

Ex Parte Communication Report

Date:

To: Public Ex Parte Communication File

Docket No:

Case Name:

From: PUC Staff:

RE: Permissible Ex Parte Communications Pursuant to Minn. Rules, Part 7845.7400.

1. Type of communication: (Oral or Written)

If written, attach the document.

If oral, Date:

Time:

NOTE: In both instances, please notify the Maker the communication has been submitted for inclusion in the record.

2. Maker of the Communication:

3. Recipient of the Communication:

4. For communications involving the setting of interim rates or the review of compliance filings, the topic was:

5. For all other permissible communications that are prohibited for the Commissioners under Minn. Rules, part 7845.7200, the substance of the communication was:

6. For oral permissible ex parte communications, has a copy of this memo been sent to the assigned Administrative Law Judge? Yes No N/A



(Name and Date)

From: [Campbell, Nancy \(COMM\)](#)
To: [Bahn, Andrew P \(COMM\)](#); [Dornfeld, Tera C \(PUC\)](#)
Cc: [Rebholz, Michelle \(PUC\)](#); [Wiedewitsch, Rachel \(She/Her/Hers\) \(COMM\)](#)
Subject: Re: question on department position in docket no. 23-524 (residential TOU)
Date: Tuesday, December 23, 2025 4:32:43 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[Outlook-bepb32pi.png](#)

Please see Xcel witness Halama Rebuttal at pages 27 to 29, and Department witness Johnson Surrebuttal at pages 31-32 & Schedule 1 for discussion on recovery of Time of Use budget in docket 24-320.

Nancy Campbell

Supervisor of Regulatory Financial Analysis Unit

651-539-1821

mn.gov/commerce

Minnesota Department of Commerce

85 7th Place East, Suite 280 | Saint Paul, MN 55101



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message is intended only for the use of the individual(s) named above. Information in this e-mail or any attachment may be confidential or otherwise protected from disclosure by state or federal law. Any unauthorized use, dissemination, or copying of this message is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please refrain from reading this e-mail or any attachments and notify the sender immediately. Please destroy all copies of this communication.

From: Bahn, Andrew P (COMM) <andrew.p.bahn@state.mn.us>
Sent: Tuesday, December 23, 2025 3:32 PM
To: Dornfeld, Tera C (PUC) <Tera.Dornfeld@state.mn.us>
Cc: Rebholz, Michelle (PUC) <Michelle.Rebholz@state.mn.us>; Wiedewitsch, Rachel (She/Her/Hers) (COMM) <Rachel.Wiedewitsch@state.mn.us>; Campbell, Nancy (COMM) <nancy.campbell@state.mn.us>
Subject: RE: question on department position in docket no. 23-524 (residential TOU)

Hi Tera,

Our recommendation for the second bullet point was in response to the following statement by Xcel in its initial filing on p. 26.

The Company intends to seek cost recovery of these implementation costs through base rates as a part of our current electric rate case. These costs will be presented in our rebuttal testimony in that proceeding, which is scheduled to be filed in October 2025. Rebuttal testimony will also include greater details on the activities required for rate implementation, including the final budget for the project.

So, we were just covering our bases here. I am not certain if there were any issues in regard to the review of the implementation budget in the rate case, but I don't believe there were any brought up by the Department. I will check with others analyst on the rate case team to verify, though.

Thanks,
Andy

From: Dornfeld, Tera C (PUC) <Tera.Dornfeld@state.mn.us>
Sent: Tuesday, December 23, 2025 11:01 AM
To: Bahn, Andrew P (COMM) <andrew.p.bahn@state.mn.us>
Cc: Rebholz, Michelle (PUC) <Michelle.Rebholz@state.mn.us>
Subject: question on department position in docket no. 23-524 (residential TOU)

Hi Andy,

Happy almost holidays! I am writing to you with a question about a decision option / position offered by the Department in docket no. 23-524, Xcel Energy's residential time of use rate. We are scheduled to hear this docket on January 8, 2026. The Department replies filed October 27, 2025 offered the [following recommendation](#):

IV. DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

- The Department recommends the Commission approve Xcel's Compliance Plan and revised methodology for determining the TOU net-metering rates.
- The Department recommends approval of the implementation budget subject to review and approval in Xcel's current rate case.
- The Department recommends the Commission approve Xcel's proposed tariff modifications.

Could you explain how approval of the budget for the TOU rate, subject to review and approval in current rate case, would work given that the public comments and evidentiary hearings have [closed for that rate case](#)?

At present my comment appears to be a clarification and I would add your response to my briefing papers. However, you are well-versed in Commission rule and if this conversation were to venture into ex parte territory, I would be required to file responses in the docket.

Best,

Tera