

From: [Wufoo](#)
To: [Staff, CAO \(PUC\)](#)
Subject: Submitted Public Comment Form
Date: Friday, May 24, 2024 11:39:09 AM

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

Name * James Siegel

Provide the docket's number. MPUC Docket No. E-002/M-24-173

Leave a comment on the docket. *

Since when does the Equity Stakeholder Advisory Group (ESAG) start proposing as to how customers of Xcel pay their bills? If this biased "pilot program" is adopted, all someone would need to do is move into that designated low-income zip code. I don't even have to fit the low-income profile! What a great proposal; let's have everyone else pay part of my bill, regardless if I would qualify for any assistance.

The projected value of the credit(s) would work out to be approx. \$460/year/household, and the proposed selected zip code(s) would be an estimated 23,000 households. Wow! My understanding is the total cost of the program (2yr) would run about \$5.4 million per year, and the burden of covering that \$10.8M would be carried by other residential/ commercial customers. Where's the EQUITY in this proposal?

This is not just a bad proposal, it's a very discriminatory one. It's one thing to ask customers, who are willing to contribute to Xcel's winter season project, but it's a whole other thing when Xcel proposes to cordon off low-income sector(s) and have everyone else make up that \$10.8M difference. There's no equity in this proposal!

* The monetary facts used were from the Centers for the American Experiment article.