yes, these types of events have been funded in the past, with approval. There was some hope of benefit. I no longer see the value. I have neither seen nor heard of any concrete positive results from past summits. We learn from the past, and then we must act. My dissent from the majority approval does just that. I further recommend the percentage of discretionary economic funds, because it has grown so large, be kept under closer scrutiny by this Commission. It appears the reporting and approval process should be expanded to require Commission approval before large amounts are doled out from the fund.