

- Not-Public Document – Not For Public Disclosure
 Public Document – Not-Public Data Has Been Excised
 Public Document

Xcel Energy Information Request No. 3
Docket No.: E002/M-24-432
Response To: Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
Requestor: Isabel Ricker & Kit Gomez
Date Received: April 17, 2026

Question:

Estimate the annual net revenue requirement associated with the Peak Time Rebate program each year 2027-2031.

Response:

Please see “Attachment A – MPUC-003” for updated CBAs forecasting the net revenue requirements for 2027-2031. These use the approved values from the Company’s 2024-2026 Triennial¹. These CBAs are based on the assumptions presented in the Peak Time Rebates (PTR) Reply Comments dated October 3, 2025², including estimated demand savings of 0.19 kW per participant and a first-year participation of 40,000 customers. We assume a modest amount of growth in subsequent years. The Company intends to include the PTR program in the 2027-2029 ECO Triennial Plan as indicated in our Reply.

Preparer: Karl Shlanta
Title: DSM Technical Policy Specialist
Department: Customer Energy & Transportation Solutions
Telephone: 612-216-8127
Date: April 29, 2026

¹ The Company’s 2027-2029 ECO Triennial Plan will be filed June 1, 2026 and analysis is ongoing at this time.

² [Reply Comments, In the Matter of a Peak Time Rebate program, Docket No. 24-432, October 3, 2025](#)

- Not-Public Document – Not For Public Disclosure
- Public Document – Not-Public Data Has Been Excised
- Public Document

Xcel Energy Information Request No. 4
 Docket No.: E002/M-24-432
 Response To: Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
 Requestor: Isabel Ricker & Kit Gomez
 Date Received: April 17, 2026

Question:

- A. Estimate the resulting change in average rates for each customer class (in \$/kWh and %) for 2027–2031 compared to 2026 rates. Provide average 2026 rates for each customer class (cents/kWh) as the baseline.
- B. Estimate the resulting change in average monthly bills (\$/month) for each customer class for 2027–2031 compared to 2026 bills. Provide average 2026 monthly bills for each customer class (\$/month) as the baseline.

Response:

For the average rates and bill impacts for 2026, please see the following table:

2026 Average Bills and Rates

Class	Avg Bill	Avg Rate (\$/kWh)
Residential	\$103.37	\$0.179828
SCI Non-Dmd	\$919.96	\$0.135921
Demand	\$115,072.30	\$0.102340
Retail	\$228.77	\$0.141721

- A. For the average rate impacts for 2027-2031, please see the following tables:

Net Program Rate Impacts (\$/kWh) Compared to 2026 Rates

Class	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031
Residential	-\$0.000007	-\$0.000012	-\$0.000017	-\$0.000022	-\$0.000026
SCI Non-Dmd	-\$0.000004	-\$0.000007	-\$0.000010	-\$0.000014	-\$0.000017
Demand	-\$0.000004	-\$0.000008	-\$0.000010	-\$0.000012	-\$0.000014
Lighting	\$0.000000	\$0.000000	\$0.000000	\$0.000000	\$0.000000
Retail	-\$0.000005	-\$0.000009	-\$0.000012	-\$0.000015	-\$0.000017

Net Program Rate Impacts in % Compared to 2026 Rates

Class	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031
Residential	-0.004%	-0.007%	-0.009%	-0.012%	-0.015%
SCI Non-Dmd	-0.003%	-0.005%	-0.008%	-0.010%	-0.013%
Demand	-0.004%	-0.008%	-0.010%	-0.012%	-0.014%
Lighting	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%
Retail	-0.004%	-0.006%	-0.008%	-0.010%	-0.012%

B. For average bill impacts, please see the following tables:

Net Program Bill Impacts in \$ per Month Compared to 2026 Rates

Class	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031
Residential	-\$0.004	-\$0.007	-\$0.010	-\$0.013	-\$0.016
SCI Non-Dmd	-\$0.003	-\$0.006	-\$0.008	-\$0.010	-\$0.013
Demand	-\$0.142	-\$0.247	-\$0.354	-\$0.465	-\$0.578
Lighting	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
Retail	-\$0.009	-\$0.015	-\$0.022	-\$0.029	-\$0.035

Net Program Bill Impacts in % Compared to 2026 Rates

Class	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031
Residential	-0.004%	-0.007%	-0.010%	-0.013%	-0.016%
SCI Non-Dmd	0.000%	-0.001%	-0.001%	-0.001%	-0.001%
Demand	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	-0.001%
Lighting	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%
Retail	-0.004%	-0.007%	-0.010%	-0.013%	-0.015%

Preparer: Nick Paluck
 Title: Manager, Regulatory Analysis
 Department: NPSM Regulatory
 Telephone: 612-330-2905
 Date: April 29, 2026

- Not-Public Document – Not For Public Disclosure
 Public Document – Not-Public Data Has Been Excised
 Public Document

Xcel Energy Information Request No. 6
Docket No.: E002/M-24-432
Response To: Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
Requestor: Isabel Ricker & Kit Gomez
Date Received: April 17, 2026

Question:

Xcel's November 21, 2025 Supplemental Filing states that (1) the PTR program will not be registered in MISO in the near term, (2) it will take several years to obtain sufficient data to forecast reliable capacity reductions for use in either IRP modeling or MISO registration, and (3) behavioral DR faces significant uncertainty in meeting MISO LMR requirements going forward.

Given these statements, explain whether the cost-benefit analysis assumes capacity value that cannot be realized in the near term, and if so, how this affects the net revenue requirement and net rate impact of the PTR program.

Response:

The Company has included behavioral demand response as part of the demand response bundles in the most recent Integrated Resource Plan (IRP). The Company plans to include them in the Company's upcoming IRP using the most up-to-date information we have regarding these types of programs¹. In addition, the Company is working on a load flexibility potential study to help model new and emerging demand response technologies and programs. By allowing behavioral demand response to compete against other firm dispatchable resources, by providing these resources as an option for the model to choose among all other resources, the Company supports that these are avoiding the need for new generation capacity. As such, the avoided capacity value in this cost benefit analysis can be realized in the near-term planning window of the upcoming IRP.

Preparer: Karl Shlanta
Title: DSM Technical Policy Specialist
Department: Customer Energy & Transportation Solutions
Telephone: 612-216-8127
Date: April 29, 2026

¹ See analysis of behavioral demand response in our 2024 ECO Status Report submitted April 1, 2023 in Docket No. E,G002/CIP-23-92.

- Not-Public Document – Not For Public Disclosure
 Public Document – Not-Public Data Has Been Excised
 Public Document

Xcel Energy Information Request No. 7
Docket No.: E002/M-24-432
Response To: Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
Requestor: Isabel Ricker & Kit Gomez
Date Received: April 17, 2026

Question:

Xcel's November 21, 2025 Supplemental Filing states that it will, once reliable estimates of PTR's capacity reductions are available, incorporate the PTR program into demand response "bundles" offered into the IRP, and that selected bundles will offset the need for other resources in IRP modeling.

How many years of performance data will Xcel need to develop sufficiently reliable estimates of PTR's impact? Does Xcel anticipate including PTR in demand response bundles in its April 2027 IRP?

Response:

There is not a specific number of years of performance data necessary to develop reliable estimates. The Company is currently working on the load flexibility potential study including behavioral demand response programs such as Peak Time Rebates, to help inform the upcoming IRP. The Company plans to model PTR as part of a demand response bundle in the 2027 IRP based on the potential study.

Preparer: Chris Shaw
Title: Manager, Regulatory Policy
Department: NSPM Regulatory
Telephone: 612-330-7974
Date: April 29, 2026

- Not-Public Document – Not For Public Disclosure
- Public Document – Not-Public Data Has Been Excised
- Public Document

Xcel Energy Information Request No. 8
 Docket No.: E002/M-24-432
 Response To: Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
 Requestor: Isabel Ricker & Kit Gomez
 Date Received: April 17, 2026

Question:

In order to allow the Commission to evaluate the potential for PTR to offset other resources in a future IRP, please answer the following questions.

- A. Estimate the PTR program’s cost (\$) per kW-year based on the Company’s current best estimate of program costs and system coincident kW saved at generator.
- B. Would a demand response bundle with the estimated cost of capacity (\$/kWyear) reflected under part (A) be competitive with other resource options? How likely is it that such a bundle would be selected by EnCompass?
- C. In the Company’s most recent IRP (docket 24-67), what was the range of capacity cost (\$/kW-year) modeled for demand response bundles? What was the capacity cost (\$/kW-year) of the bundle economically selected by EnCompass (Bundle 6)?

Response:

- A. Currently, the best estimate for program costs is \$792,000 and the current best estimate for System Coincident kW is 8,403 kW. This equates to \$94.25/kW-year or \$7.85/kW-month.
- B. The Company is currently developing assumptions for our 2027 IRP. Because the estimated cost of the PTR program compares favorably with recent BESS projects approved through our 2024 RFP and ERAS process, as shown below:

Table 1
2024 RFP and Proposed ERAS Project BESS Pricing

Project	Size (MW)	Cost of Capacity (\$/kw-month)
		[PROTECTED DATA BEGINS]
Blue Lake BESS		
Sherco South BESS		
Crowned Ridge BESS		

Project	Size (MW)	Cost of Capacity (\$/kw-month)
Crane BESS		
Mayhew BESS		
Sandhill BESS		
Benton II BESS		

**PROTECTED
DATA ENDS]**

While we are still developing assumptions for the next resource plan, a DR bundle that reflects the cost of the PTR program would likely be competitive.

- C. Detailed costs for each DR bundle were provided in Table F-7 of Appendix F of our most recent IRP. “Attachment A – MPUC-008” provides Table F-7 with the addition of the costs for each bundle in \$/kW-year.

Preparer: Chris Shaw
Title: Manager, Regulatory Policy
Department: NSPM Regulatory
Telephone: 612-330-7974
Date: April 29, 2026